TRUE LIMITS OF RITUAL IN THE CHURCH

EDITED BY THE SAME

Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

THE LORD'S DAY AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST: Treated in a Series of Essays by various Writers. With a Preface by ROBERT LINKLATER, D.D.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

TRUE LIMITS OF RITUAL IN THE CHURCH

EDITED BY

REV. ROBERT LINKLATER, D.D.

VICAR OF HOLY TRINITY, STROUD GREEN

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY
1899

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

PREFACE

As I am only contributing a very elementary paper to this volume, I can the better explain its scope and praise its merits. First as to the scope. The writers intend it as an Eirenicon. We think it is advisable to use the present opportunity, when laymen are greatly agitated about ritual (as witness the correspondence in the papers and the discussion in Parliament), to place before those who honestly want to know the rights of the matter the fundamental principles which govern the ritual of Divine Service. For this reason it seems a propitious moment to address the public.

Men want to know about ritual, and they are as a rule fair enough to listen to both sides.

We offer these papers as a modest defence of the High Church position; but above all things, we are anxious, for the sake of Divine charity and because

we love our people, to allay the uneasiness and distrust which have been created. Devout and earnest laymen, who have not had special opportunities of studying the subject, are asking, "Where will this end?" Here is our answer, which will both defend our position and assure those who are disquieted of the due limit we have set before us—namely, loyalty to the Prayer-book and obedience to the lawful directions of our Bishops.

We are pledged to the Prayer-book, and we only wish to keep our pledge. The Prayer-book is our Office-book, and, read with common sense and properly understood, it is quite sufficient.

We have already, as clergymen, asserted this in our "Declaration of Assent," in which we use the words, "I assent to the Book of Common Prayer and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons . . . and in Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

This we affirm *ex animo* and without any reservation. The papers in this book of ours are treatises on the meaning of this "Declaration," all that it demands

and all that it implies. The various writers may and do take different views of *detail*, but they uphold their views only as conscientious and defendable interpretations of the rubric, and not in a spirit of disloyalty to the authority of the Church of England.

It will be a relief to many of our readers to know that there is a limit in our ritual matters, and what the limit is, even if they do not accept the premises on which we base the limit.

There *must* be some sort of ritual in the public worship of Almighty God, and its character cannot be settled by the changing whims and fancies of men—what we like or dislike; for our likings are all different, and we could not possibly please every one. There must be some rule other than this. Yes, there is a high fixed principle to guide us—it is the only true principle, satisfactory to men and pleasing to God—*The Order of God Himself.* This will answer all objections, satisfy all objectors, and close the controversy, at least as far as principles are concerned.

For remember, when the privilege of worship was given to man, when on the approach of the Incarnation men were taught how to worship, in order

that they might know how to behave themselves in the presence of God's Majesty when He should visit and redeem His people, Moses was shown the worship in Heaven, and God told him to make the Tabernacle and to order the Jewish services on the heavenly model: "See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount" (Heb. viii. 5). Every little detail of the Jewish service had this high authority: "It is like the service of Heaven." Men may have fretted then under its rule, and grumbled at what they could not understand. All that Moses could say to quiet them was, "I assure you it is exactly like what I saw with my eyes in the Church in Heaven,—the reproduction of what the heavenly creatures offer to their Creator in Heaven itself." It may have worried the Jews to have to do so many things which seemed to them trivial and unmeaning, but if they wanted to worship God they had to do these things.

We, from our standpoint, know the Divine meaning of many of these services which were dark and unmeaning to them; for example, the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement. They all pointed to

Christ, and we have them explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Is it not common sense that when man, God's creature, is moved to offer to his Creator worship, he should offer the worship that God is pleased to accept—and which God, indeed, has commanded him to "do"—in order that the worship of earth may at least be in harmony with Heaven, and that with Angels and Archangels and all the company of Heaven we may laud and magnify His Holy Name?

I have said that this order of worship had reference to the training and preparation of the Jews for our Lord's Incarnation; but it had also an immediate application to the Sacramental Presence of Jehovah in the Glory Cloud—the Shechinah.

Surely it was more than a coincidence that, when God came down from Heaven to lead His people through the wilderness, and to dwell amongst them in the "Holy of Holies"—on the Mercy Seat overshadowed by the Cherubim—the Divine Order of Worship was communicated to men that men might worship the Eternal God, in His Veiled Presence on earth as He is worshipped in Heaven?

"Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven."

Churchmen will see at once from this how the argument applies to the ritual of the Altar, where we believe our Lord is sacramentally present under the veil of bread and wine—our Shechinah. The Jewish Dispensation has passed away, or, more strictly speaking, has blossomed into the Christian Service. Aaron's rod has budded. But Heaven has not changed, and our worship must represent to God's people on earth what is being done in Heaven. It must be like it. We say as much as this in the great service which our Lord hath commanded us to do, "therefore with Angels and Archangels;" and we "do" our great act of Christian worship on our earthly altars as our great High Priest Himself does it in Heaven, where He presents His Sacrifice once offered on Mount Calvary, but constantly pleaded there by Him. He has entered into the Holy of Holies, Heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us. The wonderful glimpses afforded us in the Revelation of S. John of the heavenly worship strengthen this position.

This has been the aim of the Catholic Church of this land, as set forth in the plain and straightforward order of her Ornaments Rubric: "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 Edward the Sixth."

In the Preface "of Ceremonies" these are declared not to be "dark nor dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve," and the writers plainly say that "of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the *whole Catholic Church of Christ*)."

That is pretty plain language, and is of the utmost importance in considering the true limits of ritual. We are told at the conclusion of the Preface that what is here presented "hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved." So that the Ornaments Rubric has not only the authority of Parliament, but also the authority of the Church.

And common sense tells us that the priests of the

Church of England who accepted the Injunctions of Edward VI. and the "Order of Communion" must have continued to celebrate Divine Service just as they had always been accustomed to celebrate it, *except in those particulars where they were expressly ordered to omit certain ceremonies.*

They could not possibly have evolved out of their own inner consciousness a service which was to be exactly alike in all the parish churches of the land without the aid of specific directions for their ritual acts. The service was the same as in past days when they used the Salisbury, Hereford, or Bangor Missals. It was called by the same name, "the Mass," as witness (first Prayer-book Edward VI.). The priests by their ordination were priests of the Catholic Church, and as Catholic priests in obedience to the Convocations of the Church of this land, and the ordering of their own Bishops, in the third year of Edward VI. they accepted the new Missal—*the first Prayer-book of Edward VI.* So much for their position and their mode of performing Divine Service.

We, by the Ornaments Rubric, are ordered to do as they did in the second year; to wear the same vestments, and to decorate our Altars as they

decorated theirs. It can only be a mind warped with unreasoning prejudice that can fail to see the plain common sense of the position. Alas! there are such minds. An Irish rector wrote a few days ago, while refusing to allow a cross to be put up over a grave in his churchyard: "If your father was hanged, would you want to keep the halter?"

Our historical papers elucidate the vexed question as to what was the second year of the reign of Edward VI. My private opinion is that it was the second year, and not the third year. The Act of Uniformity, of which the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. was the schedule, did not receive the royal assent until March 14th of the *third year* of the reign of Edward VI., and was not used until Easter in the third year. So that as an hypothesis, and to prove the point, if Edward VI. had died before March 14th in the third year of his reign, the things ordered in that book would never have been used in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament—*never;* and therefore they were not used by the authority of Parliament in the *second* year of his reign. But the priests of the Church of England did celebrate Divine Service in the second year, and we can

easily find out what *ornaments* they used. These are the ornaments we are ordered to use in duly celebrating the Rite which is in our present Prayer-book.

But I leave the argument in the hands of the various writers who have so kindly contributed to this volume. Their names will be sufficient guarantee of the value of their opinions.

It only remains for me to thank them most heartily for their self-denying labours and to assure our readers that each writer is only responsible for his own paper.

ROBERT LINKLATER.

HOLY TRINITY VICARAGE,
STROUD GREEN, N.,
Mid Lent, 1899.

CONTENTS

AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

By the Editor

I had not intended to write a paper for this volume. It deals with a subject which from its very nature belongs to theologians who have made it their special study, and I have been fortunate enough to secure the co-operation of writers who are well qualified to speak with knowledge and authority on the subject of which it treats.

But while we have been waiting for a paper promised some eight or nine months ago by a friend, and without which we are at last obliged to go to press, events have happened which have altered my determination. The letters in the press, and the speeches in Parliament, have revealed such an abyss of unexpected and profound ignorance on the most elementary principles of the question, that, for the sake of those who know nothing of the subject, and who desire to understand the question from its very

beginning, in order that they may form a fair and correct judgment on the subject-matter, I venture to offer the following remarks.

First, to dispose of the difficulty which fair English minds must necessarily experience in accounting for the united and sustained opposition, at the present moment, of all sorts and conditions of men against the High Church clergy of the Church of England: the Press united in condemning us; Dissenters of every denomination, including Roman Catholics, one in delivering their attack. On the first view, surely it is natural to suppose that we must be wrong when every hand is against us, and every mouth condemns us. But then we remember certain utterances of our Divine Lord and Master by which He prepared His Disciples for the opposition of the world, and warned them that they must expect to be treated as the world had treated Him. "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord" (S. Matt. x. 25). This has been experienced by the Church in all ages. The Apostles themselves rejoiced "that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His Name." So that the condemnation of the world need not necessarily mean the condemnation of God; and God-fearing men and women will be led to examine the question for themselves, in spite of public clamour, in order that they may arrive at a just

judgment. If the tide of human wickedness could surge round the very Cross of the Friend of Sinners—the Sinless One—well! His unworthy servants who preach His gospel must not murmur if they are misunderstood, and reviled, and persecuted. Of course it is not pleasant. It is very hard for those who are trying to do their duty, whose whole life is spent for others, who only want to speak God's truth and deliver their message faithfully,—it is very hard to be accused of all manner of wrong things—dishonesty, disloyalty, etc. When the Church was asleep, when the clergy neglected their sacred duties, when the Sacraments were not administered, when the churches were closed from Sunday to Sunday, when the poor were allowed to die without the consolations of religion, when every manner of wickedness was rampant in the land and the country was honey-combed with infidelity,—no accusing voice was heard in Parliament, no indignation meetings were held. But now that the Church is awake, and her clergy are devoting their lives to their sacred calling, and the faithful are fed with spiritual food, and the lambs of Christ brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, when the fabrics of the churches are restored, and the services are frequent, and the worship of Almighty God is offered with the best that we can give—then the

newspapers condemn us, paid agitators desecrate the holy sanctuary, indignation meetings are held, and every kind of false witness is brought against the clergy.

Who can be at the bottom of all this? I ask the question very seriously, having in view the issues that are at stake. Whose empire is threatened? Whose craft is endangered? Who is it that resents souls being rescued from sin—poor creatures out of whom unclean devils have been cast, and who are now clothed with God's grace, and in their right mind? If we believe in Satan—that there is such a person—Satan, who defied God in Heaven when He said, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness,"—Satan, who so turned against Him the hearts of our Lord's own kinsmen after the flesh—His people—the Jews—that they cried out, "Crucify Him, Crucify Him;"—if we believe in Satan we need not wonder who is responsible for the persecution of to-day. For notice, that the noise is made by those who do not belong to the Church—those who are the sworn enemies of the Church. It is true that a few nominal Churchmen are found in their company, but even their friends, the Nonconformists, twit them with their anomalous position. They do not believe in the Church; they do not believe the doctrines of the Church; they do not believe the plain teaching of

the Prayer-book. It was pertinently said by a fair-minded Nonconformist in the House of Commons' debate—I give the quotation in substance as it appeared in the papers—

"What have Dissenters to do with this matter? They left the Church of England because they said it was steeped in sacerdotalism; what right have they now to turn round and abuse the clergy of the Church of England, who are faithful to her teachings and doctrines?"

The crisis is really not in the Church of England, but in bodies outside of her; because so many of her young people are coming over to the Church; because the Church of England, in her awakened life, is sweeping into her fold the generous and single-hearted men and women who, from no fault of their own, have hitherto been outside her influence and care.

But let us get to close quarters with the charge which is made against the High Church clergy of the Church of England. They are accused of being unfaithful to the Prayer-book, disloyal to the Church, and false to their ordination vows. Grave charges these, and were they true they would be utterly unworthy of their sacred office, unworthy to speak in the name of God. The charge is that they are false to the Reformed Church of England; and when we examine what their opponents say, it is because they believe in the Apostolic succession of our Bishops, in

valid Sacraments, and especially because they use the vestments and utensils ordered by the Prayer-book. They must prove this, of course; prove that the Prayer-book teaches what they believe, and that the Prayer-book orders the ornaments of the Church and ministers which they use.

But that is the charge. The storm has been raised against a school of clergy in the Church of England because they hold certain opinions, and do certain things, which these disinterested friends, who know so much better than Church-people do, say are contrary to the teaching and practice of the Church of England. It is very easy to settle this question. We need not go to documents which are out of reach. We have our Prayer-book to refer to; and the circumstances which surround the Reformation are well known. And first with regard to the ministry of the Church. If there is one thing more plain than another in these controverted questions, it is that the Church of England took the greatest pains to continue and perpetuate the Holy Orders of the Church. At the Reformation she could easily have dispensed with Bishops and Priests of the Church, if such had been the intention of the reformers. Then it really would have been a new Church made by Henry VIII. The foreign reformers had done this, and consequently we find no Bishops nor Priests

amongst them. In Scotland, afterwards, the Presbyterians dispensed with Bishops, and have lost the Apostolic ministry, and consequently the reality of the Sacraments. But in the Church of England the greatest care was taken to perpetuate Orders. The Reformation, indeed, was the work of the Church. The whole process was conducted on strict ecclesiastical lines. The Convocations of Canterbury and York exercised their undoubted powers. All the mediæval superstitions which had crept in were faithfully cast out. The Church of England returned to ancient and Apostolic teaching. The Church of England retained her ancient and Apostolic ministry. During the reign of the Roman Catholic Queen Mary, when the country returned to Rome, the English Catholic Bishops were deposed from their sees, not by canonical and ecclesiastical process, but by the mere power of the Queen. Consequently the intruded Roman Bishops had no canonical jurisdiction. When Elizabeth was crowned the See of Canterbury was vacant. Cardinal Pole, the last Archbishop, was dead (even he had not canonical jurisdiction, for Cranmer had not been deprived by canonical process). All the English Bishops in canonical possession of their sees, except Bonner, acknowledged Archbishop Parker; and Bonner tacitly acknowledged him, for his suffragans, Bishops Scory and

Hodgkyn, assisted at his consecration. Out of nearly 10,000 parish priests all but 185 conformed to the Church of England, and for eleven years all the Roman Catholics communicated at the English altars. This does not look like any break in the succession of the ancient Church of this land. The Bishops were the same. The priests were the same. The service was the same, only rendered in English. In the first Prayer-book it was called by the same name, the Mass. And this was the reformed Church of England. In truth, what had happened was this: The usurped authority of the Pope of Rome was repudiated. He never had any right in England. His intrusion was clean contrary to ancient canons of the Church. The Church of England regained her original freedom. And she still is what she ever has been, Ecclesia Anglicana, the Church of the English people. The ivy, which had grown round the ancient tree, and which was smothering her, was cut away, but the old tree planted in ancient time in this island was left untouched. This is the position of the clergy of the Church of England to-day. They are the natural successors of the ancient clergy. They can show their title. There has been no break in the succession of Bishops; the priests ordained by our Bishops of to-day have exactly the same Christ-given powers as the priests of the Church before the

Reformation. And the Church of England intended that it should be so, and so she retained intact her Holy Orders. Are our clergy, then, perjured because they say they are priests? They hold letters of Priests' Orders. Without these they could not have been appointed to their livings. Without these the churchwardens have power to prevent any one celebrating at the altar or saying the Absolution—this, not because they are High Churchmen, but equally so for the most Low Church minister. All accepted the same ordination. All have been made priests. The Prayer-book calls it "The Ordering of Priests." All knelt down when the Bishop laid his hands upon their heads and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," etc. Which is the honest man? the one who in his heart of hearts believes it, because he knows it is true, and thus accepts the ordination; or the one who for the sake of the position goes through the form, which in his heart he does not believe, and which he does not hesitate to say is a blasphemous lie? The preface to "The Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according

to the Order of the Church of England," runs thus "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" (Prayer-book). This demands the consideration of the Dissenting ministers who made such a brave show, and loud noise, in their demonstration against the High Church clergy. Just in passing, let us notice the charge that the clergy hear confessions and give absolution. Of course they do. What is the use of having this tremendous power unless they use it? The Bishop said at their ordination as priest, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven." They believed this with all their heart, and they knew it by personal experience. How did the Bishop get the power? Our Lord gave it to the Apostles, on the first Easter Day, when He appeared to them after His resurrection, and said, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them" (S. John xx. 21–23). And this power has been handed on in the unbroken succession of the Apostolic ministry. This is the meaning of "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." The Father sent Him to send them, He sent them to send others, and so on to the end of time.

That the Church of England teaches this is evident from many parts of the Prayer-book. Every time you come to church you hear, "And hath given power, and commandment, to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." This has to be pronounced by the priest alone. In the "Visitation of the Sick" the absolution runs: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." But I pass on to the question that is most prominent—that we use Romish vestments and Romish ceremonies, which are not ordered by the Church of England. Well, let us look at the Order. Here it is, just before Morning Prayer: "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 Edward the Sixth." This is quite plain. We are to use the ornaments which were in this Church of England in the second year of King Edward VI. The first Prayer-book was not

used until well on in the third year. The Act says Pentecost—but it was really used for the first time on April 9th, Easter Day, 1549. This was well on in the third year. "The Authority of Parliament" means the Act of 25 Henry VIII., plus the injunctions of 1 Edward VI. (1547). Well, it is perfectly plain what we are to use. Certain superstitious ceremonies had been taken away. That which was not taken away was, of course, intended to be used. Is it not common sense? These old priests of the Reformation period, who continued their services to the nation, who were specially retained and established in their parishes, who had all their lives been accustomed to say Divine Service in a particular way—who knew no other way of saying it—of course they continued doing the same actions, saying the same things, except where they were expressly forbidden. Things not forbidden were, of course, allowed. They said the Service in English instead of in Latin. So our Church of England is a reformed Church—not a brand-new thing made by Henry VIII., but the old Catholic Church of this country, founded here long before S. Augustine came to convert the Saxons in A.D. 597. For three British Bishops were present at the Council of Arles in A.D. 314, so that evidently the French Church knew of the existence of the ancient British Church, and

sufficiently esteemed her Bishops for their learning and piety to invite their representatives to visit Arles, and deliberate with them on matters affecting the common welfare of the Church of Christ. S. Augustine met the Bishops of this ancient Church at the famous conference in Worcestershire—we know the names of the seven sees they represented, —and he demanded of them that they should acknowledge the Pope as Bishop of the whole Church. This they absolutely refused to do, and so the conference came to nothing. It is very important that we should remember this attitude of the earliest Bishops of this country on the crucial question which, in the sixteenth century, brought about the Reformation.

We find the very same question cropping up a few years later (A.D. 664) at the Synod of Whitby, when the missionaries from Rome met the missionaries of Iona. Colman, the Bishop of Northumbria, represented the Northern Mission; Wilfrid represented the Roman claims. Oswy, the King, had married Eanfleda, of the Anglo-Saxon Church; so that the differences of the two parties came into acute antagonism in the royal household. The practical difficulty was the keeping of Easter; but the final issue turned on the claims of the Pope. We have the most dramatic account of the Council in the pages

of Venerable Bede. Wilfrid adduced the regular texts for the supremacy of the Pope. Colman declared that S. Columba, their founder at Iona, knew nothing of such claims. Wilfrid pertly rejoined that at the Judgment Day many would say to our Lord, "We have preached in Your Name," and Christ would answer, "I never knew you." Oswy succumbed to home influence, and Rome gained her point. The Northern clergy retired from the Council, and repudiated the whole transaction. This was the beginning of papal supremacy in the north of England. I am making so much of this point because it shows so clearly that the reformers of the sixteenth century simply gave effect to the protest of the ancient British Bishops of the sixth century. In all other points of doctrine at that time the Churches were absolutely identical. They held the same Catholic faith, and had the same Sacraments: Baptism, Holy Communion, Absolution, Confirmation, Holy Orders, the Apostolic Succession of Bishops, etc.

The Roman Church added to this the new-fangled and most uncatholic claim of the Bishop of Rome to be Pope of the whole Church.

We prove that this is an addition by appealing to the famous Eighth Canon of the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), two hundred Bishops present, to show

what was the mind of the Church as to the equal authority of the Bishops. The Bishop of Antioch had invaded the province of Cyprus and ordained priests without the authority of the Bishop of Cyprus, Evagrius. This is what the Council says—

"We declare, that they which preside over the holy Churches which are in Cyprus shall preserve without gainsaying or opposition their right of performing by themselves the ordinations of the most religious Bishops, according to the Canons of the holy Fathers, and the ancient customs. The same rule shall be observed in all the other dioceses, and in the provinces everywhere, so that none of the most religious Bishops shall invade any other Province, which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hand of himself or his predecessors. But if any one has so invaded a Province, and brought it by force under himself, he shall restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed, nor the pride of secular dominion be privily introduced under the appearance of a sacred office, nor we lose by little the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Deliverer of all men, has given us by His Own Blood. The Holy and Œcumenical Synod has therefore decreed that the rights which have heretofore, and from the beginning, belonged to each province shall be preserved to it pure and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old. But if any one shall introduce any regulation contrary to what has now been defined, the Holy Œcumenical Synod has decreed that it shall be of no effect."

I have gone into this matter at so great a length

because it is most important that we should understand that the Church of England only exercised her proper authority in delivering herself from the intolerable bondage of the Bishop of Rome at the Reformation; that she did not cease to be the Catholic Church of this country because she cast off her chains; nay, that she became purer, and more after the pattern of the Ancient Church of the General Councils by thus asserting her freedom.

It would be impossible to enumerate, in the space allotted me, the wrongs England had suffered at the hands of Rome. Let one instance suffice. Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, caused his clerks to count up the annual income of foreigners in possession of English parishes—seventy thousand marks,—three times the revenue of the King. At one time the Pope sent him the list of three hundred Italians who were to be provided with benefices. These men never intended to live in this country, and most likely did not know the language. Matthew Paris, Monk of S. Alban's, says of Grosseteste: "Wherefore he often threw down with contempt the letters sealed with the Papal Bulls, and openly refused to listen to such commands."

I am insisting on this that my readers may see I am not exaggerating the position of this one most important point. Popery means the Pope. The

Church of England ceased to be Popish at the Reformation because she cast off the authority of the Pope. But she did not cease to be catholic; on the contrary, she returned to ancient and catholic customs and doctrines, and only cast away the modern superstitions which had crept in.

The 30th Canon thus expresses it:—

"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 or practised, that, as the 'Apology of the Church of England' confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those Ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and *only* departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders."

OF THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC

By J. T. Micklethwaite, V.P.S.A.

"*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 Edward the Sixth.*"

The purpose of this essay is to assert that the rubric quoted at the head of it was intended to mean what it says, and that Churchmen now have a right to take it as doing so.

When the lawyers interfere in Ecclesiastical controversy, we are generally told that the legal meaning of words is something different from, or even directly contradictory to, that which an unbiassed intelligence would put upon them. The inconvenience of this is lessened by the fact that these legal meanings do not last long. They change with the times, and when men have become accustomed to the matter in

dispute the natural meaning asserts itself, and the legal one is heard of no more.

The Ornaments Rubric has had several legal meanings within living memory. Now, the natural one has generally prevailed, except that, when the book says *second year*, the lawyer says we must understand *third year*. No doubt this little difference will pass away like the others as time goes on, but meanwhile it is a source of some trouble to Churchmen who find themselves called upon to defend their liberty to do as the Prayer-book bids them. We do indeed contend that, as to matters in modern controversy, the ornaments used in the third year of King Edward were the same as those used in the second. But there is authority for them in the second year which can not be disputed, whilst the appearance of the first Prayer-book marks the beginning of changes which, before the end of the reign, had stripped the English service of everything but the barest essentials. These changes were forced upon the Church by the irregular use of arbitrary power; but it suits the Puritan controversialist to assume that all was done lawfully and in order, and he has a power of turning history backwards, which enables him to read into the first Prayer-book all later changes which fall in with his humour. It happens that some of the ornaments which he does not like

are explicitly ordered in that book, and a few years later were violently taken away by men whose only authority in the matter was the power to force obedience. On the strength of this, we have been told that these same ornaments may not lawfully be used now. To show that they continued in use through the second and third years, and for some time after, would be no great task, but it is more useful to search out what is the real meaning of our present rubric, and when that is done, we find that, after all, we are not referred to the first Prayer-book, but to something earlier.

The rubric of 1662 and that of 1559, of which it is a recast, each refers back to the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., and it will scarcely be disputed that whatever these words meant at the earlier date, they also meant at the later. Now, the first regnal year of a king begins on the day of his accession, and the number changes on each successive anniversary of the accession. Edward VI. succeeded to the throne by the death of his father on the 28th of January, 1547, and his second year began on the 28th of January, 1548, and ended on the 27th of January, 1549. Therefore, "legal meanings" apart, it is between those dates that we must seek the authority to which the rubric now refers us. An authority of earlier date, remaining still in force

within the time limited, is of course included, but a later authority cannot be brought back into it by any process known to historians or antiquaries.

The first Prayer-book received the authority of Parliament on the 21st of January, 1549—that is, in the last week of the second year of the King. And on the strength of this we are told that the reference in the present rubric is to the Act which authorized that book. That might have been a good argument, but for two things. The first is that the Act itself fixes the time when it was to come into operation. The book was to be used on the Whitsunday next following, which was the 9th of June, 1549; or, if it might be had earlier, then three weeks after a copy had been procured. Therefore, even if the book were published on the day that the Act was passed, which is unlikely, it could not have been used "by authority of Parliament," even by the most hasty reformer, until the King's third year was at least a fortnight old.

The other difficulty is that the Act does not deal directly with the ornaments. In the body of the Act there is not a word about them. In the book a few ornaments are mentioned incidentally, and the retention of some others, such as the chrismatory and the pix, is implied by the ordering of actions for which their use was necessary. The only passage

that hints at any departure from ancient usage is the rubric as to vestments at the beginning of the order of the Mass, which seems to allow the use of the cope by the celebrating priest instead of the chasuble. There is no mention of lights, which it is quite certain were used, and as to which there had been a new order less than two years before, nor of some other things, the use of which has come down by tradition to our own time. The book could not have been used if only the ornaments mentioned in it were allowed, and, even if there did not exist abundant evidence that men went on doing with the new service as they been accustomed to do with the old, it must have been clear that we must seek beyond the first Prayer-book, and the Act of Parliament which authorized its use, for guidance as to the meaning of our own rubric.

In going back to the second year of King Edward, we are not going back to the whole mediæval tradition. In the later years of King Henry VIII. there had been made nearly every desirable reform as to the ornaments of churches and the manner of conducting the services, except the translation of the services themselves. And some important steps had been made in that direction. The Gospel and Epistle and other lessons were read in English, and the English litany used before High Mass. And if

Henry had lived a few years longer, a complete English Prayer-book would probably have been brought out. As to ornaments, no change had been made in those which pertained to the regular services, but very important ones as to some connected with practices outside those services. All relics and shrines had been taken away, and the lights and other ornaments connected with them, also all images which had been made the objects of superstitious observance; and it was forbidden to set lights before images or to cense them. Images and pictures retained were to be "for a memorial only."

In 1547 a set of *Injunctions* was put forth by proclamation, and these contained all the changes which had been made up to that date, with a few more then first added. The authority of these Injunctions[1] may be questioned, but they are useful as showing the utmost departure from traditional uses which the Crown authorities then thought it proper to enforce.

Late in 1547 a very important Act, 1 Ed. VI. c. 1,

[1] The Injunctions owe what Parliamentary authority they may have to the Act 31 Hen. VIII. c. 8, which gave the force of Acts of Parliament to proclamations made, under specified conditions, by the King, or, in case of a minority, by the Privy Council; and, before they can be quoted for any purpose of coercion, it ought to be shown that the conditions, which are exactly laid down as necessary to give authority to a proclamation during a minority, were properly observed. At present this is at least doubtful.

ordered the restoration to the people of Communion in both kinds. No form was included in the Act, but a form was drawn up and was approved by Convocation, and on the 8th of March in the same year, it was ordered by proclamation to come into use on the following Easter Day. It is called the *Order of Communion*, and is an order for Communion only, not for the Celebration. When used it was to be inserted into the old Latin Service, which was to go on as before, "without varying of any other rite or ceremony of the Mass." The Order of Communion was not for use daily, but only when there were others besides the priest to receive, which was not yet the general rule. And it continued until it was superseded by the English book of 1549—that is, through the greater part of the second year of King Edward, and some months of the third year.

That this is the time which the men of 1559 had in mind when they first named the second year of King Edward VI. as that the usage of which was to fix the Church ornaments, appears evident, not only because the date was so recent that it is scarcely possible that one year should be put for another by mistake or accident, but because the standard of a time when all really objectionable ornaments had been taken away, but before the Puritan party had grown strong enough to force

their extravagances upon the Church, is just that which moderate reformers would be likely to choose.

But it has been said that the rubric has always been understood to refer to the first Prayer-book, and that all authorities have interpreted it so. Without admitting that this is exactly true, we may admit that it is so generally. In 1662 the mistake was a very natural one. After more than a century, during which the Church had passed through many vicissitudes, and when she was but just emerging from the sectarian flood, which at one time seemed likely to overwhelm her, no nice distinctions between the usages of the years 1548 and 1549 were likely to be made. For the purpose of the time one was as good as the other. Men may have talked then of the Book of 1549 as the authority, and others have done it since. We who now contend for the other view did the same ourselves, till circumstances led us to look more closely into the matter.[1] But still the fact remains that the men of 1662 repeated the order of 1559, and we must assume

[1] It was not Puritan hostility which led to the search. The old weapon was quite effective against that, though the new one may be handier. But it was undertaken to find out as far as possible what the ornaments in use in the second year of King Edward VI. really were, and how far some of those lately brought into use in our churches under cover of the rubric are properly entitled to that shelter. The result has been published in No. 1 of the *Alcuin Club Tracts* with the title *The Ornaments of the Rubric*.

that in doing so their intention was to do what the men of 1559 did.

The improbability of any mistake having been made at the earlier date has already been mentioned, but now let us turn to positive evidence of how the Elizabethan rubric was understood when it first came out. In the library of Lambeth Palace there is a letter [MS. 959 (40)] from Edwin Sandys, who later became Archbishop of York, to Matthew Parker, soon to become Archbishop of Canterbury. It is dated April 30, 1559, two days after the Act of Uniformity passed through Parliament.[1] In this Sandys writes—

"The *last boke of service is gone thorowe* | *with a proviso* to reteane the ornaments which were used in the first and second years of K. Ed. untill yt please the quene to take other order for them | owre glose upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them | but that others in the meane tyme shall not convey them away but that thei may remayne for the quene."

Now, here was a man in the midst of the controversies of the time, who disliked the new order, and was seeking a way to evade it. Such a man would try to make the order mean as little as

[1] The letter has often been quoted, but not exactly, and Mr. St. John Hope has been good enough to copy it afresh from the manuscript for the purpose of this essay. The italics in the letterpress represent underlinings in the manuscript, apparently in the same ink as the writing.

possible. And, if he had been able to read third year instead of second, and thereby in any way to minimize its effect, he would certainly have done so. But he says *first and second* years, which shows plainly, either that it was not open to him to substitute the third year, or that the ornaments of that third year were so far the same as those of the two next before it, that it was nothing to his purpose to make any distinction between them. The advocates of forced meanings may take the alternative they like best.

Sandys quotes the Act in a way that leaves little room to doubt that he had seen it. And if so, his *glose* is a singularly impudent one, for the provision as to the *use* of the ornaments is as clear in that Act as it is in our present Prayer-book, whilst the rubric in the book which accompanied the Act is, if possible, even more explicit.[1] But the Bishops took it up.

[1] The words of the Act are: "Provided always and be it enacted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorised under the great seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical or of the Metropolitan of this realm."

The rubric is: "And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion and at all other times in his ministration shall use such ornaments as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

The chief of them had been exiles, and had come home saturated with the puritanical teaching which prevailed at Geneva, and their wish was to force the same upon the Church of England. This matter of the ornaments stood much in their way. The Act ordering them made provision for further changes, but no such change was formally made. One cause of this was no doubt the personal opposition of the Queen. But what the Bishops failed to bring about in a regular way they did effect by the irregular use of their own authority, each in his own diocese. And there were plenty amongst the lower clergy and the laity ready to follow the example of lawlessness set by their superiors. That some were moved by conviction is not to be doubted, but the "taking away of ornaments of superstition" afforded opportunity for private gain, which the doings of some chapters show was not without motive power.

The movement went further than most of the Bishops would have had it,[1] and indeed they soon

[1] The Bishops seem to have wanted change rather than the extreme of bareness. The monument of Archbishop Sandys, the author of the *glose* quoted above, is a curious example. It is in Southwell Minster. There is an effigy in alabaster, which was once painted. Over a long white vestment, like an albe with pudding-sleeves and cuffs, is worn a red chasuble with a train behind, formed by elongating the back of the vestment. Over this again is a red doctor's hood. Sandys died in 1588, and this is probably the latest appearance of the chasuble in English monumental sculpture until our own time. The monument

found themselves fighting for existence against the monster of their own creating. Where the Puritans of baser sort held sway, the state of public worship sank to a condition which has now no parallel within the Church, and probably none amongst the more decent sects of Dissenters. Before the end of the Queen's reign, the first generation of Bishops having passed away, the reaction came, and their successors began to strive in earnest to put matters into better order.

The canons of 1603 are part of this reforming movement, and what they say as to the ornaments does not in any way override the rubric. That continued still in force, though for nearly half a century usage had been drifting further and further away from the observance of it. The new canon fixed a minimum of observance which was to be required of all.[1] It succeeded generally, and in many churches much more than the minimum was brought back. As to

has been badly treated by the "restorers," turned out from the quire into the north transept, scraped clean of all the paint, and a new head put on. The colours here given are taken from a drawing in a collection made by Sir William Dugdale about 1640, which, when the notes of it were made, was in the possession of the late Lord Winchelsea.

[1] Although the canon as to the use of the cope and surplice may not be quoted as forbidding the other vestments retained by the rubric, it may, of courtesy, be allowed as an excuse to men accustomed only to traditional ways, and unwilling to change them for what would to them be strange and distracting.

some things, the traditional use of which had been lost in the period of depression, the new use was, as we who have had the benefit of antiquarian study know now, not such as a strict interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric would sanction; but nevertheless we must believe that the intention of the users was to do as the Prayer-book directs.[1] The general level of Church observances became at least decent, and in cathedrals and other chief churches all of what have been known in modern controversy as the six points were in some sort used, and the service was done with surroundings which, though they may not have been in strict accordance with ancient precedent, must have been very dignified and impressive.

Notwithstanding the rude break of the Civil Wars, the improvement was maintained when matters in Church and State fell into their old order at the Restoration. And in 1662, when some revision was made in the Prayer-book, and a new Act obtained to give it parliamentary authority, the old order as to ornaments was repeated.

This, indeed, left the law exactly as it had been

[1] The burning of incense before the altar on a standing tripod, which seems to have been done in many places, is an example of this. No such church ornament as the tripod was used here in the second year of King Edward. It belongs to classical paganism, and it came to the men of the seventeenth century through their study of classical literature.

before, but it is important as a confirmation and also as taking away all need for disputing as to the legal value of any of the irregular doings between the times of the two Acts. In 1662, usage in the second year of King Edward VI. was, without any reserve or qualification, made to fix the law as to ornaments, as it had been before in 1559. What it meant at the former date it must still mean, and we have seen that that sends us to something earlier than the Book of 1549.

Some of those engaged in the revision of 1662 knew very well that the rubric which they put in covered much more than they could hope to see brought back in their time. But with a far-seeing confidence, they prepared for a future which, after two more centuries, has now come. We speak of the *Ornaments* Rubric, but there is matter behind the ornaments of much greater importance, very necessary to be insisted upon now that the Church of England is called upon to assert her Catholic position before all the world and all over the world, and not less so for its value in maintaining and spreading the faith at home.

It has been claimed that the rubric makes lawful all things which were in the churches in the second year of King Edward. And, interpreted literally, it does cover the *retention* of all, so that any ornament

which can be shown to have been lawfully in the Church then may equally lawfully have a place there now. But the clause, "*at all times of their ministration,*" puts some qualification on the order for *use.* For it is obvious that ornaments connected with ministration not provided for in the Book, and proper to them only, can not now be used by authority of the rubric. It does not follow that the use of every such ornament now is wrong. There may be good authority for it elsewhere than in the Prayer-book. For example, there is not provision in the Book for any ministration for which the chrismatory is proper. But chrism is used in the coronation of kings, and the use of it implies that of some fit vessel in which it may be kept. And so it may be of other things. But the technical *retention* of an ornament does not by itself justify the introduction of any ministration, not covered by the Book, for the sake of bringing that ornament into *use.*

It would be foolish to furnish churches with ornaments for which there is not now any use, but the nominal retention of such is not without value. Some belong to ministrations which, though now in abeyance, are in themselves desirable and likely to be restored. And if any such be restored, it will be far better to use such of our own ancient ornaments as are proper to it, than to borrow from abroad or to

invent something new. The old have not only the sanction of the rubric, but they owe their forms to the experience of many centuries, which gradually moulded them to what was fittest for use.

Amongst the ornaments are some—such as screens, pews, and such-like—which are generally useful and seemly furniture not specially connected with any ministration; and others—pictures, reredoses, curtains, and many more—which are ornaments in the modern popular understanding of the word. All these should be now "as in times past," which does not mean that our work must pretend to be of some other date than it is. The artist of to-day may use his liberty to the full without any lack of respect for the law under which he works.

The Prayer-book resembles most of the older Service-books in giving very little direction as to ceremonial, and mentioning very few of the ornaments. In 1559 there was no need. Everybody knew all about these things, which had come down through the tradition of centuries, kept alive by daily use, but for a short break in the last years of Edward VI. The rubric shows that they who drew it up intended that the tradition should go on. And so it would have done but for the interruption of it by the unauthorized action of the Bishops. Some of it, indeed, did survive, to reappear with the reforming movement at the

beginning of the seventeenth century. But much had then been quite forgotten, and in place of it new was brought in which, whatever were its merits, and however dignified and edifying it may have been, could not, or at least can not now in the light of fuller knowledge, claim to have the authority of the rubric.[1]

The tradition of the seventeenth century was carried into the eighteenth further than is perhaps generally known. But the days of the Georges were days of decay. And no one who remembers the state to which churches and services had come fifty years ago will deny that the need of reform was great. The reform has come, and even the most backward has been affected by it. The change from what things were to what they are is wonderful to look back on to those who have seen it all, whilst few of the younger ones have any idea of how great it has been. The change is the beginning of a new tradition. The new reformers have not gone to the seventeenth century for guidance, but to the Prayer-book itself, which sends them to the sixteenth.

[1] It would be interesting to search out the sources from which the Churchmen of the seventeenth century drew their ceremonial and the ornaments which belonged to it. Some, as the "aire," were Greek. The tripod censer, as said above, comes from classical antiquity. The credence, as its name implies, is Italian, and the altar-rail may be, though perhaps we need not go abroad for a precedent for what was brought in to meet a real evil at home. But whence came those strange ornaments, the "tun" and the "tricanale," which took the places of the crewets for wine and water respectively?

It is not denied that many mistakes have been made, and things brought in, under cover of the rubric, which were not in use here in the second year of King Edward. This has been from want of knowledge, and as knowledge increases such things will drop off. But it is not reasonable that, because some men have made mistakes, all should be asked to give up any of their Prayer-book birthright. We claim liberty to use all that the rubric allows according to its natural interpretation. What that is must be ascertained by patient inquiry. And thus it is that this Ecclesiastical question becomes one for the antiquary. The contortions, distortions, and contradictions of the lawyers have raised such a cloud of obscuration that it is difficult to get men to see the matter in a dry light. But till they do there is no hope of a satisfactory settlement.

We claim that about every ministration for which the Prayer-book provides a form there shall be used the same ornaments as were used about the same ministration in the second year of King Edward, and that they shall be used in the same way; and whereas, at the time we are referred to, there were differences as to the use of the ornaments caused by various conditions of place and time, the same range of difference is lawful now.

It is not the purpose of this essay to give a list of

the ornaments, but two simple examples shall be taken to show how a punctual observance of the rubric brings in the ornaments. Nothing shall be said about the vestments, as there is no longer any serious contention as to them. But take the reading of the Gospel. Of old, at the principal service of the day on all Sundays and feasts, the reader took the Gospel-book from the altar, and proceeded to the place of reading, with other ministers going before him carrying lights and incense, and on high days the cross. In private services, and at the principal one in small country churches where the priest and clerk were the whole staff, the priest read the Gospel himself at the altar, either without these accompaniments or with only some of them, according to the means of the place. Here, then, we find that the ceremonial use at the reading of the Gospel of the cross, processional lights, and the censer with incense, is covered by the rubric, but, on the other hand, they are not required on all occasions.

The other illustration shall be from the offertory. At the preparation or "making" of the chalice there were used the chalice itself with the paten, the crewets for wine and water, and sometimes the spoon. Before the offertory the corporas had been taken out of its case and spread upon the altar. After it the priest took the censer and censed the offering,

and was then himself censed, which done, he washed his hands either over the piscina or at the corner of altar, the basins and napkin being brought to him there. Here we find many ornaments in use, and there does not seem to have been any considerable variety as to them in different places, except that in poor churches incense was not generally used except at high feasts.[1]

It cannot be denied that these things were in use at these two points in the service in the second year of King Edward VI., and no change has been made in the form of the service which renders them less suitable now than they were then. The contention, that because certain Bishops of Elizabeth's time disliked these and other such things, and put a dishonest "glose" on the order for their retention and use, and then, by their own authority, tried to do away with them, therefore the act of Church and Realm a hundred years afterwards is to be understood to mean the exact contrary to what it says, will not be accepted by Churchmen even at the bidding of judges whose opinions on matters within their proper jurisdiction would receive the fullest respect.

[1] There is some reason for believing that at plain-said Masses incense was only used at the offertory.

THE CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE OF CONFORMITY IN DIVINE WORSHIP

By the Rev. C. F. G. Turner

Conformity to authorized formularies of Divine worship may be considered from three points of view, viz. (1) from that of the private judgment of the individual—his own personal appreciation, that is, of the merits or defects of any given liturgical form, or of its authority, orthodoxy, practical usefulness and expediency, or the like ; or (2) it may be considered in its relation to legislative enactments under any existing convention between the Church and the State ; or lastly, (3) conformity may be considered, and its true nature and limits defined, as required by obedience to the law of the Holy Catholic Church, and by œcumenical tradition and custom.

1. Of the first of these points of view, it should be hardly necessary to speak at all. The principle of

private judgment—the right, that is, of the individual to constitute himself the judge in matters falling within the province of an authority he has already admitted and submitted to, and which already have been ruled by that authority—strikes at the root, not only of all Catholic tradition on the matter, but of *any principle of conformity whatsoever.* Logically, and in final analysis, it would render the very existence of a prescript form of Divine Service not only abortive of any practical usefulness, but absolutely impossible.

"If," says Hooker, "it should be free for men to reprove, to disgrace, to reject at their own liberty what they see done and practised according to order set down; if in so great variety of ways as the wit of man is easily able to find out . . . the Church did give every man license to follow what himself imagineth that God's Spirit doth reveal unto him, . . . what other effect could hereupon ensue, but the utter confusion of His Church?"[1]

Yet, so inveterate is the spirit of criticism and intolerance of authority, merely because it is authority, which generations of Protestant eclecticism have engendered,—so hard is it now for Englishmen to shake off altogether the dreadful intellectual nightmare of so-called independence—that it has become by no means impossible for an otherwise loyal and

[1] *Eccl. Pol.*, V. x. 1.

Catholic-minded son of the Church to strike out a line for himself in matters upon which the Church claims his unquestioning allegiance, and to appeal, precisely as the veriest Protestant would, to the Bible, or the Fathers, or the Primitive Church, or the "Mediæval practice," or "what is done abroad,"—to, in fact, something or other which happens to fall in with his own course of action or commends itself to his own private judgment.

It is precisely against this temper, and the confusion in which its influence inevitably results, that the following pages are directed. It will help us but little to observe the disintegrating effects of individualism and of undisciplined initiative among the fragmentary forms of separated Christianity, unless we ourselves lay to heart the lesson that, as in unity lies the secret both of strength and perpetuity, so in subordination to law and order, and in that alone, lies the secret of unity.

> "O new-compassed art
> Of the ancient foe! but what if it extends
> O'er our own camp and rules amid our friends?"[1]

2. The second point of view, the requirement of State law, is not altogether without importance. It is not meant, of course, that any obligation of conformity whatever arises solely, or even primarily, from any

[1] Newman, *Verses*, lxxxiii.

action of the civil authority, *as such*. Indeed, we cannot insist too strenuously on this. Nevertheless it most certainly is true that, in the existing relations between Church and State, *a fresh obligation* is created *ex contractu cum statu*, so to speak, by the fact that the original obligation arising from the law of the Church has been promulged, and enforced upon all who minister in these realms, as a condition of their legal and official status by legislative enactments. Their emoluments are, in a certain sense, guaranteed to them by the State on the understanding of this convention, and that they will in this, as in other matters, obey the law of the Church herself whose ministers they are.[1]

[1] This is so simply and yet so ably put by the late Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln in his little book *Theophilus Anglicanus*, that it has been thought worth while to give the whole passage. He is dealing with the obligation of the Acts of Uniformity, and he asks—

"Q. Is not the force of the spiritual enactment weakened by this *civil* sanction?

"A. No. On the contrary, it is strengthened by it; *lex humana jubendo quod lex divina jubet, novam superaddit obligationem.*

"Therefore, when we obey the rubric, we obey, not only as Christians, but as citizens; and he who *disobeys* when God commands by the voice of the State and that of the Church is *doubly* guilty; 'apud homines pœnas luit et apud Deum frontem nor habebit.'" And he quotes Barrow (iii. 288): "It is a great mistake to think that the civil law doth anywise derogate from the ecclesiastical: their concurrence yieldeth an accession of weight and strength to each. Now that spiritual laws are backed by civil sanctions the knot of our obligation is tied faster; and by disobedience to them we incur a double guilt and offend God in two ways, both as Supreme Governour of the world and as King of the Church."

3. But it is with the third of these points of view —viz. the law and custom of the Holy Catholic Church—with which we are chiefly concerned. Nor should it be necessary to say what is here meant, nor to uphold the sovereign authority in such matters as that under discussion, of that law and custom. For we are addressing those only who profess to recognize it, and to uphold its authority as opposed to that of private judgment, in all matters of Church order and government. And by the law and custom of the Church is not merely meant that written law as it is embodied in canonical enactments, or that custom merely which is witnessed to by specific ritual and ceremonial provisions, but that great unwritten principle of action—the very law, so to speak, of the Church's being—the principle of subordination to constituted authority, so markedly different to the subjective and experimental system of the sects, and to which her entire history and her life at the present time bear witness. Surely, whatever may be the individual preferences and divergent practice in ceremonial matters of those amongst us who profess to understand what is meant by Catholic consent and to appeal to it, their aim, if they are consistent and true to their profession, will be to know more and more the mind of the Church, and to base their teaching and practice upon it, for its own sake, and

because it is, and they believe it to be, the very "mind of Christ."

I.

Let us, first of all, consider the position which the prescript Order of Divine Service occupies in the economy of the Catholic Church. This is important, because it is beyond question, one would suppose, that in the Church of England that position is fully occupied now by what is known as the Book of Common Prayer.

Now, we may take it as absolutely beyond question that a prescript form of Divine worship is part and parcel of the constitution of the Church of Jesus Christ. It is, in fact, a part of the Divine Tradition, that Deposit of Faith and Morals delivered by the Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to the Church, together with the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and, in point of fact, including the inspiration and right use of these.

The broad fundamental principles of Divine worship now recognized in various forms throughout the Catholic Church undoubtedly appertain to that Tradition. As the public worship of the Almighty appertains to the natural law, so that public worship falls within the supernatual law of the gospel,

and its regulation became, inevitably, a primary consideration with the first pastors of the Church. There resulted, in the Apostolic Age itself, the recognition of this principle and the foundation, in its broad outlines, of that liturgical system which has continued throughout the Church till the present time.

"That very set and standing order, which, framed with common advice, hath, both for matter and form, prescribed whatsoever is herein publicly done. . . . No doubt from God it hath proceeded, and by us it must be acknowledged a work of His singular care and providence, that the Church hath evermore held a prescript form of common prayer, although not in all things everywhere the same, yet for the most part retaining still the same analogy. So that if the liturgies of all the ancient Churches throughout the world be compared amongst themselves, it may easily be perceived that they had all one original mould, and that the public prayers of the people of God in churches thoroughly settled did never use to be voluntary dictates proceeding from any man's extemporal wit." [1]

The principle, then, of a Prescript Form of Public corporate Worship we may take, so far, to be of Divine institution. It was recognized by our Blessed Lord Himself, not only in the counsel He gave to others, but by His own attendance at the public official worship of Israel and by His scrupulous

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, V. xxv. 4.

fulfilment of the ceremonial law at His Circumcision and His Presentation in the Temple.

To His Apostles, when He taught them the highest and holiest of all prayers, He Himself delivered, at least in germ, the Divine "Lex Orandi" of His Church: to the corporate prayer and worship of the faithful, gathered together in His Name, He assured His abiding presence. So the principle of a form of Divine Service became a part of the Divine Tradition itself. Committed, in principle at least, by the Divine Head of the Church to His Apostles, it was by them in turn delivered to the Church. It grew with her life, and expanded to meet the ever-increasing spiritual need of her children. It enshrined her sacramental ministry, and became, so to speak, the constant outward expression, the full practical exhibition of her faith. The Church, in her approach to God in worship, took with her words which soon occupied a place in the minds of faithful clergy and laity alike, not far removed from that of the inspired Scriptures themselves.

As time went on, not only do we find the Sacred Liturgy appealed to as testifying to the faith of Christendom, but its very language passing into common use among divines, preachers, and mystical and ascetical writers, who quote it and adopt its phraseology with hardly less freedom and assurance

than they are wont to quote the very words of Holy Scripture itself; nay, that in this they had the example of the inspired writers themselves is more than conjecture. Passages occur in S. Paul's writings, for example, which, clearly as they are borrowed from some perfectly familiar and well-known source, are no less clearly not quotations from any other part of the Bible. These are held, and with much show of probability, to be actual quotations from or reference to the earliest form of the Liturgy.[1] Christian thought, even amongst the devout lay folk, framed itself, and found expression, naturally and freely, even down to our own day and in the Anglican communion, in the very language of the Liturgy, as children's, in their mother tongue. It was, in fact, from the very first, and throughout the Church's history, *a very sacred thing.* Solemn councils, gathered together to define the faith against heresy, paused in the midst of declaring and expounding the great mysteries of revelation, to legislate for the worship of the faithful.

Here we see the true position of a prescript form of Divine Service in the Church's economy as well as its real dignity. It is one sphere, unquestionably, in which the Church exercises her teaching office and authority. The "Lex Orandi" is the expression

[1] Dr. Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology*, p. 410.

of the Divine "Lex Credendi," as well as its perpetual and most accessible witness. As regards the one, no less than as regards the other, *so far as their broad fundamental principles are concerned*, we at least who believe that the promise made to the Church by her Divine Head can never fail, must hold that she is preserved from error.

That such broad fundamental principles—notwithstanding the widest divergence both as regards time and place—do exist, and that the mind of the whole Catholic Church is practically at one about them, is also beyond question. Such, for example, are the structural form of the Liturgy of the Eucharist, and the general principle of a relation between this and the other daily services of the Church; the use of the Psalter and the public reading of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; the use, too, of ceremonial, and—in principle—of special postures for prayer and praise, of special vestures for the officiating ministers, and of special things, consecrated by immemorial custom as fitting adjuncts of solemn worship, such as incense and lights and the use of music.[1] But there is one principle—the most important for our present purpose—which undoubtedly refers the final ordering of public

[1] All these principles are undoubtedly recognized and maintained in our formularies.

Divine Service, and the application in detail of all the foregoing principles, to *the Ecclesiastical authority itself.* To this principle the whole history of the Catholic Church, from the very time of the Apostles themselves to our own, bears constant and unbroken witness. At first, and while the worship of the Church was still in its infancy, there would be less need for the exercise of authority in respect to rites and ceremonies. Still, there is enough, and in the writings of S. Paul himself,[1] to show that, from the very first, the ordering of, apparently, even trifling ceremonial details, was regarded as of sufficient importance to call for the advice of the Apostle, and to fall within his right, as representing the authority in the Church, to deal with. But from the Council of Nicæa onward we find that authority occupied, not merely with the definition of Articles of Faith against heresy, but with the order, even in minute particulars, of Divine Service. And what the Chief Pastors, assembled in Council, could order, and did order, for the whole Church, or for that part of the Church of which a Council was representative, that, it was held, each of them would consider as falling immediately within his own Episcopal jurisdictions, though obviously with certain

[1] *E.g.* 1 Cor. xi. 5, etc.; xiv. 29, 40; and cf. *ὁσιόυς χεῖρας, . . . τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, κ.τ.λ.* (1 Tim. ii. 8).

limitations, for the members of his own flock. This, in fact, is the principle of the *Jus Liturgicum*, first, of the Episcopate, collectively, of the Catholic Church; and next, of each Bishop in his own diocese.

We see, then, from the first: (1) a prescript form of Divine Service; and secondly (2) that prescript form again and again made the object of Conciliar, Synodical, and Episcopal provisions and enactments.

Now, this would be unintelligible, as it would have been purposeless, unless the Church had from the very first recognized the principle that refers such matters to the Ecclesiastical authority, and was content to abide by its rulings; in other words, unless what the whole mind of the Church had in view was uniformity in principle and conformity. It takes for granted, in fact, that *conformity to authorized formularies is a known law and custom of the Holy Catholic Church.*

It is well that this should be stated quite plainly at the outset, or the real gravity of the questions now under discussion will never be realized. To point out, or even to demonstrate, defects in authorized formularies, to insist upon their modification as called for by the spiritual needs of certain souls, or the changed conditions of Church life, is really to obscure the issues. The real question is not, for the moment, the intrinsic excellence of one form

of Divine Service as compared with another, but how and by whom such forms may be dealt with, not as the sporadic sects would have us, on principles of individualism and private initiative, but according to the unbroken and constant tradition and usage of the Holy Catholic Church.

Taking for granted, then, the existence of this law of conformity, we are led on to ask what, if any, are the limits of its obligation? We need not linger on those limits so far as they concern the other Churches of Christendom. It is useless to deny that the position of the English Church is peculiar. Her isolation from the rest of Christendom both East and West, and the inroads made upon her tradition during the past three hundred years; the great ignorance of Catholic principles prevailing among large masses of her people, and, it must be frankly owned, affecting a certain proportion of her clergy, and as a result a widespread repudiation, where, indeed, it is understood at all, of the Catholic "Standpoint;"—all this, taken in connection with the characteristics of the whole nation, has undoubtedly a very important bearing upon all questions of the obligations of Ecclesiastical law and custom. Thus, it is not reasonable to press the conclusions in such questions of the great moral theologians of either the Eastern or the Western Church, even when these

are dealing with the obligation of Ecclesiastical law still actually in force, at least, as to its letter, in England, or to overlook the fact that these divines are legislating for souls under conditions of Church life as utterly unlike our own as can be conceived. Hence, we may admit at once that it is at least debatable whether there may not exist in the English Church certain conditions which limit the obligation of this law of liturgical conformity. These circumstances, the whole condition of our Church life, are peculiar, as regards the Ecclesiastical authority, related as that is to the civil power, as well as both the formularies themselves, and also the people to whom we minister. Throughout the length and breadth of the country we have to deal with large numbers of people not wholly without a certain sentiment of religion and a certain grasp of the main verities of the Christian faith, but steeped in heretical ignorance of Catholic principles, and contempt for Catholic custom, and with utterly perverted ideas of the purpose and end of Divine worship. In the large towns and centres of population, the clergy have to work, not only among the fairly educated, but often careless, indifferent, and self-indulgent, but among a submerged and utterly religionless class to whom any sort of liturgical worship whatever is unknown, and would be as

incomprehensible as to the veriest heathen. Much is thus almost unavoidably left to the initiative of the parochial clergy, and the Ecclesiastical authority itself is compelled to allow them a greater freedom possibly than is to be found in other parts of the Church, or existed formerly.

But that is not all. Our own liturgical forms, beautiful though they undoubtedly are, differ in more than one important particular from those of almost the whole of the rest of Christendom. It is this, beyond question, which, to the minds of so many English clergy, affects their claim to Catholic authority. Containing no doubt all that is absolutely essential, they are—let us freely admit it—disfigured by the removal of much that has the sanction of venerable antiquity, of primitive tradition, and of almost universal and immemorial custom. Compiled in a language which is no longer the colloquial vernacular, they labour under the very grave disadvantage of uncertainty of meaning, and of an admitted ambiguity. In the recoil from error and exaggeration there is, too, a reserve which tends to obscure our common heritage in the faith, and notably in "the Communion of saints," both as regards the departed and the spirits of the just made perfect in glory. The large development in recent years in the use of metrical hymns alone testifies to the widely felt

sense of deficiency in our formularies. And they are, confessedly (as well as in historical fact), a compromise and provisional.

Nevertheless, the English Church is as fully in possession of an authoritative prescript form of Divine worship as any Church in Christendom. It has the fullest synodical authority. It is imposed upon the clergy by the joint action of Church and State. Each member of the clergy when licensed or preferred to the cure of souls, is (with a preciseness, so far as the present writer is aware, not to be found in any other part of the Western Church) required to enter into a definite and solemn engagement to "use that form and *no other*." That he will do so is not taken for granted, and merely safeguarded by Ecclesiastical penalties, as in the case of the rest of the Western clergy. He must give an express promise to do so. To what does that promise bind him? What is it understood, by those into whose hands it is made, to cover? What, if any (and clearly there is a growing uncertainty on the subject), are the limits of its obligation? To what tribunal, in fine, are questions arising about its bearing upon particular cases; or possible hindrances to effectual ministrations arising from its too rigid fulfilment; or the incidental inadvisability, or seeming impossibility in some instances,

of fulfilling it at all to be referred? Here is the double problem which the Catholic clergy have to solve. Clearly it cannot be solved by an appeal to the conscience of the individual apart from the rule of faith and the claims of lawful authority; nor yet to the letter of Holy Scripture as against the legislative power of the Catholic Church. The Church herself is the witness and keeper of the "Apostles' Doctrine," the "Prayers," the "Form of Sound Words," at this very hour, no less surely than she is of Holy Scripture itself. Nor is it to primitive tradition, or the Fathers, or Mediæval custom, or this or that rite or liturgy,[1] which is not the one put into our hands by our own legitimate superiors, that we should look. It is to some fundamental principle of universal acceptance. It is to the living voice of the Church universal expressing itself uniformly in her present life and action. It is, practically, to the Catholic Church herself, in her ordinary *magisterium*—that full, practical exhibition of her mind throughout the world at this very day in which we live. The Apostles themselves, and those who first learnt our holy religion from them, knew no other rule of faith, or worship, or Christian life.

What, then, looking throughout the Church

[1] It is, of course, taken for granted that the "Rite" of the Book of Common Prayer is neither that of Sarum nor, *à fortiori*, of Rome.

Catholic, do we see? In every diocese of Christendom a prescript form of Divine Service, sanctioned by the Ecclesiastical authority, and in every place the clergy bound to use that form and no other. It is the Bishop's duty in each diocese to see that the recognized and authoritative form is there used, and its prescriptions carried out; to him, primarily, all questions that might arise, and especially the reform of all abuses, would be referred. Nor would this be less so even in those parts of Western Christendom, where the use of the Roman Service-books has superseded the ancient Diocesan Use, and the further authority of the Sacred Congregation of Rites would be in operation.

Here, then, are two principles of universal Catholic observance—

1. Conformity to the authorized formularies, such as they are, in each locality.

2. The reference of all matters connected with them, and all questions arising about them, in the first instance, to the Bishop of the diocese.

Now, both these principles are explicitly maintained by the Church of England: the first by the Acts of Uniformity and by the engagement which every clergyman licensed to the cure of souls is required to enter into—viz. that he "will use the Form in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed,

and no other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority;" the second, in set terms, in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, which lays down that those "in doubt as to the use and practice of the same" shall "always resort to the Bishop of the diocese;" and, further, that if the Bishop of the diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.[1]

Yet, notwithstanding this unequivocal witness on the part of the English Church to these principles of Catholic order, in practice she is the one exception throughout Catholic Christendom to their uniform observance and application. For it is not too much to say that, in her darkest hour of Erastian servility and Protestant apathy and misrule, she did not exhibit, so far as her prescript order of Divine Service is concerned, an exterior more utterly at variance with the spirit and principle of Catholic custom than she does at the present moment. It is quite true that the ceremonial provisions of the authorized Service-books are better understood, as well as more widely respected and loyally carried out, whereas, at the period referred to, they were, in great measure, systematically ignored, and any attempts at their observance viewed with suspicion, misrepresented, and

[1] We have seen recently how a proposal on the part of the Archbishops to deal with matters in dispute on this very principle has been met in certain quarters!

not infrequently opposed by the very authority whose chief duty it was to see them loyally carried out. And this, no doubt, destroyed, to some considerable extent, the outward resemblance of our public worship to that of the rest of Catholic Christendom. But, notwithstanding, the services (containing, admittedly, the essentials of Catholic worship) were recited in their integrity. Their traditional order, of Matins, Litany, and the Administration of the Lord's Supper, was maintained. In the midst, no doubt, of much slovenliness and irreverence up and down the country, there yet was, in the cathedrals and college chapels at least, and in many of the larger parish churches, a considerable dignity, and a certain stiff stateliness in the conduct of Divine Service—enough to uphold the Catholic ceremonial principle, and, therefore, to provoke the hostility of Methodists and other Protestant separatists. And no one then, at any rate, called in question the right and office of the Bishop in respect to the conduct of Divine Service. What do we see now? A great increase, doubtless, of what, for want of a better name, are called "ornate," or "hearty" services, surpliced choirs, and floral decorations; here and there, a resemblance, so far as externals are concerned, to the services of the rest of Christendom. But, on the other hand, not only

the utter disregard on the part of a large majority of the clergy of the plain ceremonial provisions of our Service-books, and neglect of the Daily Offices, but the endless and ever-increasing curtailment and variation of the Offices themselves; the "farsing" of them, and now becoming an almost intolerable abuse, with metrical compositions having no semblance of liturgical authority; the omission, at the sole discretion of the minister and on some purely subjective principle of his own, of important and structural and often considerable portions of the Liturgy itself; the interpolation, not as acts of private devotion, but as part of the public service itself, of fragments gathered from other Liturgies; the substitution of entire Offices out of some other rite for those of our own authorized formularies, and an ever-increasing adoption of what are known as popular services, inspired by Methodist revivalist meetings and the Salvation Army at one end of the range of selection, and by the Brompton Oratory at the other—by anything that may lie between these, or even by both together!

But this is not all. All this is done, not only without the sanction of authority, but frequently without any sort of reference to it, not seldom in the teeth of the known disapproval of the diocesan, and in far too many instances on the strength of a

toleration wrung from his weakness and his fear of further divisions and disunion, and the scandal of resistance to lawful authority on the part of those whose first duty it is to maintain and submit to it—a toleration which, as a natural result, he is constrained to extend in a totally opposite direction, to such intolerable profanities, for example, as "Evening Communions."

II.

It will make our meaning clearer to say something of the variations which have recently become common, from the prescribed and authorized formularies. Incidentally, the usual line of argument employed to defend these variations will be noticed in order to show that it not only runs counter to the spirit of Catholic order, but is logically *destructive of any principle of conformity whatever.*

These variations may be classed, roughly speaking, under four heads. They may, first of all, be divided into—

I. 1. OMISSIONS of single portions, or of several consecutive portions of the services, and—

II. ADDITIONS to them; these, again, are—

2. Interpolations in the services themselves of extraneous matter.

3. Additional services of a strictly liturgical character, borrowed from some rite or "Use" other than that of the Book of Common Prayer, to supplement, or even, in some instances, to supersede, the offices in that book.

4. "Popular Services," of a devotional rather than a liturgical character—Mission Services, "Flower" and "Toy" Services, Children's Services, Church Parades and the like.[1]

It will be seen at once from this summary that the conditions of public worship in the Church of England are quite unlike those of the rest of Christendom; nor, most certainly, are they such as are contemplated by the official and authorized formularies of the Church herself. Rightly or wrongly, a new departure has been made, not only from the custom of the English Church, but *from that of the whole of the rest of Christendom.*

1. To take the first of these classes—Omissions—the case must be admitted to be one of the utmost gravity. So widespread is the practice,[2] so universal in its operation, so much is independent action on

[1] A "Doll" Service was recently held at a well-known London church; the dolls—of all sorts—being arranged *on* and about the Holy Table!

[2] The omissions and abridgments authorized by the latest Act of Uniformity Amendment (the "Shortened Services") Act, are, of course, not referred to here. All those mentioned are within the writer's personal knowledge.

the part of the clergy in respect of it on the increase, that it is well-nigh impossible to give examples not only of what may, on some pretext or other, be done and defended, but what actually is done, apparently with impunity, all over the country.

In the Morning and Evening Service it is quite a common thing to exenterate, so to speak, the Exhortation, possibly to save time. The fine address, so full of sound Christian divinity, with which our noble Marriage Service opens is either curtailed—Bowdlerized, in fact—or omitted, lest it should shock the modesty of the folk who crowd to "Fashionable Weddings." Elsewhere, for some equally plausible reasons, the entire "Altar" portion of the Service is left out. Whatever may be said in defence of the practice, it is certain that the Office for the Visitation of the Sick is rarely, if ever, recited in its entirety. The Office for the Churching of Women may possibly—owing to brevity—escape curtailment, but the Burial Office certainly does not, although again and again it is modified and subjected to interpolations, and the use of Psalms and portions of Scripture other than those which it contains. The Baptismal Office fares no better: in one church the commentary on the Gospel; in another, the addresses to the sponsors; in yet another, the solemn declaration that the "child is regenerate;"—are all left out

at the discretion (!) of the minister.[1] All this is bad enough, but, to make matters worse, it is the Office for Holy Communion, the Liturgy itself, properly so called—what throughout the rest of Christendom not only is, as our own service is, but is called the Mass —which suffers most. For it is not too much to say that there is hardly a single portion of this Service which is not liable to omission, or which, in fact, has not been omitted at the sole discretion of the officiating clergyman.

On one pretext or another, the Commandments, the Creed, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, are omitted. It is quite a common practice in some churches[2] to omit the entire office up to the short exhortation to the communicants; and in others not only the Commandments (for which the singing of the ninefold *Kyrie Eleison* of the Latin rite is substituted), but everything between the prayer for the Church Militant and the *Sursum Corda* is left out. One clergyman omits the first, another the second, half of the words of Administration, or says them to only one of a railful of communicants. Another omits the Prayer of Humble Access, or practically does so, saying it inaudibly as an act of private devotion.

[1] See the Dean of Lichfield's admirable pamphlet, *The Ritual Crisis*, p. 13.

[2] Where, for example, evening communions are in use and the service follows a lengthy evensong and sermon.

The Consecration Prayer itself is, so far as the faithful are concerned, at any rate, not *heard* in many churches,[1] and the Blessing is omitted and replaced by a formula not in the Service. These examples are taken at random to show that the practice is not confined to one section of the clergy or to one party in the Church only. Hence it follows that the justification offered for it in each case—expediency, ancient authority, doctrinal considerations—is of an extremely varied character and purely subjective. For, in final analysis, it almost invariably falls back upon what the individual priest considers right and desirable.[2] Two things, however,

[1] An instance of its *omission* actually occurred, it was said, a few years back at Cheltenham. The Dean of Lichfield refers to two other cases in Paddington (see *The Ritual Crisis*, p. 11).

[2] Very frequently the reason given is "the Congregation," and what the individual incumbent considers best suited to its needs. This was, in fact, advanced only a year ago in one of the Church newspapers by a clergyman of standing and great personal self-devotion. He asked, "Which is worse—the omission of even an important part of the office, or the omission, so to speak, of the congregation?" Here we have a principle clearly stated: the right of the "congregation" to be referred to finally is, in principle, as fully admitted as it could be in any Dissenting body. So far it is "Congregationalism" pure and simple. But that is not all; it is assumed, clearly, that it is better to omit even an important part of an office than that "the congregation" should diminish. It is a principle, moreover, which, once stated, is capable of almost indefinite development and expansion. No distinction is made either between parts of an office which are important (the Consecration Prayer, *e.g.*) and those which are not, or between a congregation who are capable of a devout and intelligent appreciation of such questions or the reverse. All, however, one would ask is, *Why have—why did Christ's Church ever have—any prescript form of worship at all?*

we may take as beyond question. First, that (1) no authority whatever is given in the formularies themselves or in the Canon Law, or by the custom of the Church from time immemorial, for these omissions. And secondly, that (2) nothing at all resembling what is referred to is to be found in any other part of the Catholic Church. Those, surely, who understand, and profess to understand, the cogency of this fact—*who, in fact, make the principle based upon it the groundwork of a large portion of their teaching—are* clearly less excusable than those who professedly neither understand nor regard it.[1] And, moreover, it is not the mere omission of any part of an office (though this is in itself hard enough to defend[2]) which is necessarily contrary to

[1] The Dean of Lichfield pleads—and rightly—that the "Ritualists" (so called) are not the sole nor the worst offenders (see *The Ritual Crisis*, pp. 7, 8). That is no doubt true if the variations in question are merely considered *in themselves*, and apart from any question as to *the Authority forbidding them* or the principle compromised by their reckless adoption. "Disloyalty to the Prayer-book" (p. 12) is bad enough; but it is a far more serious thing when it involves disloyalty to a perfectly well-known law of universal Catholic acceptance.

[2] The received opinion in the Roman Communion is, of course, that all such omissions are in themselves, although not all in the same degree—*sinful*. S. Alphonsus Liguori (lib. vi. cap. 3. no. 404) says that the omission of the ordinary portions of the Mass is of itself grievous sin: "De se est peccatum mortale, nisi levitas materiæ excuset." "In Canone autem mortale est omittere quamlibet orationem vel ejus verba mutare," etc. Some omissions are only venial, but nevertheless sinful. See also Gury-Ballerini, *De Eucharist.*, cap. ii. art. ii. no. 409, *et seq.* As to the Daily Service (consisting of the Canonical Hours), S. Alphonso's answer to the question, "Quæ culpa sit omittere

Church order and tradition and present œcumenical usage; it is their omission at the sole whim of the officiating priest, without a shadow of Episcopal authority, possibly in defiance of its repeated censure, and merely—as in too many cases—for the sole purpose of creating a factitious resemblance to the services of another use. It is this which, beyond all question, is "uncatholic," because it is in opposition to the uniform tradition and custom of Catholic Christendom.

It must, however, be conceded that a certain amount of weight attaches to *recognized custom*, as in the case of the longer address to the communicants beginning, "Dearly beloved, ye that mind," and now at least very generally omitted. But the custom must be *recognized*—that is, not only widespread, but allowed by authority. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the mere prevalence of an omission is not, *of itself*, a sufficient justification.

officium *vel partem ejus notabilem?*" is, "Est tanta ut peccet mortaliter quisquis habens hoc onus, horas, *vel notabilem earum partem* omittit." Certain inconsiderable omissions he considers to be venial, but still sins (lib. v. cap. 2, no. 146). He inclines to the opinion that it is *deadly* sin to change the office appointed for the day and read another instead (*ib.* art. 4). "Mutare officium diei est de se peccatum in genere suo mortale, juxta communissimam sententiam" (Scavini, *De Ordine*, cap. vii. art. 2, ii.). These references are given merely for the benefit of a certain section of our brethren who constantly quote, as of paramount authority, the current opinion of the Roman moral theologians.

There was a time when the omission of the prayer for the Church Militant—practically the intercession of the *Anaphora*—was extremely common. A distinction, too, must be drawn between the *essential and structural* portions of the Liturgy, and those which, obviously, are framed with a view to its celebration in particular cases or on certain special occasions. Thus no one probably would consider the rubric as to the "sermon or homily" binding at every celebration of the Holy Communion. The omission of both these is so frequently urged against those who maintain the obligation of omitting no part of the Office, that it is necessary to insist on the distinction which has been pointed out.

We might, indeed, illustrate this distinction by reference to the method pursued in the Roman Communion in dealing with difficulties of this kind. Canon Newbolt, in his *Consolidation*, no doubt gives expression to a very general idea that there is a distinct advantage in some Court of Appeal such as the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Those, however, who know anything of the internal working of the Roman Communion, know perfectly well that the decrees of the Sacred Congregation are far from compelling universal conformity. Still, if it may be permitted to indulge in the dream of a reunited Christendom, and its result in something or somebody

to set us all to rights in disputed liturgical matters, one might imagine some such questions as the following being addressed to the Sacred Congregation: 1^mo^. Utrum in Missis pro defunctis, ritu Anglicano celebrandis omittere liceat "Credo," et "Gloria," vel saltem Decalogum cum Kyrie Eleison. 2^do^. Utrum in Missis quotidianis ritu Anglicano celebrandis semper habenda sit Concio ad populum. 3^tio^. Utrum in Missis eodem ritu celebrandis prolixior Exhortatio, sci., quæ incipit his verbis, "Dearly beloved, ye that mind," licite omitti possit. The answer, in all human probability, would be: Ad 1^m^. Negative. Ad 2^m^. Servetur consuetudo non obstante Rubrica generali. Ad 3^m^. Servetur laudabilis consuetudo, salva auctoritate Reverendissimi Ordinarii. In fact, we should be very much where we are at present.

2. A yet wider departure from Catholic tradition and universal Catholic custom elsewhere is the interpolation, in the course of the authorized and canonical Offices, of extraneous features, either as acts of private devotion on the part of the officiating minister or as part of the public service. Such a practice is, of course, quite unknown in other parts of the Church. Among ourselves, however, it has long been recognized, in principle, by the introduction at various points of the service of metrical hymns. The use of these, together with the *Benedictus*

and *Agnus Dei* sung in the Communion Service, has acquired the sanction of custom as well as the further express sanction both of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act and the Lambeth Judgment. But it surely is unreasonable, on the ground of these additions to a chorally rendered service—intended to occupy certain pauses in the course of the Office (such as during the collection of alms or the administration of the Holy Communion)—to argue that all sorts of interpolations, even those which necessitate an otherwise avoidable break in the service, are thereby made lawful. And, of course, though some allowance may be made for the fairly prevalent use of private devotions by the celebrant at the Holy Communion in the English Church, and a wide distinction made between interpolations which are, like these, *inaudible*, and those which are audible, recited publicly as a part of the Office, and possibly joined in by the faithful—yet, it must frankly be admitted that such interpolations are a departure from both Catholic tradition and present custom in the rest of the Church.

Many clergy, for example, are in the habit of reciting privately the noble series of prayers which constitute the Canon of the ancient rite, and it would no doubt be a deep spiritual privation to many of them to discontinue a practice which, at the most

solemn moment of their ministry, unites them heart and voice with the Church of the past and of the present in the rest of Western Christendom. At the same time, it cannot be denied that the private recitation of a long form of prayer, and that, too, of a distinctly liturgical character, in addition to the authorized "canon" or consecration prayer, is opposed to the uniform and constant usage of the Catholic Church elsewhere or in the past. And it is most important to guard against any notion of the need of this devotion, to the completeness of the great Eucharistic act, or that anything can add to its essentials which, *beyond all question*, are contained in our own "Prayer of Consecration." [1]

3. But beyond these interpolations, there is the further question of the use of Offices, entirely supplementary to those in our existing formularies. And here one is met by an argument, based upon the fact, readily admissible, that, so far from supplementary services, over and above those which are strictly liturgical, being opposed to Catholic usage elsewhere, the very reverse is the case. But those who appeal to this fact are apt to leave out of sight (*apart from the stringent exercise of Episcopal control everywhere, in regard to these supplementary Offices*) the fact that among ourselves they are of *two quite distinct classes*,

[1] See on this point *The Ritual Crisis*, p. 28.

one of which, it is not too much to say, is absolutely unknown in the rest of Christendom. That is to say, it has become quite common now to supplement the canonical Offices—and on the most solemn days in the year—by *Liturgical* Offices, *borrowed in their entirety from the use or rite of another "Church."* This is a perfectly new departure from previous Catholic tradition and present œcumenical usage alike.

No question is here involved as to the Offices themselves, or as to the wisdom, or the reverse, of the compilers of our Service-books, in omitting them. The fact, however much we may deplore it, remains that *they are not there.* Such are the picturesque ceremonial which gives its name to "Candlemas" or "Palm Sunday" respectively; the yet more impressive rite—so full of Christian sentiment—which lingers as a memory only in the title of "the first day of Lent;" the incomparably beautiful and soul-stirring Offices of the Parasceve; the yet more majestic Paschal rites, with their wealth of Scripture teaching and mystery, and their imperishable witness to primitive faith and worship. These have gone, and, let us own quite frankly, it is hard to have to part with them. They are no longer in our Service-books, and no longer, therefore, possess, *among ourselves*, that which, beyond even their own intrinsic beauty, is their chief recommendation to those who still possess and use them, *the sanction of authority.*

Many of our ancient Offices are absent from the Oriental rite, as Offices in that rite are absent from the Western. What strikes one as so utterly foreign to universal usage is that the Liturgical Offices of one "Use" should be borrowed at the will of the individual priest, to supplement, or even to supersede, the Offices of his own rite. That surely is, in the strict sense of the word, "*uncatholic.*"

Nothing would serve to illustrate this better than the use, now becoming more and common, of *Tenebræ.* Now, what is "*Tenebræ*"? It is simply the Matins and Lauds—practically the "Order for Morning Prayer" for the three last days of Holy Week in the Office-books of the Latin rite. The melody to which parts of the Office are chanted is peculiar to it, and of singular pathos and sweetness, and the Office itself is of considerable beauty, mainly composed of Psalms and portions of Holy Scripture, and containing a mine of patristic and mystical application of these to the mystery of the Atonement. And there is, incidentally (though this is not universal), a ceremonial extinction of tapers, for which no rational interpretation can be given. When all is said and done, these three Offices remain, literally, the "Order for Morning Prayer" for the last three days of Holy Week, of a rite other than that of the Ecclesia Anglicana.

Now, let us suppose for one moment that the curé

of a large Parisian church—say, the Madeleine or S. Roch—had travelled in England, and been struck (as he could not fail to be, and as French ecclesiastics so frequently are) with the dignity and beauty of our Cathedral service. Let us even conceive him animated by the pious wish of showing how much of Catholic truth lingers in our worship, honestly admitting its excellences, even in his inmost heart secretly preferring it to his own. We need not go so far as to imagine him airing his contempt at every opportunity for his own rite, encouraging his flock to despise it, or describing himself by some French equivalent—if such could be coined—for "un-Prayer-booky." But we may imagine him—the thing is, of course, well-nigh inconceivable—gravely setting to work to train his *maîtrise* to perform our Office as a *Service Musicale* to supplement his own on the morning of Good Friday, having already sung his own *Tenebræ* the previous evening, and possibly with the co-operation of some enthusiastic young laymen, providing his *bons paroissiens* with nice little copies—Lecoffre, 32mo, tranches rouges—of *Le Morning Prayer de Lincoln!* One has only to state the case—*the exactly parallel case*—in this way to show how utterly alien to the spirit of the rest of Western Christendom—however little those who hold and defend such services among ourselves

may suspect it—how utterly *uncatholic*, in fact, the use of "Rouen *Tenebræ*" really is.[1]

4. We now come to consider the last and in some ways the most important class of variations from the prescript forms of Divine Service—what are known as "Popular Services," that is, services of a distinctly popular and devotional, as distinguished from a ceremonial and liturgical character. That there has been for some time past a growing demand for such services is undoubtedly the fact, and a certain need for them has been admitted by those in authority or qualified by experience to form a reliable judgment on such matters. No one denies this, and it is—at least, by implication—recognized by the Committee of the recent Lambeth Conference. Such services no doubt exist, and are recognized in other parts of the Catholic Church, at any rate in Western Christendom. We may, in fact, honestly admit that in this matter we are following the lead of other Churches—or say, rather, that we are obeying the promptings of the same One Spirit which dwells in the whole body—quite as much as we can be said to be adopting the methods of the separated sects, if not indeed far more so. So far, then, there is no departure from the usage of the rest of Western Christendom.

[1] All this applies, of course, to "Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament," or "of the Dead," so far as these are the "Evensong" practically of another "use."

From the time of S. Philip Neri "popular" devotions in the vernacular have been common in Rome itself. When, mainly through the instrumentality of Father Faber, these devotions came into favour with English Romanists, they took the place, in great measure, of what, questionless, were English devotions on the lines of the Prayer-book Offices. Thus the devotions before Mass opened with a form of the *Venite;* there was an "Evening Service" containing the *Benedicite, omnia Opera,* in English; and the prayer, "Lighten our darkness," and that of S. Chrysostom, as well as others in use among ourselves, are to be found in such books as *The Sunday Manual* and other Roman Catholic books of popular devotions of that date. The public recitation of the Rosary is another form. And, last of all—the solitary exception among Roman Catholics of anything of the kind—we have the sham "Evensong" services invented by Cardinal Vaughan. These have in great measure superseded the noble "Vespers" of the Latin rite, and the best that can be said of them—so palpably are they copied from the Offices of the Prayer-book—is that imitation (even such exceptionally miserable imitation as this) is the sincerest flattery.

Two things, however, must be borne in mind. (1) First, all these popular vernacular devotions owe their existence, beyond all question, to a circumstance

which does not (at any rate, just yet, God be thanked) exist among ourselves—the use of *Latin* for the Liturgy and Offices. A factitious need for such services may be pleaded by those who, by reciting the Liturgy inaudibly or unintelligibly, reduce it to the level of one not "understanded of the people." But that, so far as the portions of the Liturgy which are to be said aloud (and *all* of ours is to be so said), is equally contrary to Catholic usage, to say nothing of positive prescriptions to that effect. And then (2) all these "popular devotions" are under surveillance, and subject to minute, explicit, and individual authorization.[1]

Thus we see that these popular services are no exception to the general principle that all matters connected with public worship must be referred to

[1] Some years ago an edition of the *Prayers of S. Gertrude* was published in England. It was approved by Cardinal Wiseman, but "with the understanding that the Litanies contained in it are not to be used in public worship." One thing, then, at any rate, is certain. Throughout the Roman Communion, all services of this sort are absolutely under Episcopal control. The performance of any public devotional exercise of which the Bishop was known to disapprove would cause nothing less than a scandal throughout Europe. Nor would the Bishop's disapproval be affected by a bad reason, or even by his giving no reason at all. It may not be generally known that in a very special way is this the case with regard to the devotional exercise known as the "Stations of the Cross." Before the pictures representing these "Stations" of the "Way of the Cross" can be put up, the *special permission of the Bishop, ad hoc* (which, I believe, is in some way dependent upon that of the general of the Franciscan Order), must be and is invariably obtained.

the proper Ecclesiastical authority, which is vested, primarily, in *the Bishop*. This, we have seen, has been recognized by a body representative of the entire Anglican Episcopate—the Lambeth Conference. One of its Committees (presided over by the present Bishop of Ely) even recommended that "in the formation of additional services care should be taken to adhere as closely as possible to liturgical usage." This very probably does not refer to the class of services we are now considering, and there is no need to press it. Still, entire Offices taken bodily from some other use, are, as a matter of fact, defended on the utterly inconsistent and incomprehensible ground that they are "popular devotions;" that they abide by the suggestion just quoted; and that they fall within the requirements of containing only what can be found in the Bible or the Book of Common Prayer. These have been already dealt with. They are, in their whole spirit and form, quite different from those now under consideration, namely, services of a purely popular and modern character. These must, obviously, be composed with some special reference to the circumstances which seem to demand their use, and to the people who are to be invited to join in them. They are "popular," and they must—let us admit it quite frankly—be acceptable, and a real spiritual help to the people. But that is quite another

thing from saying that a form of popular devotion is not to be submitted to the judgment of authority, merely if it should prove to be really popular, successful, and generally attractive. No other plea, practically, is put forward on behalf of the Salvation Army contortionists. In fact, it comes to this, that the end justifies the means. Moreover, if devotional offices are to be altogether adapted to suit the idiosyncrasies of the local worshippers, instead of these being taught to understand and value something good and approved, *why have a common order of Divine Service at all?* Why should not the clergy (those, for example, who are known by the vulgar and almost irreverent name of "Slum Parsons") each invent and use what will likeliest go down? No; we may depend upon it that if we must, as it is said, "copy Rome" (and no one denies that we may learn, as we have already learned, much from her), it will be wiser to copy what is best in her—her consistency and loyalty,—and especially, her constant practice of assuring the sanction of lawful authority to every public act of Divine worship, without exception; or, better still, let us stand to principles which are ours, as a living part of the Catholic Church, as surely as they are hers, and so best vindicate our common heritage with her in the principles of Catholic order and custom.

An attempt has been made to deny that the Book of Common Prayer occupies the same position in the English Church as that of the authorized formularies in the other Churches of Christendom, as that, for instance, of the Missal and Breviary in those of the Latin rite. This Prayer-book, we are sometimes told, is a manual, *mainly for the use of the lay folk*—what, in fact, is known in France as a "Paroissien," and was never intended by its compilers to be more than that. Hence, it is unreasonable, we are told, to expect that it should contain the full rite of the Church, or to limit the clergy to the use of those services only which are found in it. Those who put forward this plea either do not know what a Paroissien is, or they are imposing on the ignorance of others. It is more charitable to assume that they themselves are in the dark on the subject, and, therefore, it is all the more necessary to state the real facts. As an example of the wild confusion of ideas existing on this subject, it has been said even that "the Prayer-book is a Paroissien and *Directorium Sacerdotum*," [1]

[1] See letter to *Church Times*, May 7, 1896, signed a "Sarum Ritualist." How a book could be at once a Paroissien *and* a Directorium *Sacerdotum*, it is not quite easy to see! Nor would a "Directorium" be of much practical use to the "Sacerdotes," for whom it was intended, if it gave no directions whatever as to how services they were in the habit of performing should be conducted, and some of which were perfectly well known to the compilers of the "Directorium," and equally well *known to have been, of set purpose, omitted from the book by them.*

two things in their very nature and purpose as distinct as can be.

What is a Paroissien? In what does it resemble and how does it differ from a Prayer-book? A Paroissien is a manual put forth by Episcopal authority in the dioceses of France for the use of the laity. It contains, besides the Mass, those other public offices which are performed in the parish churches, and which the parishioners attend, and it derives its name from this. So far it may be admitted to bear a considerable resemblance to a "Prayer-book." But the difference between a Paroissien and *the Book of Common Prayer* is very considerable. A Paroissien is not, and does not profess to be, the standard authorized formulary, which (*and no other*) the clergy are to use, as the Book of Common Prayer is, and undoubtedly professed to be. No French priest enters into a solemn engagement (as every single English priest licensed to the cure of souls is required to do in the case of the Book of Common Prayer) that he will use the form *in that book*, and no other. And it is precisely that large class of rubrical instructions which are found in the Book of Common Prayer, and which mark it at once as a *standard of Divine Service* for the clergy, that are conspicuous by their entire absence from a Paroissien. And the latter

invariably contains *private* morning and evening devotions, of which there is not a trace in the Book of Common Prayer.

We may, however, let this pass, and assume, for the sake of argument, that the Prayer-book is, and was intended by its compilers to be, what is understood by a Paroissien. We shall then see that, even allowing this to be the case (though we have already seen that it is not), the whole line of argument based on it falls to the ground. We cannot do better than take as an example the Paroissien Romain, "a l'usage des Fidèles du Diocèse de Paris," published in 1875. It has the approbation of "Joseph Hyppolyte Guibert, Cardinal de la Sainte Eglise Romaine, Archevêque de Paris." It is described as being "entièrement Conforme au Missel et au Bréviare;" it contains the "offices particuliers au Diocèse de Paris." It exhausts, in fact, *all the authorized liturgical services in use in that diocese.* It contains everything[1] the faithful may expect in the way of Divine worship, whenever they attend the public offices at their parish church. It tells us in

[1] It does not of course contain confraternity meeting services such as those held at Nôtre Dame des Victoires, or such services as the "Chemin de la Croix," or the Rosary. These are all extra liturgical, but under strict Episcopal surveillance. They do not affect the general argument, which deals, so far as the alleged resemblance between a Paroissien and the Prayer-book is concerned, solely with Liturgical Offices properly so called.

the preface that it is intended to facilitate "l'assistance aux offices publics;" and what it takes for granted clearly is that those "Offices" will be those of the Missal and Breviary — such as they are— which are usually performed in parochial churches, with such "offices particuliers" as are expressly permitted by authority in that diocese. In other words, it takes for granted the existence of a recognized prescript form of Divine Service, uniformly solemnized without variations, either in the way of excision or accretion by the parochial clergy. It therefore takes for granted that the parochial clergy in their public ministrations will use that form "and no other," as we require our clergy expressly to do.

One may therefore ask—Of what conceivable use would such a book be if the clergy were at liberty to mutilate or embellish, to supplement or supersede, the Offices it contains? A book which does not contain an Office, which does not contain important and striking features of that Office, can hardly be said to facilitate assistance at it. There is not, in fact, a single Catholic diocese throughout France where Offices are in use, of which no single trace can be found in the "Paroissien, destiné à l'usage des Fidèles."

The fact is, we have no Paroissien in England, and *cannot have one.* If ever the Prayer-book served the purposes of one, it has absolutely ceased to do

so now. The nearest approach to one, perhaps, is a "Church Service," with "Hymns Ancient and Modern," or some kindred collection, bound up with it. But then, that does not contain "Rouen *Tenebræ*," or the "Creeping to the Cross," or "Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament"! In fact, the utter impossibility of such a book as a Paroissien among ourselves lies, *not in the lack of an authorized order of Divine Service*—for the Church of England is provided with one—but in the lamentable fact that the uniform observance of that order, its use, and that of "no other," can no longer be depended upon. The whole point is there. By all means let our clergy place the Prayer-book in the hands of their flocks, and tell them to regard it and use it as a French Churchman does his Paroissien, namely, to facilitate his "assistance aux offices publics;" but it does seem unreasonable as well as unfair to those in whose hands the book is so placed, that it should be so equally deficient in the matter of important services which they may find in use in their own parish church.

III.

It will not be necessary here to vindicate further what has been so often already referred to—the relation of the Episcopal authority to all these variations

in the mode of performing public worship. But it will be well, perhaps, to make a few remarks on the subject. And this because an insidious argument (which will be dealt with presently) has been put forward, which would tend to put that relation in a false light, if not wholly to obscure it. But the fact of its existence—the fact, that is, of what is termed the *jus liturgicum*, inherent in the Episcopal Office—is beyond question. It may even be said to have direct Apostolic authority, and to have been exercised by S. Paul himself in his oversight of the Church of Corinth especially, and elsewhere. And it has been re-stated quite recently in explicit terms in the Encyclical of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled in the Lambeth Conference.

"We think it our duty," the Bishops say, "to affirm the right of every Bishop within the jurisdiction assigned to him by the Church to set forth and sanction additional services." And again, in the forty-sixth resolution of the Conference, it "recognizes that each Bishop has, within his jurisdiction, *the exclusive right* of adapting the services in the Book of Common Prayer to local circumstances." [1]

[1] It may, perhaps, be open to question whether the Bishops, individually, and apart from the Provincial Synod, have any right to vary the *fixed* portions—the "Ordinarium"—of the services. By common custom, however, clearly recognized in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, and acted upon very generally not only in England but throughout Western Christendom, they apparently may vary the *variable* portions—the "Proprium"—such as the Collects, Lessons, Psalms, and the Epistles and Gospels on special occasions.

And yet again, in the report of the Committee appointed to report of the Conference on these very questions, we read—

"That *the only proper course*, whether for local adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer, or for the provision of additional services, is for the Bishops to avail themselves of the *jus liturgicum*, which, by the common law of the Church, belongs to their office."

The sole question that can arise is as to what extent this *jus liturgicum* of the Bishops is limited by their relation to the State, and what are known as the Acts of Uniformity. It is not for one moment meant that this *jus liturgicum* either derives from the State, or that the State, *proprio jure*, can limit that, or any other right or office inhering, *jure divino* or *ecclesiastico*, in the Episcopate. But it is none the less the fact that certain limitations agreed upon between the English Episcopate acting synodically, on the one hand, and the State, in giving that agreement the force of law, upon the other, do exist; but although this fact is admitted by the Committee of the Lambeth Conference, the report speaks very guardedly as to the extent of these limitations, and indeed states that—

"It is not at all clear that the Acts of Uniformity deprived Bishops of the *jus liturgicum*, including the right to set forth for use in their dioceses forms of prayer other than such as are prescribed in those Acts."

But it is constantly alleged that the application of this principle is in many cases impracticable; that to have recourse to the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishop, and to submit to its exercise, would involve a real hindrance to the progress of Catholic development; that as a matter of fact its exercise has so operated, and success has resulted only from resolute resistance to it. Surely it is necessary to answer an allegation so utterly compromising to the cause it professes to maintain. If, for the sake of argument, a priest had to face the fact that the Bishop's prejudices or indifference might, if he were deferred to or intervened, throw considerable difficulty in the priest's way, hamper him in his work, or even weaken his power for good, even so, in referring to the Bishop, the great Catholic principle of submission to authority would have been safeguarded. Nor must it be forgotten that the Bishop's own claim to obedience is based upon his own relation to the law he is called upon to enforce. He is himself, like every one in authority, "a man *under* authority." He cannot command illegalities: within certain limits he may, no doubt, dispense with the observance of ceremonial details, or a too rigid fulfilment of rubrical directions. Certainly he may counsel and earnestly caution a priest in regard to such matters. And surely his advice is entitled to precedence as well as to the very

highest consideration. But—let us say it quite simply—he cannot command *illegalities.* No Bishop can lawfully require a priest to break laws which he himself is bound to obey, or to disregard formularies to which he himself is pledged. He could not, for example, *forbid* an incumbent to carry out the known, and now fully admitted, provisions of the Ornaments Rubric,[1] still less authorize what is forbidden by the formularies or by the common law of the Church ; as, for example, the marriage of divorced persons, the administration of the Holy Communion to notorious evil-livers, or "Evening Communions." Should the emergency arise, the priest would surely know how to act. There is no question of insubordination. But it is only that priest whose strict fidelity to his own promise of canonical obedience is above suspicion who will have the whole weight of justice and consistency on his side when he finds himself thrust into the necessity of having to disobey an illegal command. When the Duke of Somerset was bidden by James II. to introduce the Papal Nuncio, he declined, on the ground that the law did not permit him to do so ; and on the King insisting on his own superiority to the law, the Duke replied, "Your Majesty may be above the law, but I am not."

[1] "If, in deference to a generally discredited verdict of a State Court, he should forbid the use of vestments which are generally allowed by a definite rubric of the Church, obedience is not obligatory" (Dr. Luckock, *The Ritual Crisis*, p. 58).

The whole point is there, and it is most important to insist upon it, because it is constantly asserted that the Catholic revival, especially as regards ceremonial reform, was carried by a policy of resistance to the Bishops, and by the independent action of individual priests. This is just one of those misrepresentations which are most dangerous as well as most cruel, because they have a certain element of truth in them. No doubt the action of many of those who led the way brought them into conflict with their Diocesans. But why? Not because the Bishops called upon them to obey what they knew to be the law, but because as they, the priests, themselves believed and again and again protested, it was the law of the Church, and the provisions of her Service-books, and *not something altogether outside both*, which was in question. To state simply, as a writer in the *Church Times* recently did, that it would be by the innovations of individual priests, and not by the leading "of the Bishops, that the end" (presumably that of the "Catholic" party) "would be gained," and that "the revival of Catholic ritual was entirely due to the action of individual priests in the teeth of their Bishops," is nothing less than an attempt to support a system of avowed anomia on a manifest perversion of facts, and calls for emphatic protest. It is a gross injustice, and adds to all the other

outrages inflicted upon those who are referred to, the yet deeper one of the admission—and that by men claiming to be their followers and representatives—of the very worst calumnies of their bitterest enemies and persecutors.

The two cases are, in fact, altogether as different as they can well be. In the one case, we have not merely the authority, but the very leading of the Bishop flouted, even when he may be standing for some sort of conformity to standard formularies as against "the innovations of individual priests;" in the other, the priests, patiently discarding "the innovations of individual priests" of a bygone generation, and standing up for a return to a stricter observance, both in the letter as well as the spirit, of the authorized formularies, and so winning the confidence, and at last the approval, of their superiors. To humbly refuse to submit to the judgment of the Bishop, to incur his censure—and the world's as well—to undergo penalties rather than fail in obedience to formularies which the Bishop himself was pledged to maintain, is one thing. To frankly disregard his authority in every matter concerned with the performance of Divine worship, as if it were not his business at all; to force him to close his eyes to, or at least denounce in general terms *illegalities* and "innovations" openly described as

"un-Prayer-booky," is *quite another.* Throughout the whole history, not only of the Catholic revival, but of the entire Church, again and again have faithful clergy been thrust into a position of opposition to their Bishops, when these were — or were conscientiously believed by their clergy to be—acting *uncanonically.* But the other attitude is, in its very essence, utterly *un-Catholic.* It is, in fact, this whole state of things which we have been considering (whatever passing liberty it may afford to teach this or that point of Catholic doctrine, or to popularize this or that detail of Catholic ceremonial and devotion) which is, in its essence, *un-Catholic.* It loses out of sight what, after all, the Catholic remnant in the English Church have all along contended for —not this doctrine or that, not minutiæ of ritual, but the ground of all doctrine, the supreme justification of all Catholic ritual — the *principle of authority.*

It is this which is at stake. Not the restoration to our Liturgy of Offices, the loss of which no one can deplore more than the present writer does; not the recognition of the Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints, by giving it a definite expression in our public services, now so lamentably deficient in this respect; nor yet the much-to-be-desired assimilation of our services more to those of our

Catholic brethren in the rest of Christendom. No; it is that which is beyond and above all these—the great principle of *obedience to the custom and law of the Church* as such, the recognition of its paramount claim upon our unquestioning acceptance and unhesitating obedience; that which, in fact, in a world impatient of authority and in a Church honeycombed with theorizing and private judgment, it is so hard to make others understand; and yet that to which we appeal and which we plead, for our inability to temporize about anything that *the Catholic Church has judged*, whether it be a practice of the Christian life, such as Fasting Communion, or a great law of gospel morality, such as the Indissolubility of Marriage.

To sum up—

1. The Church of England fully possesses, like every other Catholic Church in Christendom, a recognized and authoritative prescript form of Divine Service, which is representative of her teaching and life. She solemnly requires all her clergy who are licensed to the cure of souls to use that form and no other.

2. To make omissions at will of structural elements of these forms on the ground that such omissions are made in similar cases *in other rites*, or to meet the preferences of the laity; to make interpolations, and introduce features, however intrinsically beautiful,

having no authority in the formularies themselves; to supplement these forms with, or, still more, substitute for them, as *acts of public worship*, anything else whatever, however primitive and beautiful—is a departure, not only from Catholic tradition, but from quite universal "Catholic" usage throughout Christendom now.

3. But, above all, to do all this, not only without reference to the *jus liturgicum* of the Diocesan, but notwithstanding his remonstrance; to withdraw from his control, as outside his province, and to adopt all sorts of offices, not only liturgical, but of a popular and devotional character;—this, surely, is yet more opposed to the constant custom and usage of the Church, and *in direct antagonism to the very spirit of Catholic tradition.*

It will have been noticed that the subject has been treated from first to last from the standpoint of *Catholic principles*—of principles, that is, which are common to the whole Catholic Church. The writer has endeavoured to leave out of sight the unhappy fact of our isolation from the rest of Western Christendom, and to treat the subject precisely as he would treat it were that no longer the case, and the English Church were at this moment in full communion with the Churches of the Latin rite, and even (to put it at its most extravagant limit) with them

acknowledged the claims of the Roman See. For the principles which have been upheld here are the heritage of the whole Catholic Church, of which no suspension of intercommunion between her living members can deprive them. And if we stand up for them, we stand up for what, after all, is a much deeper, much more lasting, bond of unity; what therefore will, in the fullness of God's good time, operate far more surely toward reuniting us once more in visible intercommunion, than sporadic and factitious and changeful resemblances created here and there upon a principle which strikes at the root of all Catholic unity, being itself the root of all division and error, the principle of self-will and independence of authority.

And one word, finally, as to what must be—to those, at least, who are really in earnest upon such matters—a very solemn and impressive side of the whole subject, its strictly spiritual side; its bearing upon the personal character of the individual; its, so to speak, "ascetical" bearing.

Beyond question we have much to forego; much of that wealth of prayer and praise which is the liturgical heritage of our own Catholic brethren in other parts of the Church, is denied us. "We are doing penance:" this was the old Tractarian watch-word. It is well, perhaps, that of all seasons of the

year we should be made to feel this most acutely, when, in the bareness of our dismantled sanctuaries and before our stripped altars, we are gathering at the very foot of the Cross itself each Good Friday! Every time we offer the Holy Sacrifice surely we should think of this. It will help us to bear with what is wanting in the Service-book itself (it comes to us with authority, *and that is best of all*); to bear yet more (for motives of wise and generous consideration for others) with the lack of solemnities which that book enjoins; it will help us to bear with the restless and undisciplined temper of the modern world, feeling our own weakness and consequent disposition to chafe against the restrictions of an authority we profess to maintain and the order of a Divine Providence which has placed us where we are. And the rest will come, we may depend upon it, in God's good time, if not in our own, at least in theirs whose fuller privileges we are day by day assuring, whose liberty in faith and worship wider than our own, we are building up by our own patience, self-denial, and,—above all,—unswerving loyalty, whatever they may cost us, to the tradition and custom of the Holy Catholic Church.

"Tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and He shall establish thine heart; and wait thou for the Lord."

A PLEA FOR REASONABLENESS

By the Rev. J. Wylde

Christianity is the most reasonable of religions; indeed, the only truly reasonable one. It is no exaggeration to say that Christianity is as much a new revelation on the side of reason as on the side of faith. The Incarnation exhibits the Λόγος, the Eternal and Divine Reason, manifest in the flesh. It necessarily, therefore, appeals to the reason of man. It is often supposed that there is a certain antagonism between reason and faith: there is no more antagonism than there is between hearing the cry of an animal and entering into the meaning and beauty of a fugal passage of Bach.

The office of reason and that of faith are entirely distinct, and so are the spheres in which they are to be exercised. True it is that some men dare to force reason into the region where faith only can penetrate, and that others degrade both by claiming

for faith what belongs to reason ; but such abuses of God's gifts make no difference to the fact that the healthy use of both faith and reason distinguishes clearly between the functions of the two, and recognizes their mutual interdependence and indispensability. All that is included, for example, in natural religion is apprehended by the reason ; and when we come to revelation, while the contents of it belong to the domain of faith, its evidences, its adaptation to the facts of the case, its fulfilment of human needs, approve themselves to the reason, which thus comes to the support of the appeal of revealed religion to faith.

Reason is able to conduct us for a certain distance on our road to God ; but there comes a point at which she hands us over to a new guide—faith ; but even then she does not desert us, but so to speak hovers round where she is unable to enter herself, reminding us perpetually that it is reasonable to believe, and that she is the far-off reflection of the Divine Word Himself Who cannot without self-contradiction call upon His creatures to accept anything *contrary* to reason, though the revelation He makes is far beyond the power of mere reason to grasp.

To take an example. Considerations of the strength of the documentary evidence for the Incarnation, the immense results that have flowed from

the belief in it, the force of its twofold appeal to the heart and the intellect, and such-like, commend it to the mind as a faith that is reasonable; but when we come to the doctrine of the Incarnation itself, reason is absolutely powerless to grasp it, and its apprehension is solely a matter of faith. Or again, faith having accepted the Incarnation and the Godhead of Christ, reason requires that His words should be accepted absolutely and unreservedly—on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, for example—however little reason may be able to grasp their significance. It is the height of unreason to acknowledge the Godhead of our Lord, and then to cavil at His words because they appeal to a higher faculty than reason. We might, indeed, go back still farther, and say that nothing could be more unreasonable than to own a God in Whom was no mystery: a God wholly apprehensible by reason would be the equal of man, and no God at all.

These are trite commonplaces enough; yet it seemed necessary to call attention to them because people are so very apt to imagine a contrast instead of a co-operation between faith and reason, and to forget that wherever faith leads, reason never deserts us in despair, but accompanies us always in readiness to lend her support to the demands of faith. The worship which we are to render to God with our

whole being is to be a "reasonable" one (Rom. xii. 1). How should the λατρεία revealed by, and to be rendered through, the Λόγος be other than λογική? And accordingly, the details of the Church's approaches to her God will all be reasonable. All ceremonial in Divine worship that is on true lines will justify itself in the long run to the Christian reason, though it does not at all follow that reason without Christian faith shall be able to enter into the signification of the ceremonial in the smallest degree.

I would plead, therefore, that in estimating variations of ritual and ceremonial, and also in estimating the persons who use them, it is only a matter of common charity both to give credit to the latter for attempting to guide themselves by right reason, and also to judge of the things done by a standard of all-round reasonableness.

In the preface to his very valuable work, *Ministerial Priesthood*, Dr Moberly dwells upon

> "the supreme importance, for the insight of real understanding, of the underlying postulates or principles which ordinarily precede conscious argument. Principles of this kind are indeed indispensable. But though they cannot be dispensed with, it is most desirable that they should be examined—most desirable that they should be criticized. Such criticism, it is to be hoped, will often, not unimportantly, modify them. But the evidence cannot be

approached without them. Examination of evidence, without postulates, would be profitless—if it were possible. It is mere delusion to suppose that, in the absence of constitutive first principles, a study of details will lead to exceptionally unbiased, or indeed to intelligent conclusions at all. The cogency of evidence—nay, its whole value, and even meaning, depends absolutely on the mental convictions with which we approach it."

It has very often struck me that the discussions which one reads in the newspapers and hears both in conversation and in deliberative assemblies, on the subject of what is familiarly (though not very correctly) called "Ritual," would be immensely more helpful if the undeniably sound and true principle enunciated in this passage were much more fully recognized. Men of undoubted strength and balance of judgment in other matters approach this particular question with mental presuppositions which necessarily foredoom their conclusions. If we start with the idea, for example, that whatever is Roman has a Divine prescription, or, on the other hand, with the conviction that Anglicanism is final and incapable of improvement in any direction, we shall never come to an agreement with men who begin with altogether different premises, and are prepared often to find distorted views of truth in the various parts of a divided Christendom. It is surely only reasonable to believe that when the Church is torn asunder the

whole truth is not left in possession of one portion only. And I do not think sufficient weight is ever given to the consideration of the bearing of national character upon the question of Reunion. It is, one might say, philosophically impossible that the tone and character of the Church should be just what our Lord intended the Catholic Church should be, as long as the Teutonic and Latin races—to say nothing of other leading races farther afield—are developing in aloofness one from the other. Here is a case where, as it seems to me, passion and pride, under the mask of faith, do not allow reason to make itself heard as it ought to be.

But we are concerned just now with internal matters. Suddenly, no one knows how, the Church in England has got into a condition of excitement and fuss, unprecedented alike in its duration, its fury, and its childishness, but which sorely needs to be contemplated in the dry light of reason.

From the beginning of human society till it comes to an end there always has been, and always will be, a conflict—more or less critical—between authority and freedom; and the crucial difficulty, both of politics and social ethics, is how to strike a just and equitable balance between them. Most people imagine that the present Church difficulties, real or imagined, are an instance of this well-known difficulty

of reconciling liberty and authority. In reality, they are nothing of the kind ; and those who most dislike the doings of "extreme men" will never do anything at all towards restraining them until they recognize facts, and perceive that it is not true that the "Ritualistic" clergy repudiate authority, and therefore proceed to do just what they like ; that it is not a question of authority *versus* liberty—but that while all parties alike have an equal zeal for authority, their differences lie in the centres of authority to which they look. Surely this is a matter of the greatest importance, and not a mere verbal quibble.

The man whom you accuse of being a rebel against authority is not likely to listen to the most convincing appeal to alter his ways, as long as he is smarting under a sense of undeserved censure, conscious as he is that it is devotion to the cause of obedience to authority, as he understands it, that has brought him into bad odour. Surely, on reflection, all will agree that it is not recognition of authority which is wanted at the present moment : what *is* wanted is a rational agreement upon what authority is to be obeyed. "Our unhappy divisions" come from the different views men take of the authority that binds them. One is trying to gather the mind of the entire Catholic Church—he conceives

that the nearer he can get in teaching and ceremonial to the *quod semper, et ubique, et ab omnibus*, the better he will be fulfilling his part as an obedient priest of the Catholic Church of Christ.

A second has persuaded himself—it matters not for our present purpose how he has managed to do so,—we are simply concerned with facts—that the sole authority on ritual matters is the Church of Rome. The Church of England has neglected, he will tell you, this side of things, and therefore he goes to those who have made a careful study of them. He will remind you, too, that if Rome has excommunicated England, Canterbury has never excommunicated Rome; and more to the same effect.

A third, finding himself a priest of the Anglican Church, does not understand why he should go anywhere else for his ceremonial but to the authorities of the Anglican Communion. The thing seems so plain as not to admit of argument. But immediately even this position splits into three, which are widely divergent from one another. There is the view that "the authorities of the Anglican Communion" is only another name for the Sarum Rite, which is to be restored *pur et simple;* there is the view that nothing is to be done or used in public worship which is not covered by the Ornaments Rubric; and there is the idea held by so many that Anglican ceremonial

cannot honestly mean anything else but the ceremonial which they themselves have been accustomed to see.

Yet another refers everything to Geneva as implicitly and devoutly as his brother of the other extreme wing does to Rome. To "go behind the Reformation"—which always in the mouth of this sort of partisan means the Continental much more than the English Reformation—is in his eyes the deadliest of deadly sin. "We must obey," he would say, "in all things the blessed Reformers."

Lastly, there are those whose one idea of authority is to be found in the Bishops. And, again, some of these would say that unquestioning obedience is to be rendered at all times, and in all cases, only to the united Episcopate. Others would centre in the person of their Diocesan the whole authority that claimed their obedience.

Why, then, may we not all—whichever of the above views, or whatever combination of any of them, may commend itself to us—give one another credit for a conscientious desire to obey authority? And would not that frank recognition of good faith and willingness to obey in others, be the most likely step to lead on to some greater agreement as to a reasonable selection of the sources of authority which all *ought* to obey? To talk at random of

disobedience and self-pleasing is only to confuse the issue, and to irritate the sore; the dominant idea everywhere *is* obedience. What is wanted is a reasonable application of the principle of obedience.

I have often thought that a priest who has introduced unusual services or ceremonial into his church, is particularly unlikely to be induced to modify them by an outcry raised against him by men of the "safe" stamp—men who do and say nothing that could possibly give offence either to their flocks or to their Bishop, and who are comfortably on the road to preferment. It is easy for such as these to declaim against lawlessness, but how much does their own vaunted obedience cost them? Their simple dress of surplice and stole, their "hearty services" of Matins and Evensong, their silence as to confession and the observance of fast days, may be their idea of obedience to "our Church;" but does it all bring with it any sacrifice? The "lawlessness" they blame in their neighbour, who, not being very wise or clever, imagines, in all good faith, that his conduct of public worship ought to be ruled by the Congregation of Rites, after all does cost him something—it brings him into disrepute with all his superiors and most of his equals. He suffers for his obedience, however wrongheaded his obedience may be.

And here, one would indeed be ungrateful were one to pass over without notice, or without deep thankfulness, the plain and numerous signs that have been apparent of late that the Bishops do earnestly desire to enter into the minds of those priests who have adopted the ceremonial practices or devotions that have of late attracted attention.

One of the most marked gains of the foolish agitation of the past twelve months has been the turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers in the better mutual understanding between Bishops and clergy that has resulted from it. The more our Bishops try to put themselves *en rapport* with parish priests, to enter into their point of view, and, above all, to give them credit for the best motives, the better hope there is that whatever of ceremonial observance is undesirable may be got rid of.

A great deal has been said about the Declaration of Assent made by every parish priest when entering upon the cure of souls, and it has been assumed almost invariably to forbid the use of any sort of service not found in the Book of Common Prayer. This is a good example—and a very pregnant one also—of the unreasonableness which, in this matter, warps the judgment of so many persons who might be expected to take a more sensible view. The

closing words of the Declaration run thus: "In public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

It is abundantly clear that these words make the use, say, of the Roman Liturgy, or the substitution of Vespers from the Roman Breviary for English Evensong, impossible for any honest man; but can any one who carefully weighs them suppose that they bear any reference whatever to what may be done or said outside of the "public prayer"—which plainly means Matins and Evensong—"and administration of the Sacraments?"

In these—the fixed and authorized services of the Church—there is to be the dutiful use of the Prayer-book. Moreover, to put the matter beyond all dispute, it is not "I will use the said book and none other," but "I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other," etc. It is the *Form* of Liturgy, the *Form* of Daily Office, the *Form* of Baptism, etc., prescribed in the book, that is insisted upon. The Declaration never so much as glances in the direction of anything like additional services of another sort; it only says in effect, "When I baptize, I will use this form; when I celebrate the Eucharist, I will celebrate according to the form here

given; when I say my Daily Office, I will use Matins and Evensong as I find it in this book;" and so on. It is an unreasonable deduction to conclude from it that a priest is to shut up his people to the use of the forms of the Book of Common Prayer to the exclusion of any other devotional exercises whatever.

The question of additional services has been further much obscured by being mixed with another perfectly distinct, that, namely, of the mode in which the Holy Eucharist should be celebrated. These two quite separate matters have been, in the excitement of the last few months, hopelessly jumbled together, so that often what was said with regard to the one was applied to the other, and the charge of lawlessness made against those who added to the existing Prayer-book services was supposed in many quarters, in all good faith, though most unreasonably, to be aimed at those priests who obeyed the Ornaments Rubric in celebrating the Eucharist. The very grave question, how far it is allowable to modify the existing Liturgy, is too large to be entered upon here. Many Bishops consider that it is within their competency to permit the omission of the Commandments and Prayer for the Queen on week-days for brevity's sake, though it is hard to see on what ground they can claim to override the Prayer-book.

Many Bishops have also given leave to use Epistles and Gospels not included in the Prayer-book on certain days not otherwise provided for. The omission of the Long Exhortation has become practically universal without any direct Episcopal sanction, but also without any Episcopal let or hindrance. But if there are certain modifications of the Anglican Rite which seem to be agreeable to common sense and present-day needs, there are others which are (to say the least) an outrage upon all ritual propriety. The most glaring instance is the cutting out wholesale of what is an integral portion of every Catholic Liturgy, the proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of the day, and the Creed. This, one would hope, is an irregularity which no Bishop would condone. Another serious departure from the plain directions of our ritual is the consumption of the Blessed Sacrament, and ablution of the sacred vessels immediately after the Communion.

But as far as it is possible, amid the confusion and strife of tongues, to seize the meaning of the complaints which are really being made, it is not the mode of celebrating the Liturgy which is just now exercising the minds of the British public, and arousing the dormant Protestantism of the country, so much as the unusual services which loom so large in the imagination of the press and of the man in

the street. The panic which seems to have invaded even the most dignified circles in this matter is the more extraordinary when we recollect—what needs no great feat of memory—that for years, and up to a very short time ago, the whole religious world was crying out for greater elasticity, and Convocation —if I remember rightly—occupied itself for whole sittings with the discussion of this matter. It was repeated *ad nauseam*, or, at least, *ad tedium*, that we could not expect our people, who had so largely drifted away from religious influences, to enter into the archaic form and language of the Prayer-book services. The greater warmth and freedom of the Roman and Nonconformist services were extolled at the expense of the stiffness of Anglican methods. "Let us have," it was said, "something that will attract the outsider! What can he make of 'Dearly beloved'?" Scarcely have the echoes of such appeals died away, when suddenly it is discovered that the desired methods are actually in use, and are attracting large and devout congregations. But, lo! it is all wrong; it is not in the Prayer-book; it must be stopped! It is the children in the market-place over again.

The first question I would ask in this connection is this: Are not our churches houses of prayer? How is it that we have come to believe seriously that

when the authorized and necessary services are not going on, it is a heinous offence to pray in our churches except in silence? We have surely only to detach ourselves from traditions and unthought-out assumptions for a few minutes, and view the matter from the outside—from the point of view, say, of an intelligent Buddhist or Parsee—to perceive that the common notion that it is wrong to use a church for prayers not contained in a certain book, is a "phantom" (as Bacon would say) as extraordinary as ever beset the human mind. For my own part, I would not only allow the priest to use such devotions as he believes to be best for his flock, but I should rejoice to see parties of lay folk coming into church to use it for united devotion without a priest at all, and even—if they liked—without a book at all. Why not? Is it objected that their prayers would in all probability be untheological and badly—even grotesquely—expressed? I do not see that any harm is done even if the church walls should echo to the sound of some unorthodox expression if it come from a heart that is earnest and humble, and ready to be corrected where it expresses itself wrongly. I am not for a moment advocating what are called prayer-meetings, where lay people lead the prayer in the presence of a priest; but I entirely fail to see why a few faithful Christians should not have the use of the

parish house of prayer if they wish to join together for the purpose of prayer.

Given the Christian religion, and unprejudiced common sense, and there is absolutely nothing to be said for shutting people—especially under the leadership of their pastor—out of the church when they want to pray prayers which are not to be found within the four corners of the Prayer-book.

But, again, it is said that if any additional services are to be used, no priest must take the initiative, but wait for the Bishop to order it. I would ask those who hold this view how it has come about in our own time, or in any period of the Church's history, that any fresh methods have been introduced into the Church's system? Has it ever been known that Bishops have first evolved a new service or devotional method from their internal consciousness, and then imposed it upon the faithful in their dioceses? The invariable course of developments of this kind has been nothing of the sort: it has always proceeded precisely upon the lines which men now cry out against as though they were unheard-of innovations in contempt of Episcopal authority. First, a priest has started some new method in his parish which he hoped would edify his flock. It has succeeded; neighbouring parishes have adopted it; it has at length attracted the notice and gained the approval

of the Bishop; it has spread still further—to other dioceses, and, in the end, has taken its place in the treasury of the Church. Such, surely, is the simple history of such devotions as have found acceptance. Others have at one stage or another died out and been heard of no more. They did not commend themselves to the spiritual needs of the people; they were disapproved by the Bishop, as involving perhaps bad or "temerarious" doctrine, or as being in some other way undesirable. But the fittest survived.

This is exactly what has happened in our own day, in the case of Harvest Thanksgivings, for instance, the Three Hours' Service, Mission Services, etc. Individuals began them on their own motion, not at the bidding of the Bishop: they seemed to meet a need, and to be of spiritual profit. Presently, when time had shown their value, the sanction and blessing of the Bishops were given to them. In all this, there has been a strict following of Catholic precedent. It is often made a matter of reproach against the Bishops that they do not lead. There is a sense in which it is true to say that it is not the function of the Bishop to lead, but rather to wait and weigh and judge. Church authority, where it has been wisely exercised, has always been slow to act; it relies, not upon a ready-made infallibility, but on

the co-operation of human prudence with Divine guidance.

The charge, then, of disloyalty levelled at those of the clergy who, in their zeal for the welfare of their people, make experiments by new departures or adaptations falls to the ground, if what has been said above of the evolution of methods of devotion be true. It is absurd to charge men with lawlessness when they are doing exactly what has always been done in such cases, and acting in the spirit of the Church of all times. For parish priests to wait for the orders of their Bishops before they moved in the providing of spiritual pabulum for their flocks, would be a reversal of the universal practice, and, it may be added, the stagnation of spiritual life. A priest is set over a parish for the very purpose of adapting the treasures of the Church, like a wise householder, to its needs, which are under his eye and the subject of his constant care. It is for the Bishop to exercise a thoughtful and circumspect vigilance over his clergy, and, having regard to the varying circumstances of their parishes, to encourage, or check, or modify, or forbid, as he deems best, the experiments of the parish priest.

I do not know whether it is too much to hope that by this time the reader allows that, after all, there may be something to be said for the lawless

'Ritualist" (so called), and that to treat him as a reasonable being is the best chance of keeping him from kicking over the traces. If so, perhaps I may be permitted to go a step farther, and try to show that even services of the kind most objected to need not be condemned out of hand in a flurry of excitement and panic, but are just as worthy of a reasonable consideration as (say) a service of intercession for the parish, which does not appear to find disfavour, "lawless" though it be. The service of all others, about which even many High Churchmen are unable to speak calmly, is that known as "Veneration of the Cross." The antiquity of this devotion is sufficiently known; and the fact that it has, throughout almost the whole history of Christendom, satisfied the religious instincts of millions of souls, should be—one might suppose—sufficient to make a man hesitate before he attacked it with fierce invective. So far, then, it merits a favourable consideration. But is it orthodox? Is it not true that there may be devotions which can claim the prescription of centuries, and yet be objectionable from the fact that they embody some false or uncertain doctrine? What is the doctrine underlying this particular service? It is the doctrine of the love of God in Christ manifested in the redemption upon the cross. The Veneration of the Cross teaches the depths of the love of the

Saviour, and the depths of man's ingratitude and sin, and seeks to excite a tenderer devotion to our Crucified Lord. How does it set about this? By the recital of certain words and the performance of a certain action. The words are almost exclusively words of Holy Scripture, being passages adapted from the prophets and other places of the Old Testament, setting forth the unwearied love of God for His people, and their rebellion against Him, with the touching reiterated refrain from Micah vi. 3, "O My people, what have I done unto thee? and wherein have I wearied thee? answer Me." Surely no Christian believer can object to the "Reproaches."

But during the singing of the "Reproaches" a certain ceremonial action is performed, and it is this, no doubt, that rouses so much unchristian feeling. That action is the kneeling before the representation of our Crucified Lord, and kissing the feet of the figure. I have never myself witnessed this devotion, but I feel quite sure I am right in saying that this is done only by such persons in the congregation who feel impelled to do so. And I would very much like to know why they should not. Is it wrong to kiss what reminds us of our absent or departed dear ones? And is it possible that any one can see sin—or anything at all but loving devotion—in kissing the representation of Him Who is dearer to our hearts by

far than any earthly friend could be? Or is it sinful, or contrary to the spirit of Christianity, to do this in the sight of others? It might perhaps be contrary to the spirit of Christianity for a single person to kiss a crucifix in the presence of a crowd of Protestant onlookers, or for a priest to attempt to introduce anything of the sort in a parish where there was no warmth of religious feeling. But where a congregation is united in a common devotion to the Saviour, what possible harm can come of their expressing the fervour of their love in an outward manifestation of this nature? It seems to me that the sole question about Veneration of the Cross is whether the congregation is a united one, and one to whom such a mode of expressing their devotional feelings is real and natural. It need hardly be added, that even if these conditions are fulfilled, it is still a question for the Bishop finally to decide, but to decide without the unreasonable prejudice which runs away with the judgment of so many good men.

Take, again, the service of *Tenebræ*. Nothing is easier than to give an account of it, which, while not untrue, represents it as grotesque and childish. The words, again, in this instance (those of the ancient Matins and Lauds for the end of Holy Week) are almost entirely from the Bible, pretty nearly the only exception being three short readings from S.

Augustine. During the recitation of the Psalms and the *Benedictus*, the gradual extinction of the lights brings home to the worshipper the desolation closing in upon the soul of the dying Saviour, as His friends one after another forsook Him. At last, while the voices of priest and choir are hushed in awe, the last light is removed out of sight for a short time, leaving the church in almost total darkness while the Office is finished. No one who has not actually joined in this service can guess how marvellously solemn this simple ritual is, and how it speaks to the Christian heart, as nothing else does, of the pathetic solitariness of Him Who for us men and for our salvation trod the wine-press alone—the winepress of the wrath of Almighty God.

I have frequently observed the same unreasonable attitude with regard to the observance of the Feast of Corpus Christi.

Corpus Christi is simply a day of thanksgiving to God for "His unspeakable gift" of the Blessed Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood. What possible reason can be alleged, why it is blameless to set apart a day of thanksgiving for temporal blessings, as is so universally done under the name of Harvest Thanksgivings, but disloyal to thank God on a set day for the highest of all spiritual blessings—the Holy Eucharist? I have heard the reply made that it is all very well in

itself, but it becomes wrong when we thank God for the Eucharist on the same day as the Roman Church. Could the temper of wilful isolation farther go? What possible hope of reunion can there be, if we are to avoid even the appearance of mere simultaneousness in giving God thanks for the very same gift? It has also been said that it is not well to glorify God for the Blessed Eucharist when the Church of Rome is doing so, because the latter has been guilty of corruptions of doctrine and practice in respect of this Sacrament. Why, then, do we not change all the days on which we commemorate the Blessed Virgin, on the ground that false teaching about her has been rife in the Church of Rome? Surely ordinary charity would regard it as a matter for rejoicing that, while kept apart by our unhappy divisions, we are at least at one in the observance of the same feasts and fasts, and the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament among them.

It must not be forgotten, too, that though we have no mention in the Prayer-book of Corpus Christi, yet it could not have been the intention of the Anglican Church to abolish it altogether, since it always found a place in the almanacs, which, if I am rightly informed, required, until some way into the present century, the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Canterbury. And to the present time this feast is marked in the law almanacs and those of the Universities.

But one generally finds, in discussions on matters like these, that when no longer able to brand what he objects to as popish, or pooh-pooh it as childish, the protester—I will not say Protestant—takes refuge in what he deems the unassailable argument of its general unpopularity. "The people of England won't stand it!" "You little know how stubborn a strain of Protestantism there is still in the average English mind," and so forth. Once more I would ask, Is it reasonable for a Christian to rely on arguments like this? In the first place, nobody wants to thrust unaccustomed ceremonial, however legal, nor "additional services," however good in themselves, upon unwilling congregations; and in the second place, had we not better gradually and gently teach them such principles as shall deliver them from the bugbears that have taken possession of their minds?

It is not necessary that an elaborate ceremonial, or services like the Veneration of the Cross, should be used, nor that Corpus Christi should be observed, in every parish, but it *is* necessary that all Christian folk should learn to tolerate such things, and to respect the devotion of those who find spiritual help in them.

What has been done already in the awakening of English Churchmen to a realization of their Catholic privileges plainly shows that it is no hopeless task,

though perhaps not for our generation, to bring back the rest of our people to an intelligent knowledge of what they mean when they say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." To resign the effort because of prejudice and opposition is alike unworthy of us, and unreasonable in the face of the fact that the Church is a Divine Society and the organ of the Holy Ghost.

In conclusion, let me sum up, as briefly as may be, the reasonable considerations which I have been trying to urge, and which seem to call for attention in connection with the present disputes.

1. It is in the highest degree reasonable that the glory of God should be the aim of all that is done in public worship, or in less authorized devotions.

2. It is reasonable that in all Liturgical matters Catholic practice should be adhered to, and that what may be supposed to be in accordance with the mind of the Church of England should not be cast aside because it happens also to be the practice of the Church of Rome. It is unreason to imagine that popery can possibly creep in through a ceremony or a gesture.

3. It is reasonable that a priest in the ordering of his ceremonial should not lose sight of the truth that he is a priest of the Church of God, and not merely a priest of the Church of England, and that therefore

it cannot be well to develop ceremonial of a new or peculiar character. It is reasonable, in the face of the Great Intercession of the Church's Head (S. John xvii.), to believe that a day will come when Christendom will be reunited; therefore nothing merely insular or peculiar to the last three hundred years can be looked upon as of necessity final.

4. It is reasonable to use the Prayer-book in a thoroughly loyal spirit; obeying its directions as exactly as possible, and knowing that we could hardly manifest a more uncatholic spirit than by conforming to the regulations of some other portion of the Church in preference to those of our own. The Catholic Church speaks to her English children through the English Church, to her French children through the French Church, and so on.

5. It is reasonable to judge an unaccustomed service or devotion upon its own merits, not upon the question as to where or by whom it may be used besides. If it does not contravene the Catholic Faith, and supplies souls with what they need, it is nothing to the point that it is also to be found in the Church of Rome, or even in a Baptist chapel.

6. It is reasonable to use our churches as houses of prayer, where Christian people may go, singly, or by twos and threes, or in larger numbers, and (with certain obvious safeguards) feel themselves at

home there, and free to pray and sing hymns or litanies.

7. It is reasonable that every priest, while he leads his flock in the ways of devotion and worship, should be careful not to separate himself and them more than is necessary from other parishes, whose congregations are less fitted for the methods which he finds useful for his own.

8. It is reasonable that whatever is done in our churches should have the approval, or at least not have the disapproval, of the Bishop.

9. It is reasonable that the Bishops should discourage nothing that, not being unorthodox, kindles devotion and ministers to edification ; and that they should trust their clergy to do their best for their flocks.

10. It is reasonable that whatever is done in church should have the goodwill of the congregation, and should be of spiritual profit to them. Ceremonial, for example, however valuable and expressive in itself, which did not carry the people with it, would be useless and even harmful. The most stately and solemn ritual would render no glory to God if no sentiment of reverence or homage went along with it on the part of the worshippers. It is necessary to the worship of the Catholic Church that it should reflect and express what is in the mind and heart, not

only of the officiating priests, but also of the people. The Church must be—in worship, above all things —"One Body," actuated by one common spirit of adoration, lifting up one voice of praise and prayer, finding its expression not in the same words only, but in the same gestures, and in the eloquent though silent witness of holy rites, which all understand as symbols of Divine Truth, and which from time immemorial have been the tokens of Christian devotion. The laity must both understand the meaning of what is done, and must be able to find edification and spiritual help in it.

11. It is reasonable that priests should give much more instruction than they are apt to do. And not only should they lay themselves out to teach their flocks, but they should take every opportunity of enlightening those whom they encounter in society suffering from the common ignorance in all matters ecclesiastical.

12. It is reasonable for a priest to speak clearly and distinctly at all times of his ministration, and help to make the services intelligible to all by clearness, reverence, and simplicity of voice, tone, and manner.

13. It is reasonable that no one should interfere with the private devotions of the priest at the Altar, who has just as good a right to say what prayers he likes

as any layman in the congregation, provided only he says them secretly, and does not make pauses of undue duration.

14. It is reasonable to give others credit for, at any rate, such devotion, loyalty, love for souls, and common sense as one would desire to claim for one's self.

After all, can we improve upon the old and golden rule?—

> "In necessariis unitas;
> In non-necessariis libertas;
> In omnibus caritas."

INTELLIGIBLE RITUAL

By the Rev. H. Arnott

It has lately been the fashion to speak of the Ritual Movement in the Church of England as one which owes its impetus to a few hot-headed young clergy with disloyal leanings to Rome, and who by their vagaries alienate the more sober and devout worshippers from their churches.

It is needful to remember that the present ritual revival amongst us is now no very modern affair, but the inevitable and logical outcome of the Tractarian Movement of the last half-century, and that so far from the "ritualistic clergy alienating the laity," it is the more devout laity themselves who, having accepted the higher Catholic teaching of our Prayer-book, have insisted upon a worthier outward expression of that teaching in the ordering of our churches and services. Those who, like the writer, can remember the riots at St. George's-in-the-East forty

years ago, will recall the influence exerted by a small band of earnest laymen in persuading Mr. Bryan King to adopt the vestments sanctioned by the Ornaments Rubric.

And at another well-known London church, in older days a pioneer church in the restoration of worship in "the beauty of holiness," the costly and beautiful vestments for the ministers at the Altar were provided and presented by members of the congregation very many months before the revered incumbent consented to use them. No doubt in most congregations some few may be found who are not wholly contented with the way in which the services are conducted, whether ornate or plain, but it is probable that in very few instances indeed has an elaborate ritual been forced upon an unwilling congregation by a wilful priest, as is so generally alleged. In the great majority of instances, the request for more advanced ritual has been urged again and again upon the parish priest before the changes have been adopted by him, and almost always the cost of the change has been defrayed beforehand by members of the congregation.

It seems the more necessary to insist on this aspect of the matter, because even in the highest quarters of late there has been a tendency to admit and to deplore a separation between clergy and people in

ritual matters, though the crowded congregations in "advanced" churches, and the wide adoption throughout the whole Church of ornaments and customs at first looked upon with suspicion and dislike, might well have suggested a very different view.

It is of course idle to deny that there is a widely felt dislike to "advanced" ritual, or the late recrudescence of Protestant opposition could not have met with so popular a reception, but it is clear that the main cause for this opposition is the quite fairly recognized fact that the ritual and ceremonies objected to are the expression of Sacerdotalism. Now, under this term Sacerdotalism is included the great Sacramental system of the Church—the Apostolic succession of the ministry, and the efficacy of the Sacraments as appointed channels of Divine grace. This has of course been the distinguishing feature of the Catholic Church of Christ in all ages, and there seems to be no logical position between this and Plymouthism. But many decades of Protestant teaching and practice in England have so hopelessly obscured this teaching that, marvellous as has been the growth and influence of the great Tractarian Movement of the past half-century, the great bulk of our people are still ignorant of or indifferent to their high Catholic heritage, and blindly

fancy that they detect Popery in every endeavour to teach and to display the true position of the English branch of the Catholic Church. And those whose mission it is to hand on and faithfully declare "the whole counsel of God" in this matter, must expect to have ranged against them not only those members of their own Communion who have not accepted the full teaching of the Prayer-book, but also the great bulk of Nonconformist Christians, and, more bitter than all, those who have left our ranks and sought peace in submission to the Papal claims.

So far, then, as an august ritual is not only an outward expression of reverence in worshipping Almighty God, but also an expression of the Church's belief in her own divinely appointed ministry, and the reality of sacramental grace, we cannot expect to make it acceptable to those who reject both.

But it is urged that many of the ritual developments of late years are distasteful also to earnest worshippers who fully accept Catholic teaching, but are disturbed and hindered in their devotions by ceremonies which seem to them fussy and unintelligible, and some even difficult to reconcile with loyalty to the plain directions of the Book of Common Prayer. It is surely worth while to attend to an objection like this, and to inquire how far it is well founded, even though the inquiry may involve some

trouble in tracing the history of some of these developments, and possibly the frank confession of mistakes having been made. For where so much had to be done to restore even mere decency into the forms of public worship, it was perhaps inevitable that mistakes should be made, and so long as all such efforts to improve matters were looked upon with cold suspicion and disapproval by our natural leaders, it was impossible to wait for Episcopal mandates or sanction.

In the simple endeavour to carry out the plainest instructions of the Prayer-book, parish priests had again and again the pain of knowing that their zeal was distasteful to the Bishops, and that their most praiseworthy efforts if recognized at all would only bring down upon them public rebuke and suspicion.

Now things are changed. From the cathedrals to the humblest country churches the Apostolic precept "let all things be done decently and in order" seems to be generally recognized, and our Fathers in God are at length assuming their rightful position as leaders and directors of a movement which has hitherto been in the hands of a few priests, forced, in spite of themselves, to take more or less independent action, and often too engrossed in parochial duties to be able to spare the time needed for much research into ritual questions. Such

clergy have therefore naturally looked for counsel from those admittedly more learned than themselves in such matters.

Unhappily, "in the multitude of counsellors" there is often more confusion than safety, and the number of experts professing to provide more or less fully an authoritative ritual companion to the Book of Common Prayer (a sorely needed supplement to our very meagre rubrics) are a source of no little perplexity to the average parish priest who needs such help, by the very variety of their directions.

On the one hand there are those who frankly advise as close a reproduction as possible of modern Roman ritual adapted to our modified English Liturgy. Others, perhaps more consistently, look to the older English uses, and try to suggest how far we may retain and adapt to our present Prayer-book, in accordance with the directions of the Ornaments Rubric, the ceremonies of the English Church in the time of Henry VIII. and the first years of Edward VI., carefully avoiding all customs which cannot claim pre-Reformation authority.

There are yet others who, with an antiquarian's horror of modern French and Italian rites and a profound distrust of all that has been already accomplished in the restoration of our churches and ceremonial, make it their mission to point out our

blunders, and in their zeal for a national Use would have us to return to the discarded and meaningless scarves, black gowns and bands of fifty years ago, and, stripping our altars of cross, flowers, and candles (save at most two lights, which may be put on the Altar at time of celebration), be content with the old velvet cushions of the Georgian period.

Meantime there seems to be serious danger of unnecessarily alienating some of the devout laity, not so much by the variety of our Uses—which may well be patiently borne with during a restless transition period like the present—as by the introduction of ritual, whether Hanoverian, Modern Roman, or Old English, which is to them unmeaning and tiresome.

We all want to restore dignity and beauty to the public worship of God. We are mostly agreed that a devout and well-ordered ritual is a valuable object-lesson to the worshipper, as well as acceptable to Almighty God. However much we may deplore some of the effects of Puritan meddling with our Book of Common Prayer, we are all agreed that our present Liturgy is thoroughly Catholic, in spite of its marks of compromise in many places. The fear is lest, in our desire to be "correct," we may either restore so many small ceremonies and long-disused rites as to cumber our comparatively simple service and render it difficult for plain folks to understand;

or, on the other hand, in the passion for archaic severity and quaint reproduction of usages of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, discard such natural and instructive developments of ritual as have been found to be helpful to all.

A study of the interesting article "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained," which forms part of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, and is usually assigned to Cranmer, seems to provide a common-sense principle which should still underlie all our efforts to restore the "beauty of holiness" to public worship.

> "Some [ceremonies] are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burden of them was intolerable. . . . And moreover, they [that remain] be neither dark nor dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve."

Even in the strenuously debated question of the proper colours of the altar cloth and vestments, surely we may profitably bring this common-sense view of what is edifying and instructive into practice. In the laudable anxiety to be English, and to reproduce only Old English Uses, the Innocentian Sequence —or Roman, as it is called, because now universally used by Roman Catholics—is laid aside in favour of

Sarum colours. But the more the Sarum Use is studied, the more difficult it is to fix upon any definite scheme which may represent the old custom. Indeed, it seems that richness and beauty were more considered than any teaching by means of the colour employed, and to those long used to the Instructive Sequence—which gives us white for great festivals, red for martyrs' feasts and feasts of the Holy Spirit, violet for penitential days and seasons, and green for such times as do not fall into either of these categories—the Use which would give us white in Lent, red on almost all Sundays and on Good Friday, and yellow on Confessors' Days, seems so far less edifying that it would be a pity to adopt it unless the historical evidence in its favour is found to be far more clear and universal than at present appears. Some of the best authorities have shown that at least in Canterbury and London dioceses the Roman Sequence was authorized before the Reformation, and, since this series of colours is quite simple and intelligible, and already in use in most advanced churches, it seems a pity to displace it in favour of a rule on which no two authorities appear to be in accord. For this is not a point on which the Prayer-book has spoken clearly, seeing that there was no absolute rule for all dioceses alike in the second year of King Edward VI.

Where the Prayer-book has a plain direction, it is surely our plain duty to follow it. Hence it is difficult to understand on what principle some of the celebrant's manual acts in common use have been adopted by us, *e.g.* consecrating on the corporal instead of on the paten, making no fraction at the consecration, or consuming at once what remains of the consecrated elements after the Communion of the people.

But these, except perhaps the last, may be thought not to affect the laity, and the object of this paper is to plead for a ritual which shall be intelligible and edifying to the laity. For we must remember that the Reformation, as it affected the Church in England, involved a good deal more than refusing to be governed by the Pope in the matter of appointment of Bishops, the relation of the secular clergy to the religious orders, and other kindred points in which foreign interference had long been resented by the English people.

Amongst other results of the Reformation due to the spread of the new learning and the art of printing, was the deliberate adoption of a Prayer-book in English in which certain changes in structure (of very varying value and significance) were made in the Missal, an amended Calendar provided, with far fewer festivals than formerly, and greatly simplified

Breviary Offices, framed for public recitation morning and evening, much after the model of Cardinal Quignon's Reformed Breviary (which itself never seems to have won general favour). One special intention was to secure the regular recitation of the whole Psalter, the reading the greater part of the Bible to the people, and a form of Office so simple and unvarying as to be easily understood and shared in by the devout laity, instead of being confined, as formerly, to the priesthood, members of religious communities, and to private recitation by the more devout.

The course of the religious revival amongst us has shown that we can secure a thoroughly Catholic, stately, and dignified service while keeping carefully within Prayer-book lines, and difficult as it often is for parish priests to restrain the ritualistic zeal of the more ardent members of their congregations, who are often also the more devout, this often needs to be done in matters which, harmless in themselves and possibly even helpful to some, are yet liable to give a fussy tone to the service and to be misunderstood by the bulk of the people. One may venture to include in this category the use of birettas during service-time; the substitution of scanty lace-trimmed cottas for the English surplice; heaping up the altar with the many small, artistically-grouped candles,

which seem to have come in with the modern rite of Benediction; lighting and extinguishing of candles in the course of the service; the use of apparels and lace on albs and surplices, and, indeed, no little of the minute details of ceremonial which, without having ancient historical sanction or real teaching significance, or being essential to reverence, are calculated to upset the quiet, sober English tone of most of our congregations.

Even so small a matter as the modern custom of partly covering the middle of a stole with lace, like a child's tucker, though it may be of some use in preserving the silk, seems to take away much of the dignity of that ancient vestment.

But there are some points for which one cannot too earnestly plead if we wish to carry the laity with us in our Common Prayer.

One is the rendering of all parts of the public service in a *clear, audible voice,* without either mumbling or overlapping verses in the recitation of psalms and canticles. There is a strange want of courtesy in the too-prevalent habit of beginning a fresh verse of a psalm before the last is nearly finished—as if one rudely broke in upon another's speech without waiting for him to conclude; and there is a very distinct want of reverence about it also, for it makes it very difficult to enter into the

meaning of words so hurried and confused in the repetition. Many earnest people have been repelled from attendance at the daily Offices by this fault, and who shall say how many others have thus drifted into mechanical perfunctory recitation of psalms, which would otherwise be full of help and consolation and beauty? No doubt the trick is usually acquired by clergy who often have to say their Offices alone, for one's thoughts run on more swiftly than spoken words; but, however learnt, it should be sedulously guarded against.

Another point is to adhere faithfully to the words of the Prayer-book in all the public parts of the service. The common substitution of other Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for those ordered for the day, however appropriate they may appear to be, and however much we may deplore the specially meagre provision for certain days in the Prayer-book, must surely be very puzzling to the laity. Even with Episcopal sanction for special lections at special services, as a rule the Eucharist of the day should have the appointed Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

On yet another point of great importance in this connection, it will be better to quote the extremely sensible words of a very learned layman, Dr. J. Wickham Legg, who, in a paper read before the

St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, on October 27, 1887, said as follows :—

"For years there has been a struggle for a reasonable and ancient custom—viz. that in our prayers both priest and people should turn one way, that the priest, by turning away from the people, should show that he is not speaking to them. This practice loses all its meaning unless the priest, when speaking to the people, turn to them. Accordingly, in the Roman rite, when the priest says *Dominus vobiscum* or *Orate fratres*, he turns towards the faithful; so does the deacon when he says *Ite missa est.* But there are one or two places where this common-sense rule is not followed; *e.g.* between the end of the Canon and the *Agnus Dei*, the priest says to the people: *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*, and yet he does not turn to the faithful. Why is this? Mr. G. G. Scott explains this apparently unreasonable practice as follows: In the basilica the curtains were drawn around the altar from the *Sursum Corda* to the Communion, and the priest, being unseen, made no change in his posture when saluting the faithful at the *Sursum Corda* or *Pax.* The curtains around the altar have gone long ago, but the practice caused by them survives. This explanation will commend itself to many; and it will be thought impossible that such a survival, now become unsuitable even in its own home, could be imitated in another rite. But it has been, and in ridiculous fashion. The *Pax*, it is well known, is in the wrong place in the Roman rite, and it has been further dislocated in the Anglican, where it has been joined on to the final blessing. The two are now welded together and form a whole. But because in the Roman rite, for some reason or other (whether Mr. Scott's be the real one or not does not

matter) it has been forgotten to bid the priest to turn to the people, therefore English priests are to say that part of the blessing which corresponds with the *Pax* with their backs turned to the people, and in the middle of the paragraph they are to turn round and finish the blessing. Surely unreasoning imitation never went further than this.

"I doubt myself if any motive but imitation exists for reading with back turned to the people the Epistle and Gospel, which are addressed to the faithful for their instruction. It would be as reasonable to read the sermon, which is to explain the Gospel, with the back to the people in the pulpit."

On the other hand, it is strange to see how a careless indolence like the custom of sitting during the psalms and at the Nicene Creed, which was common enough in the seventeenth century, is again coming in at some of our "advanced" churches, where careless irreverence is the last thing intended by the worshippers. Common as it was in the latter part of the seventeenth century, Hickes, writing in 1701, describes those who refused to stand at the singing of psalms and anthems as "stiff, morose, and saturnine votists." Yet now it seems by many to be regarded as a mark of special piety.

Even the use of special hymn-books with introits, graduals, sequences, etc., is a matter which needs carefully watching. Every one must have felt at times the practical inconvenience caused by the

variety of hymnals in use amongst us, but few seem to consider how disturbing and annoying it may be to an ordinary well-instructed Churchman to find that he cannot follow the service without some one by his side to lend him a book and instruct him in the use of it. Certainly where extra local books are used, copies should be freely supplied in the seats, and by means of hymn-boards every facility given for all to understand the service alike.

And in this connection attention may be drawn to what gravely concerns the ritual of the laity—the convenience for kneeling in the seats in church. Few things are more painful to notice in a church than the studied disregard of this point, even in churches otherwise well served and well appointed. The narrow sloping boards often supplied are as ill-adapted for the purpose as possible. Who would think of kneeling to say his private prayers at home on a slanting bit of board? Nature has provided us with knees constructed to kneel on the ground, and although the hard and possibly dirty floor may be rendered clean and comfortable by a moderately thick kneeling-pad, anything at all high, or sloping so as to throw one back, is necessarily either very fatiguing or can only be used in a half-sitting posture, when the weight of the body is thrown on to the seat. Yet how seldom does one see anything

provided beyond a few high hassocks here and there, or the hard raised board which is more painful in use than the floor itself, while the seats themselves are often so closely packed that an average man's legs cannot be stowed behind him, either with chairs or benches! Surely every parish priest who tries to teach his people reverence should himself test the kneeling accommodation in various parts of his church from time to time, and correct what is defective.

Indeed, if we wish to win men back to the Church, no pains must be spared not only to render the services edifying and helpful, but also as free as may be from all drawbacks in the way of their taking a personal and intelligent part in the worship. One cannot be constantly preaching about ritual, but a simple explanatory chart such as that issued by Messrs. Mowbray may be hung up near the porch, and any new departure in ceremonial may be simply explained at the time of its introduction.

One great want of to-day is no doubt some authoritative statement drawn up by a committee of experts which should suffice to provide a minimum of decent and essential ritual for a village church, and also suggest a fuller and more stately ceremonial for use in larger town churches. Such a guide must be furnished before long, and when it is undertaken,

the writer would earnestly plead that in restoring rites which have fallen into general disuse, due care be taken to avoid as far as possible fussy unintelligible details which are difficult to carry out, and too often only confusing and disturbing to average congregations.

THE ENGLISH LITURGY

By the Rev. T. A. Lacey

The Divine Liturgy is the framework of prayers, lessons, and hymns in which are set the essential acts of the Christian Sacrifice. These acts are few and simple. Bread and wine, according to our Saviour's institution, are to be solemnly blessed, in order that by the consecrating word they may become to us the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Sacrament is then to be solemnly consumed. These are the only essential acts; in them the sacrifice is complete. Our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood, sacramentally separate as a sign of His death, lie upon the Altar, the one perpetual unchanging Sacrifice; and of these the priest and the faithful communicate, making the sacrifice their own. There is required, therefore, the action of the priest, consecrating the elements, and the action of priest and people, consuming the Sacrament. These two actions are constant; all else is accidental

and variable. Indeed, the mode in which the priest consecrates the elements is itself also variable; he must effect this by a prayer expressing clearly what is to be done, and it is probable, to say the least, that his prayer must necessarily include the recitation of our Lord's own words of institution; but apart from this the tenor of the consecration prayer may vary, and does vary widely in the actual use of the Church.

But the Holy Sacrifice is never celebrated, never from the first was celebrated, by the bare performance of these two essential actions. They are set in the framework of a Liturgy. The outline, at least, of the Liturgy seems to have been fixed from the earliest age of the Church, and something of a settled order was, perhaps, from the very first prescribed for the use, if not of apostles or bishops, at all events of simple presbyters. The original outline has been faithfully maintained; the description of the holy Mysteries which we read in S. Justin Martyr would be an accurate account in brief of any existing Liturgy.

As the forms in use throughout the Church settled down to a fixity of detail, there was a tendency to considerable diversity of detail. This tendency was, however, corrected by the emerging importance of the great sees which in time became the Patriarchates. The Liturgy of Alexandria dominated the valley of

the Nile. The Antiochene Liturgy spread throughout the East, where all the existing forms are either derived from it or have been profoundly affected by its influence. The Liturgy of Constantinople, itself a daughter of the Antiochene, has spread still more widely, and is now used throughout the whole Orthodox Eastern Church. The Roman Liturgy, probably after undergoing vast internal changes in the passage from the Greek to the Latin language, spread in like manner through the West, displacing almost entirely those Latin rites which are grouped historically under the name of Gallican. These last were dominated by no one strong centre, and therefore, although they had much in common, diversity reigned the more among them, and they were the less able to stand against the spreading influence of Rome; but the Roman Liturgy, in pervading the churches of the Gallican rite, borrowed not a few details from local use, and some of these made their way even to Rome itself.

The later Middle Ages, therefore, saw two Liturgies, those of Rome and Constantinople, in use throughout the Catholic Church. The Gallican rite barely survived locally at Toledo, and more doubtfully at Milan. There were, however, several forms in use among the separated Churches of the East, which from time to time were brought to the cognizance of

orthodox Christendom by the reconciliation of fragments of these communities to the Roman see, when in all cases the resulting Uniat body retained its own rites with little or no alteration.

The English Liturgy is an immediate daughter of the Roman, but in the passage from one to the other changes were made so great and important that we practically have a new and separate type. We cannot study the English Liturgy satisfactorily if this fact be slurred over or forgotten. But the English Liturgy is not only an object of study: we have to use it in Divine worship, and we desire to use it in a worthy fashion, with reverence and dignity, with stateliness and splendour, according to the measure of our circumstances. We cannot succeed in this unless we pay due regard to its characteristic features. A living Liturgy is not a mere text; it is surrounded by a living commentary of usage. This may be either traditional or written; it may be rigidly fixed, or it may afford room for wide variations. The Roman Liturgy is richly annotated in this way. Roman ceremonial, it has been said, is a finished work of art. It has grown up round the structure of the Liturgy, and fits it perfectly. The English Liturgy has but a meagre equipment of the kind. The traditional usages which we have inherited were almost always inadequate, and were in many cases bad. We have

been reforming these with extraordinary vigour. We have sought our materials, as was natural and right, from the treasury of the mother-liturgy of Rome, looking either to existing usage, or more logically to the usages which prevailed in the English Church while she still followed, with some local peculiarities, the older Roman rite. Indeed, we are expressly directed thither by the prefatory note to the Prayer-book, which we call the Ornaments Rubric. But though we have gone to the right source for our materials, it may be doubted whether we have made the best use of them. We have been obliged to make experiments; it cannot hurt us to acknowledge that we have made some mistakes. Mistakes we must surely make if we take the mother's dress to clothe the daughter, without sufficient regard for differences of face and figure.

I propose, therefore, to call attention to certain points in which the English Liturgy has a character of its own. I shall not compare it favourably or unfavourably with other liturgies, but shall use comparison only for the purpose of illustration. Our object should be to understand the liturgy which we use, and when we are thoroughly familiar with its form, then and then only to venture on adornment.

We must first observe that in its general structure the English Liturgy is like all other liturgies. For

my present purpose it will be convenient to divide the whole, in a way not altogether usual, into three parts. The first part will answer to what ritual students know as the *Missa Catechumenorum*, from the fact that in ancient times the unbaptized attended thus far and were then dismissed ; it includes all up to the sermon. The second part will be the *Offertory*, which will call for special attention. The third part we may call by its Greek name, the *Anaphora ;* it begins, as in all rites, with *Lift up your hearts.*

In the first part we are struck at once by the absence of psalmody, which is an important feature of all other liturgies. In the Roman rite, which retains only a fraction of its former wealth in this regard, we find the *Introit*, called in the old English books by a Gallican name *Officium*, the *Gradual* and *Alleluia*, or the *Tract*, between the Epistle and the Gospel, and on festivals the hymn *Gloria in excelsis.* Of these the psalmody between the Epistle and Gospel is by far the most ancient and the most integral. It was originally sung by the deacon ; in the sixth century it was assigned to special cantors, but the sacred ministers of the altar still gave it their attention, having nothing to occupy them at the time. At Salisbury, indeed, by a custom hard to account for and harder to defend, the deacon and sub-deacon prepared the chalice at this time. The intolerable length

of the Sequences there sung allowed this, but they were not introduced merely to pass the time occupied by a ceremony. The Introit, on the other hand, had precisely this object. It was sung by a choir to cover the solemn entry of the sacred ministers; it formed no part of the rite which they were to read, and found no place in the older Sacramentaries. Its length varied with the actual need of the time, and the chanting ceased when the celebrant approached the altar. Reduced to a single verse, it found its way into the later Missals, and came to be recited by the priest himself. In spite of this difference of origin and dignity, we find that in the first English Liturgy the Introit was retained, as well as *Gloria in excelsis*, while the Gradual was markedly cut off; it was carefully provided by rubric that the Gospel should *immediately* follow the Epistle. At the revision of 1552 the Introit and the Gloria disappeared. The general freedom now enjoyed of introducing hymns or anthems, where they do not disturb the appointed order of worship, has brought back something corresponding to the Introit as originally used. One may have doubts about a restoration of the Gradual.

If the public eye and ear are struck by the absence of psalmody, the priest who has to use the liturgy will be perhaps even more impressed by the character

of the Preparation. In all rites there are certain prayers to be said by the priest before he actually goes to the altar. In the Oriental and Gallican rites these have a peculiar significance and solemnity. At Rome the Masses of the Stations had a very elaborate Preparation of psalmody and prayer, said by the Pope and his attendants while going in solemn procession to the church. This was cut down for ordinary use to a single psalm, with a general confession and certain prayers ; but the details varied greatly in the different Churches using the Roman Liturgy, the confession alone being a constant feature. In the first English Liturgy the Preparation consisted only of the Lord's Prayer and the Collect, *Almighty God, unto whom all hearts*, etc., which were included in the Salisbury form. The revision of 1552 added the Ten Commandments, with their responses. This was entirely novel, there being nothing of the sort in any other liturgy. The rite has some analogy with a confession on behalf of the people, for they are directed in responding to "ask God mercy for their transgression ;" but it would be idle to force this point of resemblance. Still less satisfactory is it to compare these responses with the ninefold *Kyrie* of the Roman Liturgy. This latter, a fragment of an ancient litany with which the Mass once opened, is peculiar to the Roman rite ; the Commandments,

with their responses, are as peculiar to the English rite. The two things have nothing common in their origin, their purport, or their mode of recital.

A word may be said as to the practical rendering of this Preparation. According to the rubric the priest is to say it "standing at the North-side of the Table;" but this, it is now generally admitted, refers to an arrangement of the Holy Table which is entirely obsolete. The Holy Table, as it was placed in 1552, had a north side; as now placed it has none. Some ingenious ritualists have suggested that any place to the north of a line drawn from the middle of the table may be spoken of as the north side. It seems more natural to say that as the altar has been restored to its older position, the priest should return with it to his corresponding position also. This position was in front of the altar at some distance. So it remained in the Liturgy of 1549. The priest was to say the Preparation "standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar." He can hardly do better than follow this precedent, and, the Preparation ended, he will then go up to the altar for the Collects.

But is the celebrant bound himself in person to recite the Commandments? We cannot press the letter of the rubric directing him to do so; for he is equally directed to read the Epistle and the Gospel

which by established custom are assigned to the assistant ministers. It would seem to follow that one of them may read the Commandments, if it be found convenient. If the ceremony of censing the altar be used—I do not here argue the question of such ceremonial usages—the proper time for it according to precedent is when the priest goes up to the altar after the Preparation. It might be done during the reading of the Commandments if they were read by one of the ministers, or, still in agreement with many precedents, the chant of the last response might be lengthened out during the time of the ceremony.

One further peculiarity in the first part of our Liturgy is the Creed. The use of the Nicene Creed as a hymn was first introduced in Spain, where it was sung immediately before Communion. In some of the Transalpine Churches using the Roman Liturgy it was sung on Sundays and certain festivals at the beginning of the *Missa Fidelium*, after the sermon; and in the eleventh century the Roman Church adopted this practice. With us it comes before the sermon, in what corresponds to the *Missa Catechumenorum*. The practical abandonment of the whole system of the *disciplina arcani* has made this position suitable. The rubric ordering the Creed to be sung or said in the ordinary course after the Gospel

seems to require its use on all occasions when the Holy Sacrifice is offered.

We pass now to the second part of the Liturgy, the *Offertory*. The point is well marked by the rubric, which bids the priest, after the sermon ended, "return to the Lord's Table and begin the Offertory." The word is derived from the short anthem, known as *Offertorium*, which occurs at this point in the Roman Liturgy, but in our book it is used in a largely extended sense to designate a part of the liturgic action. We find this represented in all liturgies, but with considerable diversities of detail. In its simplest elements it may almost be regarded as essential. The bread and wine which are to be blessed by the priest—the matter of the Sacrament—must be placed upon the Holy Table. Clearly this might be done without any accompanying rites or ceremonies, but nowhere do we find this to be the practice. The act is always treated as a solemn oblation of the bread and wine, or as part of a wider act of offering. In the Oriental Churches, and in those of the ancient Gallican rite, the former conception prevails. The sacred elements, prepared beforehand with a solemn rite, known to the Greeks as the Liturgy of the *Prothesis*, are brought with stately ceremony and placed upon the altar. In the Roman Church, which appears in this particular to have retained a practice once universal, there was

in former days a general offering. The lay people first brought their oblations of bread and wine. The priests and deacons assisting—we must remember that the ancient *Ordines* invariably suppose the Bishop himself to be celebrant—then brought offerings of bread alone; lastly, a sub-deacon went down from the sanctuary to the singers, who were too busy with their chant to take part in the general offering, and received from them an oblation of water. What importance was attached to the act of offering may be learnt from the great ritualist Amalarius, who observes that provision was thus made for the singers "*that they might not be deprived of all share in the sacrifice.*"[1] When all had offered, the principal deacon selected from the oblations a quantity of bread, wine, and water, sufficient for the sacrifice, and laid this upon the altar. During all this action the singers performed an elaborate chant, of which the modern *Offertorium* is a survival. This done, the Bishop, after rinsing his hands, went up to the altar and said the collect known as *Secreta*, after which he at once began the *Anaphora.*

Such was the ceremony of the oblation in the ancient Roman Church, but it was obviously subject to variations. In its entirety it was proper only to

[1] Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.*, iii. 19. "Statutum est eis, ut penitus non sint extorres a sacrificio, custodire aquam, et hanc unum offerre pro caeteris."

those stational Masses which the Pope solemnly celebrated in person. He alone was attended by deacons; the titular priests in their churches were ministered to by acolytes alone, and there, as also in the oratories, the private or sepulchral chapels which abounded in Rome, there can be no doubt that the celebrant himself presented the elements upon the Altar. Still more in other churches, when the use of the Roman Liturgy spread to them, was there found room for modifications based on local usages. Two of these modifications call for special attention.

At Rome, as we have seen, the deacon took the bread and wine for the altar from the general offerings. But elsewhere it was prepared beforehand, and brought with great solemnity. This practice was imported into the Roman Liturgy when used in the Gallican Churches. The elements were prepared, the wine mixed in the chalice, by the sacred ministers, either at the beginning of Mass, or, as at Salisbury in later days, during the interval between the Epistle and the Gospel. At the Offertory they were solemnly brought to the celebrant, and by him offered upon the altar. Thus the oblations of the people, though retained, lost their intimate connection with the Sacrifice. This general offering, strangely enough, has long since dropped out of use at Rome itself, but survives, in a mutilated form, to this day in some of

the Churches which use the Roman rite. It is represented by the familiar *pain béni* of French parish churches, and in the sixteenth century it survived in England in the form of the "Holy Loaf," which, as we know from the Prayer-book of 1549, was customarily offered by the households of the parish in rotation. But as the general oblation lost its connection with the altar, it was easily commuted into an offering of money, and in mediæval England the "mass-penny" was a familiar institution.

The second modification to which I would call attention is the introduction of ritual prayers in connection with the offering. At Rome there was originally nothing of the kind; but in other churches the custom was at this point of the service to read the *diptychs*, or list of those for whom special prayer was to be made, and a general supplication followed. In the Roman Liturgy, the commemoration of the living and the departed was made, as we shall see, in a different part of the service altogether; but as it came into use in Gallican lands, there seems to have been a tendency to interpolate some prayers of this kind at the Offertory. We find them inserted in ritual books from the ninth century onward in great variety, beginning, for the most part, *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas hanc oblationem*, and proceeding to specify the various classes of men or the various needs for

which the sacrifice is specially offered. One of these, couched in the most general terms, found its way into constant use at Rome itself, and is prescribed in the Missal of the present day.

Other prayers, originally private, used in connection with the ceremonies of the Offertory, found their way into the mediæval Missals, and so acquired a ritual character. They varied considerably in different churches; those now printed in the Roman Missal probably represent the traditional use of the Papal Chapel.

I have devoted so much attention to the historical development of the Offertory, in order to have material with which to compare our English rite. The rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, though, as usual, they enter very little into detail, are quite clear as to the outlines of the ceremonial. It begins conspicuously with the general offering. The later practice of a money-offering is fully accepted; "the alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people" are brought, and, quite in the ancient manner, the *deacons* are appointed to receive them, though churchwardens or other fit persons may take their place. While this is done certain sentences are said, one or more at the discretion of the priest. He is directed to say these himself, but, as in the case of the Epistle and Gospel, this can hardly be interpreted, in the

face of both ancient and modern custom, to exclude the chanting of them by a choir. They thus correspond exactly to the *Offertorium* of the Roman Liturgy in its original form, which also was lengthened or shortened according to the time consumed by the offering. The offerings are then brought to the priest, and by him presented and placed upon the Holy Table. This solemn offering of alms at the altar is peculiar to the English Liturgy. It has the effect of bringing the people's offering, as in ancient times, into close association with the sacrifice.

The general offering completed, "the Priest shall then," says the rubric, "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." This is the only direction with regard to the central and all-important action of the Offertory. Interpreted as in other places, the rubric would not forbid the performance of this act, as in the ancient Roman rite, by the deacon; but the practice of the whole Church for many ages requires it to be done by the priest in person; and when this is done, he says a great prayer of oblation, beseeching God to accept the offerings made, and interceding "for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth."

The Offertory thus consists of three members—the general offering, the ceremonial oblation of the bread and wine, and the prayer. So far all is simple;

but there are difficulties, due partly to the very simplicity of the rubric, partly to varieties of practice. Nothing is said about the preparation of the sacred oblation. The old English custom was to prepare the host and the chalice either at the beginning of Mass, or between the Epistle and Gospel. The first English Liturgy of 1549 appeared to abandon this custom in favour of the Roman practice of doing all at the actual time of the Offertory.[1] The rubric was explicit; after the general offering:

"Then shall the Minister take so much Bread and Wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion, laying the Bread upon the Corporas, or else in the Paten, or in some comely thing prepared for that purpose: and putting the Wine into the Chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the Chalice will not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean Water, and setting both the Bread and Wine upon the Altar."

In the revision of 1552 this rubric was omitted, and nothing took its place, nor is it clear what practice thenceforth prevailed. The twentieth of the Canons enacted in 1604 requires the wine to be "brought to the Communion Table" in a stoop or flagon, but nothing is said about the time. Andrewes, when consecrating the chapel at Ridgeway Heath in 1620, appears to have prepared the bread and mixed

[1] See, however, in Collier, vol. v. p. 115, ed. 1840, the same use recognized by the *Rationale* of date *c.* 1537; MS. Cotton. *Cleop.* E.5. fol. 259.

the chalice at the Offertory, but the notes of the ceremonial used are too fragmentary to be quite clear.[1] Wren, Bishop of Norwich, in 1636, required the "holy oblations" to be "received by the minister standing before the table at their coming up to make the said oblation, and then by him to be reverently presented before the Lord and set upon the table till the service be ended,"[2] but this appears to refer mainly to alms, of the presentation of which at the altar this is, I believe, the earliest mention. In the Liturgy prepared by Laud for the Scottish Church, the presentation of the alms is ordered, and the priest is directed then "to offer up, and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table." Here is clearly the germ of our present rubric, which dates from 1662; the elements are spoken of as prepared beforehand, but no indication is given of the time when this was to be done.

It is indeed probable that the ancient English custom of preparing the elements at the beginning of Mass, and placing them at once upon the altar, continued, in however slovenly a manner, to be generally observed. Nor did the new rubric of 1662 effect any change. Wheatley observes that it was the general practice of his own day to place the

[1] Andrewes, *Minor Works*, p. 326. Oxford, 1846.
[2] Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, vol. ii. p. 256.

elements upon the Lord's Table before the beginning of morning prayer.[1] He calls this "a profane and shameful breach of the aforesaid rubric," words which are too strong for a practice founded on immemorial custom. The practice continued until, within recent years, a more scrupulous and literal observance of the rubric was adopted.

As is well known, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in his judgment on the Bishop of Lincoln's case, decided, on a review of the evidence, that the chalice ought to be mixed according to ancient precedent before the beginning of the liturgy. This should, of course, be done with due solemnity. It matters nothing whether it be done in the sight of the people or no. If a church have a fair and stately sacristy, properly reserved for sacred functions, it may reasonably be done there; but our churches are as a rule so badly furnished in this respect, that we can hardly do it in seemly fashion except in the chancel or at the altar. A general agreement on this point is much to be desired.

The elements thus prepared are, according to the rubric, to be placed upon the altar by the priest at the Offertory. They should be brought to him, where it is possible, with stately pomp, as in the Eastern Churches and in those of the ancient Gallican rite.

[1] Wheatley, *Rational Illustration*, p. 272. Ed. 1848.

This implies a full assistance of ministers; but when the priest is celebrating without ministers, or with one layman perhaps serving him, it seems reasonable to allow him, according to the persistent custom of which I have spoken, to place the elements upon the altar as soon as they are prepared. He will then "present" them at the Offertory, though he will not, strictly speaking, place them at that time on the Holy Table.

There are two usages connected with the Offertory, venerable for their antiquity and reasonable in themselves, for which no provision is made in our Liturgy, but which have been revived, and are being widely accepted. They are the rinsing of the priest's hands and the censing of the oblations. Where should these come in? There is much variation in the place assigned by the liturgies to the ceremonial hand-washing. The various forms even of the Roman Liturgy do not agree, but as a rule they place it after the oblation of the elements. The reason for this must be sought in the ancient use of the Roman Church. There, as we have seen, the deacon placed the elements on the altar, and when this was done, the Pope, who up to this point had been seated on his throne in the apse, washed his hands, went up to the altar, and at once said the *Secreta.* In adapting this ceremony to our English Liturgy, we have to

consider only convenience and symbolical appropriateness. Andrewes, according to the record already referred to, seems to have rinsed his hands after the general offering before he proceeded to the oblation of the elements; and this may seem on every account the most suitable arrangement. As to the place for the censing, there should be less room for doubt. According to all precedent this follows the oblation; therefore with us it should follow the prayer for the Church Militant, which in our Liturgy accompanies the actual oblation.

The Offertory, then, when performed with all fulness of solemnity, will thus proceed. The people first make their general offering, while the Sentences are sung, the priest, we may suppose, remaining seated. This done, the priest goes up to the altar, receives and solemnly presents the offerings. He then rinses his hands; the sacred elements, already prepared, are solemnly brought to him by the ministers; he places these upon the altar and offers them, saying the prayer for the Church. He then censes the oblations, and the Offertory is complete.

This sequence of rite and ceremony is dislocated, and the dignity of the liturgy is consequently marred, by a practice common to many of our parish churches. If the whole ceremony is hurried through while the collection of the general offering is being

made, order and significance are confused. If sundry details—the hand-washing, the censing, the presentation of the alms—are forced in between the actual oblation, or placing of the elements on the altar, and the verbal oblation contained in the prayer for the Church, the point of the latter is lost. We sometimes see the priest and his ministers going through an elaborate performance, while the people sing a wholly irrelevant hymn; they perform the whole ceremony of the Offertory, saying privately the accompanying prayers of another liturgy, and afterwards, when all is finished, the prayer for the Church is perfunctorily added, with the now unmeaning petition that "our oblations" may be received. A grave wrong is thus done to the appointed rite, and the added ceremonial, instead of clothing the liturgy with dignity, is interposed in layers between severed portions of it, which remain themselves bare and unadorned. The order and integrity of the rite should be observed. We have, first, the general offering, then the particular oblation of the elements, and intimately associated with this, as in the Gallican Liturgies, the great intercession for the Church. All ceremonial adjuncts ought to cluster round this order, illuminating, not obscuring it.

After the Offertory the liturgical action proceeds to the *Anaphora.* It is so in all liturgies, but the

English has here a special feature of its own. A short office of preparation is interposed, consisting of an address to the people, a general confession and absolution, and the verses known as the *Comfortable Words*. Inserted in the first English Liturgy of 1549 immediately before the Communion, it was afterwards removed to its present place before the beginning of the *Anaphora*. The only thing remotely resembling it in any other liturgy is the insertion at this point in the Mozarabic of the brief preparation: "*Introibo ad altare Dei: Ad Deum qui laetificat iuventutem meam.*"

So far back as we can trace the Christian Liturgy we find the general outline of the *Anaphora* subsisting unchanged; we have the best of reasons for supposing that we receive it from Apostolic times. After a preliminary salutation, not always used, it invariably opens with the verses: "*Lift up your hearts: We lift them up unto the Lord. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God: It is meet and right so to do.*" The celebrant then takes up the last verse and proceeds with a solemn act of thanksgiving, known to us as the *Preface*, the characteristic feature of the whole rite from which we derive the word *Eucharist*, and this culminates in the seraphic hymn, *Holy, Holy, Holy*. The act of thanksgiving then passes more or less gradually into a prayer, in which

is included the record of the institution of the Sacrament, and the consecration of the elements. This concludes, in all ancient liturgies, with the Lord's Prayer, to which a clause known as the Embolism is added. Immediately before or after the Lord's Prayer, as a rule, comes the solemn fraction of the Host. Then follows the Communion, the end and completion of the sacrificial act. These are the constant features of the *Anaphora;* all other details vary widely. It is needless, for our present purpose, to examine all, or any large number of the variations, but a consideration of some of them will be helpful.

Speaking generally, the Eastern Liturgies proceed after the seraphic hymn with a recital of the whole work of Redemption, concluding with the Institution of the Holy Sacrament; then follows the *Anamnesis*, or remembrance of the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Lord. After this the style changes into that of formal prayer, and in the *Epiclesis* the Holy Spirit is invoked for the consecration of the elements, "that this Bread may be made the precious Body of Christ, and what is in this Cup the precious Blood of Christ." Easterns invariably regard this *Epiclesis* as the true consecration. The prayer then develops into a great act of intercession for the whole Church, for the living and for the dead, and finally

into a commendation of those present, which leads naturally to *Our Father*. The position of the Intercession, however, varies. Then follow prayers of humble access, the Communion, and a Blessing.

If we turn to the ancient West, we find in the great family of Latin Liturgies, known as Gallican, a very different structure of the *Anaphora*. The greater part of it varies from day to day. The opening verses are unchanging; so, too, are the Seraphic Hymn, or *Sanctus*, the recital of the Institution, and the Lord's Prayer. Between these fixed points are inserted varying forms—a special Preface for each day; a prayer after *Sanctus*, which leads up to the recital of the Institution; a prayer after the recital, called *Post Secreta*, which sometimes, but not always, resembles the *Anamnesis* or the *Epiclesis* of other liturgies; an anthem sung during the solemn fraction of the Host before the Lord's Prayer. There is here no *Intercession*, as in the Eastern Liturgies; the Gallican, as we have seen, placed it not in the *Anaphora*, but at the Offertory. Neither is there any *Anamnesis* or *Epiclesis*, unless accidentally on certain occasions the prayer *Post Secreta* seems to be such. After the Lord's Prayer, the *Commixtion* is made with a short prayer. Then in preparation for Communion there is a *Benediction*, long and elaborate if the Bishop celebrate, short and simple for a priest;

an anthem called *Trecanum* is appointed to be sung during the Communion, and a brief thanksgiving follows.

Such was the rite which for some ages prevailed throughout most of the Latin Churches of the West. It fell out of use after a time, the Roman Liturgy taking its place; but many local features were, for a time at least, absorbed into the latter, notably the Preface varying day by day, and the Episcopal Benediction at the time of Communion. The true Gallican Liturgy survives only in the Mozarabic rite used at Toledo, and less entirely in the Ambrosian rite of Milan.

Midway between East and West, and partaking of the character of both, we find the Roman Liturgy. Originally Greek, it became Latin, probably in the course of the fourth century, and in the process of change it seems to have borrowed largely for its *Anaphora* from the existing Latin forms of the Gallican rite.[1] Like the Eastern Liturgies it has, and apparently always had, a fixed Preface for ordinary daily use, that of the *Missa Cotidiana*. It has also special Prefaces, like those of the Gallican rite, for occasional use. At one time very numerous, these were eventually reduced to nine, at which number

[1] See on this point an interesting paper by Mr. Burbidge in the *Guardian* of March 24, 1897, p. 471.

they were, in the twelfth century, erroneously supposed to have been fixed by the Pope, Pelagius II.[1] In reality the restriction was at that time quite recent, all the Sacramentaries down to the eleventh century containing a large number. Two others were afterwards added, making the eleven which are now contained in the Missal. The part of the *Anaphora* which follows *Sanctus* is invariable, as in the East, one or two phrases only being occasionally changed. For this reason it has received the name of *Canon*, or fixed rule, in contrast, no doubt, with the varying prayers used in other Latin Churches. The Canon follows, in the main, the lines of the Oriental *Anaphora*, but with some marked peculiarities. It opens with a long section commemorating and interceding for those on whose behalf the offering is made, and then commemorating also certain of the saints. This corresponds closely to the prayer of the Diptychs recited in the Gallican Liturgies at the Offertory. Then come two prayers for the blessing of the oblation (*Hanc igitur* and *Quam oblationem*), which answer in part to the Eastern *Epiclesis*, and these lead to the recital of the Institution. The *Anamnesis* follows (*Unde et memores*) and a prayer (*Supra quæ*), which historically is the true

[1] Honorius of Autun was perhaps the first to propound this legend in his *Gemma Animæ*, i. 120.

Epiclesis, though it is naturally weaker in expression than those of the Eastern rites, since the consecration is taken to be already effected by the words of Institution. The *Intercession*, which comes next, is reduced, probably in consequence of the commemoration already made, to a prayer for the departed only (*Memento etiam*), and with a commendation of the worshippers (*Nobis quoque*) the Canon comes to a confused conclusion, the despair of students, which is probably due to compression. The Fraction originally took place here, but was removed by S. Gregory the Great, in order to bring the Lord's Prayer into closer connection with the Canon, which it now follows immediately. After the Lord's Prayer came *Pax Domini* and the Kiss of Peace, and then, according to S. Gregory's rule, came the Fraction, at that time a long and imposing ceremony, which, from the end of the seventh century, was accompanied by the chant of *Agnus Dei.* It now takes place during the Embolism. There were originally no further prayers preparatory to Communion, such as the Oriental and Gallican rites supplied; those actually said were of a private character, and differed in the various churches using the Roman Liturgy. The antiphon called *Communio* was appointed to be sung while the faithful communicated; the *Postcommunio*, one of the three varying collects

characteristic of each Roman Mass, closes the service.

This rapid survey of rites will enable us to appreciate the character of the English *Anaphora*. The first English Liturgy of 1549 followed very closely the Roman Liturgy from which it sprang. Down to the end of *Sanctus* there was practically no change, the special Prefaces only being reduced in number. Then followed a Canon, longer than the Roman, beginning with a full Intercession and Commemoration of the Saints. The prayer for the blessing of the elements, before the recital of the Institution, was enriched by a special mention of the Holy Spirit, and so brought more into harmony with the Oriental *Epiclesis*. There followed the *Anamnesis*, and the rest of the prayer contains a two-fold oblation of the sacrifice, together with a new and beautiful feature, the oblation of the worshippers' selves, both soul and body, as partakers of Christ. The Lord's Prayer was then said, without any Embolism; devotions for Communion followed, including, as I have noted above, a general confession and absolution, together with that which we know as the Prayer of Humble Access. There was a Communion anthem, a Thanksgiving, and the service closed with the Blessing.

In 1552 the structure of the *Anaphora* was

completely changed, and reduced to the form in which we now have it. The great Intercession was removed altogether, and placed, as we have seen, in the Offertory. It is uncertain why this change was made, and whether the revisers knew that, in fact, they were reviving a feature of the Gallican rite; but such was the case. The whole preparation for Communion was also removed; the Confession and Absolution being placed before the beginning of the *Anaphora*, the Prayer of Humble Access before the Consecration. The Communion itself was placed in the middle of the liturgical action.

These changes have given great offence to many devout students of the Liturgy. The writer of those notes on the Prayer-book, which once passed for Cosin's, thought one of them so inexplicable that, in the face of all evidence, he supposed it to have been due to a printer's error. I am not here concerned either to justify or to condemn the changes. The existing Liturgy is that which we receive from the authority of the Church. We are bound to use it, and to use it faithfully. We should study it devoutly, to see how, in using it, we can best fulfil the purpose of the Church, and set forth the holy sacrifice with due solemnity.

We begin the *Anaphora*, therefore, in immemorial fashion, with *Lift up your hearts*, and that which

follows. The Preface ended, we sing the seraphic hymn. To this was formerly added the clause, *Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord*, which we have no longer. We are not altogether peculiar in this; for though the clause is found in the great majority of liturgies, it is absent from that of the Apostolic Constitutions, which probably represents the most ancient Roman use, and from those of the Alexandrine patriarchate. Here follows the Prayer of Humble Access, and then we pass, with a verbal memorial of the Passion and Sacrifice of Christ, to a prayer for the blessing of the elements, and the recital of the Institution. This memorial does not answer to the *Anamnesis* of the Oriental and the Roman Liturgies, which follows the words of Institution. There is nothing at all analogous to it in the Roman Canon; but it recalls, in a very abbreviated form, the long passage which occupies the same place in the Liturgy of the Constitutions, and in those of S. James and S. Basil. The blessing of the elements, *Hear us, O merciful Father*, which comes next, is, of course, historically a weakened form of the similar prayer in the Liturgy of 1549, as that, again, was an improvement on the corresponding part of the Roman Canon (*Hanc igitur* and *Quam oblationem*). Liturgically, however, it may be compared rather with the varying prayer *Post*

Sanctus of the Gallican rite, which leads up, like this, to the recital of the Institution.

The Fraction is made in close connection with the act of Consecration, and immediately afterwards our Liturgy directs us to go to Communion. No ritual preparation whatever is appointed, but it is needless to remark that at this point custom allows, we may almost say enjoins, a pause for private and silent prayer. After Communion, the Lord's Prayer is said, not by the priest alone, as in the Roman Liturgy, but, as in every other rite, by priest and people together. The Embolism, *For Thine is the kingdom, etc.*, is almost the same as in the Liturgy of Constantinople.

This is followed by a prayer which calls for close attention. It retains, in a great measure, the wording of the last part of the Canon of 1549. It contains a threefold oblation: first, of *This our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;* secondly, of *Ourselves, our souls and bodies;* thirdly, of *This our bounden duty and service.* The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is, of course, the Eucharistic Sacrifice itself, the phrase, common to almost all liturgies, recalling the peace-offerings and thank-offerings of the Old Testament, in which the offerers were "partakers with the altar," and so entered into communion with God; it is the sacrifice of the Lamb of God

offered continually upon the altars of the Church, the means of communion, and the instrument of propitiation, so that in the act of offering it we pray "that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion." We offer this; and then, by virtue of our union therewith, as partakers with the altar, we offer also ourselves, to be wholly sanctified and blessed. Then, recording our own unworthiness, we gather up the whole action, our bounden duty and service, as one united sacrificial act.

The ideas of this *Prayer of Oblation* are found in all rites; it has special points of contact with the Roman Canon, from which it may be said to be historically derived; liturgically, however, it is comparable rather with the prayer *Post Secreta* of the Gallican rite. It is, moreover, not exclusively used in this place. There is a prayer for alternative use which, beginning with a thanksgiving for Communion, concludes with a petition for the grace of perseverance. There is here no direct mention of the Sacrifice, but there is a memory of "the merits of the most precious death and passion" of the Lord.

Then follows the Angelic Hymn as an act of thanksgiving and worship. Originally belonging to the

Office of Matins, it came at Rome to be attached to the beginning of the Liturgy, properly so called, in the first instance only at the midnight Mass of Christmas; afterwards on certain Sundays and feasts, when the bishop celebrated Mass in person; finally, on these same occasions, whether priest or bishop were the celebrant. It retained the same position in the first English Liturgy, its use or omission being left within certain limits to the discretion of the priest, who would naturally follow the old order in that respect. Removed to its present position, it becomes an integral part of the *Anaphora*, and the old rules no longer apply. It would seem to be appointed for invariable use. The rite concludes with the Peace and the Blessing.

If the English *Anaphora*, thus arranged, be compared with those of other liturgies, three features will stand out as specially noteworthy. They are the position of the Fraction, the position of the Lord's Prayer, and the introduction of the Communion into the middle of the action.

In no other liturgy is the Fraction intimately associated with the act of consecration; it is connected rather with the following prayers; in the Roman Liturgy, after the time of S. Gregory, it became a part of the ritual of Communion. There was here, however, another ceremony with which the solemn

Fraction seems in the course of time to have been confused. Immediately after the Lord's Prayer a fragment was broken off one of the Hosts and left lying upon the altar, in testimony of the abiding sacrifice, throughout the ceremony of the Fraction and the Communion which followed. In later days the sole Fraction was made at this point, during the Embolism. The first English Liturgy made no mention of any Fraction in the body of the rite, but a note at the end required that every Host used in the Communion should be broken. The Fraction was thus brought, in accordance with the Roman use of the seventh century, into connection with the Communion. We are now required to break the Bread while saying the words *He brake it*, in the prayer of Consecration. The object clearly is to connect the act of the priest with the act of our Lord Himself. That an inclination to do this existed, even before it was ordered, is shown by a curious rubric in the printed Sarum Missal of 1554, which mentions the practice only to blame it.[1] Our rubric is explicit, and one cannot but wonder at certain books of instruction for priests which ignore it and direct the Fraction to be made, not here, but later in the action. They ignore, not this rubric only, but the preceding one as well, which directs the priest to take the paten into his

[1] See the Burntisland *Missal*, col. 616.

hands. The main object of the paten is to serve for the Fraction, though it is not, strictly speaking, used for this purpose in the modern Roman rite, the Host being broken over the chalice, and the broken fragments afterwards laid upon the paten. According to all liturgies, the Bread, when offered, is laid upon the linen cloth or corporal; the paten is then put aside or held by one of the ministers until it comes into use immediately before the Fraction. Our rubric therefore directs the priest to take the paten into his hands, and then to break the Bread, the two acts being necessarily connected. Great stress is laid upon this; another rubric directs the priest to have all prepared beforehand, "*that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people.*" The late Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Lincoln judgment already referred to, required it to be done with some degree of ostentation; and however little we may approve the extravagant gestures by which some priests endeavour to attain this end, the purpose in itself is good. The Fraction is to be done before the people; it is not merely a breaking for the practical purpose of Communion; it is a solemn and significant ceremony representing the death of Christ upon the Cross. We may think this more properly done, as in other liturgies, after the Consecration, when the Bread is actually become to us the Body

of Christ, when the Sacrament itself is broken, not the mere element that is to become the Sacrament; but, on the other hand, we cannot narrowly fix times and moments in celebration of this great mystery, the action is one and continuous throughout, and just as in the Roman Canon words are used before the actual consecration which can hardly be applied to the bare elements, and words after the consecration which refer strangely to the perfected Sacrament, so in our Liturgy a ceremonial act precedes, which in other rites, and more naturally, follows the consecration.

The position of the Lord's Prayer is equally exceptional. In all other rites it is the culminating member of the complex prayer following the Consecration. It is not, indeed, mentioned in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions; but this, we must remember, is not a ritual book, but merely a description by some private author of the rites used in the Church; it is in the highest degree improbable that the Lord's Prayer was ever omitted in practice. In the ancient Roman Church it was severed from the rest of the Eucharistic action by the elaborate ceremony of the Fraction, and immediately preceded the Communion, for which it would seem to have been the only immediate preparation.[1] In our

[1] Such is Duchesne's view. See his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 177, note 2, ed. 1889.

Liturgy it appears in the middle of the Eucharistic action; it is indeed brought into close connection with the Communion, but following, not preceding it, and the petition for the daily or supersubstantial Bread loses thereby the point developed by S. Cyril of Jerusalem.[1] Indeed, it seems hard to say anything for this position, save that what the Church ordains must be accepted as good.

The position of the Communion is more remarkable still. In every other liturgy it follows the completed Eucharistic action. In ours it finds a place in the very middle of the action, and follows immediately upon the Consecration. This arrangement has been severely criticized. It is supposed to empty of all meaning the Prayer of Oblation which is said after the Communion, and some have gone so far as to deny the integrity of the sacrifice thus offered.

Such criticism is vitiated by two faults. In the first place, it proceeds on too narrow a survey of liturgical forms. It assumes the necessity of certain forms used in a certain connection. This kind of criticism dates from the time of the Nonjurors, who, after their separation from the Church for one slender reason, became, in a way not unusual with sectaries, keenly alive to the deficiencies of the appointed order on other grounds as well. Brett, for example, persuaded

[1] S. Cyril. Hieros. *Catech. Mystag.*, V. (xxiii.) 15.

himself and some of his companions in separation, that an express invocation of the Holy Spirit on the lines of the Eastern *Epiclesis*, and a verbal oblation made immediately after consecration, were essential to a valid Eucharist.[1] He accordingly composed and brought into use a new liturgy of his own devising. A closer acquaintance with the relics of the Gallican rite would have shown him that neither of these features appears invariably in ancient liturgies. He still has not a few imitators, who do not perhaps deny the essential adequacy of the English rite, but who question its completeness, because it does not conform to a standard which they suppose to be universal.

In the second place, this criticism ignores an important characteristic of our rite. In all other liturgies the act of Communion normally implies the entire consumption of the Sacrament. If any be reserved, it is not for the purpose of the sacrifice then being celebrated. The Communion, therefore, completes and closes the sacrificial act; and this is strictly in accordance with the sacrificial types of the Old Testament. To make any verbal oblation after this total consumption of the Sacrament would indeed be a strange inversion. But in our rite the act of Communion does not imply entire consumption. On the

[1] Brett, *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies, etc., with a Dissertation upon them*, pp. 358, seqq, ed. 1720.

contrary, we have a rubric which expressly contemplates the reservation of a part of the Sacrament, in both kinds, until the end of the action. What thus remains after the Communion is left lying on the altar, and the final consumption takes place after the Blessing. The Sacrifice is therefore present, and not merely by accident, but by express provision, when the Prayer of Oblation is said. If any priest should desire a practical suggestion for the due observance of this ceremony, he might be referred to the ancient custom, already referred to, of leaving a special portion of the Host upon the altar, during Fraction and Communion, to symbolize the perpetuity of the sacrifice. Of the two portions into which he breaks the Bread at the time of Consecration, he may consume one for his own Communion, and reserve the other for consumption after the Blessing.

The grounds, therefore, upon which the position of the Communion is most frequently criticized, will not bear examination; and, however much we might prefer an arrangement more consonant with the general tradition of the Church, we may still find in our own use one feature of striking appropriateness. If the essence of the sacrificial act consists, according to the general teaching of theologians, in the consecration of the Eucharist under the two kinds, setting forth in mystery the Blood-shedding of the

Lamb of God, it is no less true, and no less generally accepted, that for the integrity of the sacrifice Communion also is needed. We may therefore find it natural to complete the sacrificial act in its integrity before we proceed to make the verbal oblation of the Sacrifice. Thus regarded, the arrangement of our Liturgy has a certain beauty and significance of its own.[1]

I shall refer, in conclusion, to a ceremony for which the English Liturgy makes no provision—a ceremony so ancient and universal that one may doubt the competence of any provincial Church to abolish it,[2] so simple, and at the same time so full of symbolic truth, that an express command is hardly needed for its justification. It is the ceremony of Commixtion, the mingling of the sacred species by placing a fragment of the Host in the chalice. It may be taken to signify the Resurrection, as the consecration of the two several species signifies the Death of Christ. Less narrowly viewed, it is a reminder that our sacrifice is the oblation not of the dead, but of the living Christ, who is entered with His Blood into the Holiest Place; our spiritual food is not the dead but

[1] I owe this illuminating thought to my friend and neighbour, the Rev. F. C. Kempson.

[2] "Neque enim in singularis cuiuspiam Ecclesiæ potestate situm est ritus ab universali Ecclesia vel observatos reicere vel reiectos observare" (Beveridge, *De Ritibus ecclesiasticis*, Thesaurus Theologicus, vol. ii. p. 330, ed. Oxford, 1816).

the living Body of the Lord. This simple ceremony is complicated in some liturgies by particular usages with which we are not concerned. In the Byzantine rite, as used now throughout the whole Orthodox Eastern Church, it is combined with the mixing of warm water in the chalice, another symbol, perhaps, of life, though spoken of in the accompanying blessing as symbolic as the zeal of faith. In the ancient Roman Liturgy, as there were two Fractions, so also were there two Commixtions, the one common to all rites, which took place during the act of Communion, and another which preceded. This was the peculiar rite of the *Sancta;* a portion of the Eucharist, reserved from a previous Mass, was placed in the chalice at the *Pax Domini* immediately after the Lord's Prayer ; the object was to indicate the perpetuity of the sacrifice, no new sacrifice being offered day by day, but the one abiding sacrifice continued. Before the change made by S. Gregory the Great, the order was as follows : The Fraction was made at the end of the Canon, then the Lord's Prayer was said, then at *Pax Domini* took place the immixtion of the *Sancta*, and lastly the Communion along with the Commixtion. After the time of S. Gregory, the order proceeded thus : The Lord's Prayer having been said, the immixtion of the *Sancta* took place at *Pax Domini*, then followed the preliminary Fraction

of which I have spoken above, then the solemn Fraction, the Communion and Commixtion. In course of time the rite of the *Sancta* became obsolete, as also did the preliminary fraction; but by a sort of confusion the solemn Fraction and Commixtion took their place, being made at the Embolism and *Pax Domini*, and so were separated from the Communion.

With these complications we are not practically concerned. If any one desire to know how he may simply and naturally comply with the general practice of the Church, he may profitably study the ancient Roman order. Of the two portions into which he has already broken the Host, he will take one for his own Communion; breaking off a small fragment from this, he will consume the rest; then placing the fragment in the chalice, he will consume this also as he communicates of the Precious Blood. It is not so much an added ceremony, but rather a part of the ceremony of Communion.

I have endeavoured to set out the leading characteristics of the English Liturgy. They are worthy of an attention which they do not always receive. They call for a study, not only academical, but also practical, by those who are responsible for the conduct of public worship. A grievous inheritance of careless and slovenly administration has caused some men to imagine that the Liturgy itself is in

fault. Its supposed deficiencies have been hastily supplied, sometimes with ill-considered adaptations from other rites; but the more closely it is studied, the less need there will be found for such supplement, the less danger there will be of obscuring its proper features by ill-fitting adornment.

EUCHARISTIC RITUAL

By the Rev. W. F. Cobb, D.D.

It is outside the scope of this essay to discuss the doctrine of the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. The reality of that Presence is assumed in the constant teaching of the Church Universal, is implicitly contained in many statements of the New Testament, and is the sole doctrine which can make the Communion Service of the Church of England consistent and intelligible. Although it is obviously possible to have a Eucharistic ritual where no belief in any objective Presence exists, yet it is equally obvious that the ritual adopted will receive a distinctive colouring from such a belief, and very probably may be justified in some details by such a belief, where but for it the charge of extravagance or hyper-æstheticism might lie. When we mention the Name which is above every name we bow the head or bend the knee, but when S. Peter found

himself in the presence of the Master after the draught of fishes "he fell down at Jesus' knees," "the more overpowered by the greatness of the miracle, because of the nearness of Him who wrought it." Assuming, then, the doctrine of the Real Presence as one starting-point for a discussion of what ceremonial befits the worship attending it, we shall proceed to deal with the question as being on different lines than it would go on if no such belief were granted.

In the second place we shall neglect all pronouncements of the Judicial Committee or of any other secular Court, as being *ultra vires*, and of no binding force whatever on the consciences of members of the Catholic Church. In the partnership between Church and State in this country, the former cannot recognize the latter as the predominant partner in the sense that in the last resource the decisive voice in matters of ritual, or of doctrine, is with the State. Here, therefore, no attention will be paid to any decision of the junior partner. It will not be accepted, nor will it be rejected; it will merely be ignored, and treated as non-existent. This will not, of course, estop us from availing ourselves of any evidence which may have been collected and put in during any of the ritual trials of recent years; all that is involved is a denial of the authority of any secular Court to touch the subject-matter at all.

A third caution may be given. The title of this essay follows the generally received and popular use of language in speaking of ceremonial as ritual. But, properly speaking, of course it should have been headed "Eucharistic Ceremonial." It seemed better, however, to avoid all appearance of pedantry in addressing a paper *urbi et orbi*, even if scientific accuracy suffered a little.

On the subject of ritual in general two remarks may be permitted. Ritual enshrines a principle, and is itself a necessity. It enshrines a principle. In theory all intelligent theists are agreed that all that is comes from the same creative hand, and Divine Wisdom orders or permits whatever happens in the world it has brought into being. Although this is the theory of all, it is not the theory which moulds their lives, and shapes their conduct, but is with many an abstract proposition of no practical value, exerting no more force than such a truism that all men are mortal. No one dreams of disputing either of these propositions, but, on the other hand, comparatively few think that they are to be placed in the Credo out of which issues life.

In religion it is a matter of common observation that most people start with some preconception, how gotten they know not, which fills the whole background of their outlook, in such a way that they

never allow themselves to examine face to face the facts on which the deeper realities of human life and thought are based. Likes and dislikes are a more potent force in ritual matters than principle or authority. Yet, if principle is to be our guide, and not prejudice, some ritual must find a place in the worship of the true God. Of Him, in His creative work, it is said that He saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.

"Behold the heaven and the earth are. They cry that they have been made, that they have not made themselves. We are, because we have been made. The cry is its own evidence. Thou, therefore, O Lord, because Thou art beautiful hast made them beautiful, good because Thou art good, hast made them to be because Thou art. Nor are they so beautiful, so good, so real, as Thou their Maker, and indeed, compared with Thee they are neither beautiful, nor good, nor real. We know them: we give thanks to Thee, and yet our knowledge compared to Thine is ignorance."

We know the wondrous works of nature; we bend a ready ear to earth's many voices, and call on mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars, to bless the Name of the Lord. Nay, we go a step further, and call in the persuasive voice of art to take its part in the great anthem of praise which creation is perpetually sending up as its tribute to its Maker.

"We know them; we give thanks to Thee," for they are good.

Where, then, should this principle be better asserted against all lurking Manichæanism than in the worship of the Sanctuary? Why should not the Catholic Church be permitted to warn men by her stately ceremonial that they are in great danger by their very earnestness about religion of falling into the common blunder of neglecting altogether one of two things which are of unequal worth, instead of giving each its proper estimate? Spirit is good, and so is matter; but why should matter be extruded from all consideration merely because it is lower than the spirit? The higher is better than the lower, no doubt, but a sound judgment regards both together as better than the higher by itself. God is to be worshipped in truth as well as in spirit, and that is no true worship which refuses any place to one whole of the two departments into which Divine Wisdom has divided the universe. Our first principle, then, consists in using ritual as the expression in thanksgiving that the world is good, and that every part of it, both the higher and the lower, is to be utilized as a means of asserting the goodness of God.

Again, ritual is a necessity. Protests against it are therefore idle, for whether we like it or not, we cannot escape from the laws of our being which

impose its use on even those who fancy that they are least under its sway. Man is a being composed of a dual nature, and it is impossible for him to engage in worship—at all events in common worship—without acknowledging the stern necessity he is under of allowing some sort of place to his body in his acts of worship. "O come let us worship," has added to it immediately, "and fall down," by way of reminding us that we are not unembodied, nor as yet disembodied spirits, and therefore are unable to do without the co-operation of "brother ass," as S. Francis called his body. *Corpus quod corrumpitur aggravat animam:* true, yet even the most uncompromising mystic cannot throw himself into contemplation without securing the assent of his earthly habitation, and assigning it some part to play.

How, then, can it be pretended that worship will be more spiritual when no ritual is used? Some posture is necessary to prayer, to praise, to thanksgiving, to the receiving of instruction, and, whatever the posture may be, it becomes ritualistic by the very reason that it is adopted. It may be appropriate and reverent, as when men kneel to drink the chalice of the grapes of God, or to make humble confession of their sins; as when they bow their heads at the Sacred Name, or turn to the East in the recitation of the common Creed. Or it may be irreverent and

inappropriate, as when men "hunker," and pretend that they are kneeling. Or, again, it may be unusual, as when men sit for the Psalms and in the recitation of the Nicene Creed. But in all cases ritual of some sort or other is inevitable, and the only question that can be raised is as to whether the ritual adopted is good or bad.

The denouncers of ritual will retort: This is precisely our contention in all our protests. We are not quite so purblind as to suppose that we can put down ritualism altogether, nor so foolish as to draw an indictment against human nature; but what we object to is a particular kind of ritual—a kind we are not used to, and which smacks to our taste of the soil of Italy, and not of this free and Protestant country. Our definition is vague, we admit, but it is all the more practically useful; fine distinctions are out of place in a popular Philippic, and we prefer to say that the Ritualists are bad in the lump. It may be unjust here and there, but some injustice is inevitable in all the rough-and-tumble of the world; and if people keep bad company, it is, after all, their own fault if they are involved in the same condemnation. Ritualism is pretty well understood by everybody, and therefore there is little need of delicacy in the application of our controversial bludgeon; and even if a bystander be hit now and then, it is

not of much account so long as the fautors of Ritualism feel most of the blows.

Something of this sort will be the answer of the modern iconoclast; but it is precisely because we believe him to be utterly mistaken in his opinion that people in general understand what ritualism is, that some attempt must be made to set forth the principles on which ritualism, both in general, and specially in its relation to the service of the Altar, rests in the conception of those who support it. Three principles, or rather three tests, may be specified as touchstones by which the goodness of ritualistic acts may be determined—that of specific authority, that of tradition or custom, and that of common sense.

1. Under the first head, that of authority, there is little practical need to discuss any specific provision of the Church of England beyond that of the famous Ornaments Rubric, the plain meaning of which, with the exception of one important point, it requires a great deal of learning to miss. The history of it is very well known. Edward VI. began his reign on January 28, 1547. The First Prayer-book was passed on January 21, 1549. Under Mary the reforms of Edward's reign were abolished, and the last year of Henry was made to furnish the standard of worship. At the accession of Elizabeth the Second Prayer-book was taken as the form of public worship, with certain

modifications, but for ceremonial the second year of Edward VI. was selected as affording a happy mean between the old and the new. The innovations of the second revision were rejected, while the use of everything in the days before the work of reformation was taken in hand was carefully excluded by the insertion of the words "by the authority of Parliament."

It is, then, a simple question of historical investigation what was in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI. For be it observed the Injunctions of Elizabeth, her Advertisements, the Canons of 1604 and of 1640, on all sound principles of interpretation must give place to the later re-enactment of the Ornaments Rubric in 1661.

It has been contended that the phrase used to define the date locks us up to the directions of the First Prayer-book, so completely so that we are debarred from any reference to what was in use on any day previous to the legalization of it. It has been contended, too, on the other hand, that the book did not receive Parliamentary sanction till after the second year was spent, and, at all events, did not come into force till Pentecost, 1549, that is, four or five months after the second year was passed.

So far, however, as the former contention is concerned, it may be admitted that as the phrase used is legal and parliamentary, and as the Act of Uniformity incorporating the First Prayer-book is numbered 2 & 3 Ed. VI. c. 1, it may not be impossible to argue that the intention of the framers of the rubric was to refer to the First Prayer-book, so long as we are not compelled to exclude any other testimony to what was in use in that same second year by the authority of Parliament.

In any case it is agreed that what the First Prayer-book allowed is allowed now. We may possibly be right in claiming more; we certainly may not be put off with less. This at once puts the eastward position, vestments, mixed chalice, and wafer bread outside the pale of controversy, for all are enjoined by the rubrics of that Book. This leaves us only the task of determining whether the two remaining of the "six points" are sanctioned by any other information at our disposal as to the use in the second year. I purposely limit myself to the six points, for the simple reason that no person of any weight, and no body of persons of any influence in the English Church at the present moment, demand for the ceremonial of the Altar any points in excess of the six just specified.

There remain, then, only lights and incense to be

considered. The question as to lights is simplicity itself, especially since the luminous judgment in the case of Reed *v.* Bishop of Lincoln. Edward VI.'s Injunctions of 1547 ordered that all the other numerous lights in the churches should be extinguished, but only two lights upon the high altar, which for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they (the ecclesiastical persons rehearsed) shall suffer to remain still. The Lincoln judgment, after reciting a certain draft of articles, drawn up after the Act of Uniformity of 1549 was passed, the object of which *inter alia* was to get rid of even those two lights, rules that

"the injunctions with the draft are evidence that up till then, after King Edward's First Act of Uniformity, lights were set on the Lord's board, and that the injunctions ordering them were received and read in the churches. The lights were legal."

This is quite sufficient for our present purpose.

Neither the First Prayer-book nor the Injunctions of Edward VI. contain any reference to incense. It is not enjoined, but neither is it forbidden. The Injunctions of 1547 were very precise and minute, and carefully prohibited such things as images that had been abused, together with lights in connection with them, all superstitious veneration of relics, praying upon beads, the ringing of bells during

service-time, the superstitious use of holy water, the "making crosses of wood on Palm Sunday, in time of reading of the passion," together with all shrines and monuments of feigned miracles. The list is so minute that it may be fairly regarded as exhaustive. If incense had been regarded as a superstitious adjunct, we may be pretty sure that it would have been included in the list of things forbidden. This is eminently a case where silence gives consent, and where the burden of proof is not on those who claim the use, but on those who seek to abolish it.

Incense was used in Queen Elizabeth's Chapel Royal, by Lancelot Andrewes, in whose chapel there was "a triquertral censer, wherein the clerk putteth frankincense." Cosin used it at Peter House, and apparently after he went to Durham. Archbishop Sancroft, in 1685, provided for the consecration of a censer in his Form of Dedication or Consecration of a Church or Chapel. Incense was used, too, in Ely Cathedral on great festivals till 1737. Among the articles used by the Caroline divines, and objected to by the Puritans, was incense. This post-Reformation evidence is quoted, not as authoritative, but as showing that some of the most representative men of the English Church, in an unbroken line almost down to living memory, were of opinion, as is plain from their practice, that the use of incense

was one of those things which were comprehended in the use received by this Church and realm.

It will be observed that, up to the present, the question of the use of incense has been discussed in perfectly general terms, without any distinction being made between one mode of use and another. But, in the Lincoln case, a distinction was made between a mixed chalice and a ceremonially mixed chalice, and between lights as an ornament and as used in a ceremony. In the same way, a Report of the Lower House of Convocation, presented to the Upper House on June 29, 1866, drew a distinction between the still and the ceremonial use of incense. In that Report—

"The Committee observe that there is no proof of the use of incense in the Apostolical age. The burning of incense, however, in a standing vessel, for the twofold purpose of sweet fumigation, and of serving as an expressive symbol, has undoubtedly been used from ancient times. The practice of *censing* Ministers and ornaments, and of swinging censers, is of much more recent origin.

"The Committee next observe that the use of incense is not prescribed by the Rubrical law of the Church of England; and that the censing of Ministers or ornaments has no authority, either in the laws or in the practice of that Church since the Reformation. The burning of incense, however, in a standing vessel has been practised since the Reformation in some Churches and Chapels, Cathedral, Collegiate, Royal, Episcopal, and Parochial.

Instances may be found down to the middle of the last century.

"Under these circumstances the Committee are of opinion that the censing of Ministers or ornaments is inadmissible. With regard to the simpler use of incense above described, the Committee think it sufficient to remark that it should not be introduced without the sanction of competent ecclesiastical authority."

This Report was considered by the President and Council of the English Church Union and was accepted at their Ordinary Meeting on August 16, 1866, in these terms—

"The President and Council . . . acquiesce in the Report . . . and they doubt not that the Members and Associates will also do the same. . . . In doing this the President and Council regard the Report and Judgment of the Lower House thereon not as *dogmata* intended to define in perpetuity the law or usage of the Church of England, but as being weighty opinions coming with great authority, and, therefore, calculated at least to be very serviceable at the present time."

One further document may be quoted as emphasizing the distinction under consideration. In a case submitted to Sir R. Phillimore, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, and seven other leading Counsel, and advised upon by them, two of their number replied—

"We are of opinion that the burning of Incense in Censers for censing persons or things in the course of

the Service is not lawful. We know of no sufficient authority for using Incense in any other way."

In the foregoing we have a specimen of what was considered law thirty years ago; but as the opinion of eminent men of that day has been overthrown by subsequent research in other directions—as, for example, in the use of Hymns in the Communion Office, the mixed chalice, and wafer bread—so we are not bound to accept any such opinion as a final ruling, but read in the light of the then circumstances and also of those of the present day.

When we do this we shall be safe in coming to two conclusions :

(*a*) That as incense was undoubtedly used in the second year of Edward VI. and in some mode or other has been largely used since, and has never been forbidden, it is still legal.

(*b*) That an inherent right is in the Bishop of each diocese to regulate, though not to suppress, its use, and that, subject to that limitation, no sufficient barrier is placed against the burning of incense as one of the adjuncts of the Eucharist.

It is enough to say that such an act comes under the sentence of the Committee of Convocation already quoted, in which they say—

"After all, the question is, whether the Church of England has really retained, or by just implication recognized, the practice."

In our opinion she has so recognized the use of incense by just implication at least, by prescriptive use certainly; so that the only questions that can legitimately be asked in any given case are concerned with the regulation of the mode of its use by the Bishop, and the spiritual needs of the particular congregation under consideration.

On the whole, then, we may conclude that the ritual which should dignify the holy mysteries may be sufficiently summed up as the six points, and that these stand on a different footing to any subsidiary points, inasmuch as we have a legal right to the one, and can enjoy the other by permission only.

2. We come now to the second test that is at our service when we are trying to determine the laws of ritual, and this is to be found in the traditions of the society with which we are dealing, the customs that prevail therein, and the special characteristics of the people who compose its numbers.

In the first place, the fact must be perfectly clear in our minds that what we are dealing with is not any part whatsoever of the Catholic Church but that part of her which is geographically situate in England. It is true that there is but one Church, the Catholic Church, and that she alone has any claim on our allegiance, and right to demand our obedience. It is also true that the English Church herself

speaks with authority just because she is the Catholic Church localized, but this is the very reason why our first inquiry must always be, not what customs prevail in other parts of the Catholic Church, but what customs obtain here in this Church of England. It is only when this latter is dumb that any appeal rests to the Churches of the West and to the East, or to the Church of older times. This would have seemed the veriest truism were it not for the fact that some whose work and worth carry weight have assumed that the contrary method should prevail. They have inquired first what the Catholic Church held, or seemed to hold, and then proceeded to lay down that this must be what the Church of England held, by virtue of her own statements about herself.

In matters of faith this method is not only allowable but imperative. In matters of discipline and of practice the case is quite different. The Catholic Faith is fixed, unchanged and unchangeable, but if we be asked to make a list of "Catholic ceremonies" which satisfy the test of *quod semper*, *quod ubique*, *quod ab omnibus*, we can give but one answer—that we know of none, if we use the word "ceremony" in the accepted sense of an external act of worship with its adjuncts. It would be a hazardous assertion that so venerable a ceremony as the making of the sign of the cross is of Apostolical origin, even though

we can trace its use to sub-Apostolic times, still less that the use of it at particular parts of Divine worship is from the beginning. Nor can it be said with any certainty that the practice of turning to the East at certain parts of the service comes to us with the authority of the earliest teachers of Christianity, in spite of the hoar antiquity which veils its birth in the Church.

From this it clearly follows that we had no right to try and impose as "Catholic ceremonies" customs which all just stop short of the desired hall-mark, however desirable and edifying and ancient they may be. A person, it is obvious, may omit some one of the ceremonies with which we are all familiar, without forfeiting his right to be considered a Catholic, whereas he could not omit belief in the Incarnation or the Atonement and expect to rank nevertheless as loyal.

On the other hand, there is such a thing as a Catholic spirit—one, that is, which instinctively gives the largest place to the mind of the whole Church as expressed in her customs, and is predisposed to accept what the vast majority of Christians do, so long as it may loyally do so in the place where it finds itself. It is not easy, perhaps, to define the exact boundary between the two fields where Catholicism tends on the one hand to become a

mass of burdensome additions and on the other a tangled undergrowth of self-willed creepers. But we shall not be far wrong if we say that the truly Catholic mind will accept and practise for himself what has respectable authority in the Catholic Church, and is not expressly forbidden by his own local Church, and is found to tend to edification in his particular case; while, on the other hand, he will abstain from passing even a breath of condemnation on his brother who does not do as he himself does. Of these two conditions the latter is as important as the former, if our supposed Catholic is to avoid the deadly sin of Pharisaism.

With this proviso we may go on to ask what ceremonies, over and above what are enjoined by formal authority, may be properly added to the recitation of the Eucharistic Office. It is quite possible to conceive that in some other Church ceremonies may be lawful and edifying which are not precisely forbidden to us, but yet which we are morally bound to abstain from. Indeed, we may go one step further, and say that there may very likely be ceremonies under the Sarum Missal which are not formally abolished by any enactment of the Reformed Church of England, but yet ought not to be resumed by us without permission from the living authority of our Church.

But as it would be a futile task to enter on the consideration of ceremonial details, such as the exact amount of support that old England gives to such a ceremony as that of "Asperges," let us be content with the humbler, but perhaps more useful labour of laying down some principles which occupy so strong a place in our national religious life that they will always make their influence felt in the determination of this and similar questions. Certain principles were asserted at the Reformation which took positive form between 1534 and 1662, and these are not at all likely to be allowed ever to fall into the background, partly because they express the genius of our race, and partly because they are based on the immutable foundation of human nature itself. They are four in number—respect for the past; directness and simplicity as dominant notes in all worship intended for all sorts and conditions of men; an assertion of the priesthood of the laity; and —which is a particular case of this last—insistence on the penitential side of religion.

(*a*) Respect for the past hardly needs to be insisted on at length.

"Granting some Ceremonies to be had, surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove them only for their age without bewraying of their own folly."

We cannot cut ourselves adrift from our past, and we ought not if we could. What has served multitudes of men and women of like passions with ourselves comes to us with a presumption in its favour, and though it is true that we still retain our liberty to prove all things, even the most venerable, yet, if we are wise, we shall give a fair trial to what bears on its face the glories of the past, and carries in its hand the accumulated experience of buried generations. Even in the Middle Age men were neither fools nor knaves to any larger extent than they are now, and if they found, say, the six points a satisfactory interpreter of the Missal, it is probable, to say the least, that we may also find them an equally satisfactory interpreter of "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper." We may, or we may not, but at any rate we are bound, if we are to take our stand on the principles of the Reformation, to give the old a fair chance.

Of course, if those responsible for the present settlement induced the Church to consent to the abrogation of any of the older ceremonies, as they undoubtedly did, this not only implies that they had put them to the trial and had found them wanting—which should make us cautious in attempting to reverse their judgment—but also that they give an additional value to those ceremonies which

they deliberately retained, such as the use of incense. We pay a high price for our experience in all walks of life, but what price can be said to be too high to be exacted from those who refuse to be taught by experience in the domain of religion?

(*b*) Next, we are given directness and simplicity in public worship. Nothing is so exasperating to the ordinary worshipper as what he is wont to call "fussiness and fads" in ceremonial. He may not know exactly why he is prevented from worshipping as he desires, and he may not be much moved by the knowledge, even if he has it, that what distresses him is at bottom what has long ago been explicitly rejected by his Church at the Reformation. He has no doubt the defects of his qualities, but we must not, in passing condemnation on the defects, forget to provide for the qualities, and this we are in danger of doing if we lose sight of the fact that the Anglican is stubbornly and fixedly practical. You must not be content with moving his feelings by the exhibition of the spiritual reality; you must also convince his reason that your method of setting it forth is sensible, and likely to attain its end. He is, moreover, not particularly imaginative, and cannot be made to see more than the very fringe of mystical interpretation, which accounts for the aversion felt by most people to more than a certain degree of sensuousness in the

worship of God. This is but one of many good reasons why it is labour lost to make any foreign standard that by which our ceremonial is to be judged, seeing that what exactly suits the warm temperament of the sunny South, may not be suited to the colder genius of us in the more temperate zone.

A service may be simple and yet complex. It may be so well knit together, and each detail may so closely dovetail into the rest, and the whole may move so directly to its end, that the worshipper finds it simplicity itself in the sense of being intelligible, while as a matter of fact it is complex in the sense of consisting of a multitude of constituent parts. What the Church of England has insisted on is intelligibility and not monotony, directness as against elaborateness, and meaningness as distinct from what merely moves and impresses. She may have been wrong in so deciding, but at any rate she did what she did under the stress of circumstances, and not through pure gaiety of heart or wanton love of change, and if ever her decision is modified it will only be under the imperative bidding of the urgent needs of her members, and not because a new order of things is poetical and nice.

Great complaint was made three hundred and fifty years ago of the number and hardness of the rules

called the Pie and the manifold changes of the Service in the sixteenth century, but if we adopt an elaborate ceremonial, partly from the Continent, partly from old (and obsolete) English Uses, and partly from our own sense of what is fitting, I hold it as certain as anything can be that long before any formal reformation is called for, the devotional instinct of Churchmen themselves will re-echo in the department of ceremonial what the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer said as to rites three and a half centuries ago.

If anthems, responds, invitatories, and such-like things were cut off in the sixteenth century, because they did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture, we may well ask ourselves whether it is not possible to evoke some similar protest nowadays by the adoption of such an elaborate system of bowings, genuflections, and changes of posture, not to mention an extravagant use of incense, as tends to hinder rather than to help the worshipper, by withdrawing his attention continually from the central reality to this, that, or the other accident of the ceremonial, the sole use of which sometimes appears to be to revive mediævalism in all its nakedness, or else to set forth visibly our entire oneness with our Continental brethren. Neither of these aims, however laudable in its place, is sufficient to justify us in

setting it in the balance against the mind of our Church plainly expressed, or against the supreme law of edification.

(*c*) Thirdly, the Reformation put an emphasis on the priesthood of the laity. This means that not only are the laity entitled to take such part in the Service as is assigned to them, but that also they are entitled to be listeners while the priest is conducting the part assigned to him. It is difficult to guess even the origin of a practice which is calmly defended by some as the only right line of action, viz. the saying the Service in a tongue or a tone not heard of the people. Probably those who favour this form of devotion are not themselves quite aware of the moving reasons in their own case even. The real reasons might seem to be a presumption that whatever is done on the Continent is right, an unconscious harking back to a lower type of religion, and—most creditable of all—a desire to protest against the prayers being preached to the people instead of being addressed to God. So far as this latter motive is concerned, it is enough to say that one extreme is not cured in religion by jumping to a contrary error.

It may be worthy of consideration, too, in this connection whether the elaborate settings of the Eucharistic Office, which find so much favour with

choirs and organists, do not to some extent encroach on the principle that all Christians are priests to God, and that therefore the layman has as much right to be protected against an invasion of his province by the choir as by the priest. It is difficult no doubt to put the finger on the exact place where the average worshipper is to be found, and it may be all very well in theory to say that the music of the Office should be a little ahead of the average man, but only a little. None the less we shall not be far from the truth or from safety in saying that when the music is so elaborate that first the fasting priest, then his assistants, and lastly the congregation, are compelled through very weariness to sit out the Creed, the boundary line has been very far transgressed.

Moreover, this consideration of the priesthood of the laity acts as a restraining force in another direction. The clergy are by their profession in a position to know more of the technicalities of ceremonial than the busy layman, even if their knowledge is surpassed by that of a small band of the laity who make it the study of their lives to master the history of the ceremonial of the Church. But this very fact should safeguard them on the one hand against the too forward zeal of the not very learned but very well-meaning of their flock, who are in the habit of urging ritual development on their parish priest, and on the

other hand should make the parish priest himself very cautious of introducing developments which commend themselves to his knowledge, but do not find any echo in the knowledge or the devotional feelings of his people. May there not be sometimes a little forgetfulness of the great truth of the priesthood of the laity in the introduction of ceremonies which at other times and in other places would be most edifying, but in that particular place are altogether unsuited to the stage of devotion to which the laity have attained?

(*d*) In the fourth place, the traditions of the English Church are full of an appeal to the individual worshipper to do what in him lies to fit himself for participation in the service of the sanctuary by self-examination, by repentance and daily renewal of the Holy Ghost. She will not take the responsibility of acquiescing in a mere outward and formal religion on the part of her members, but insists that as far as her power extends they shall come to her Offices after some amount of spiritual effort on their part. For this purpose she is wont to preface them with an exhortation, as *e.g.* in the case of Matins and Evensong, the services for Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and Marriage.

Similarly, every communicant is reminded by the recitation of the Decalogue of the duty of seeing that

he makes some attempt to order his life accordingly before he presumes to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. It is difficult, therefore, to see what plea short of overwhelming necessity can be put in to justify the omission of what was inserted deliberately, and for reasons which cannot but commend themselves to every experienced or well-balanced mind.

Nor is it any answer to this complaint to say that every practical purpose is served by the short Office of preparation which it is now the custom for the celebrant and his assistants to use at the Altar before the service itself begins, for the simple reason that the Church has provided for the whole body of worshippers an Office of preparation in the Decalogue and its responds, and hence we are in honour bound to fall in with her mind, however much we may add in private to what she has provided for public use.

It seems to the present writer anyhow that the same tone of mind which omits the Decalogue as superfluous, so far as it acts with full knowledge of the true bearing of what it is doing, will also proceed to emphasize unduly the corporate side of the rite, and depreciate proportionately the individual, and so destroy the balance which it is one of the most persistent endeavours of the English Church to maintain. Moreover, this initial mistake will infallibly overflow to the ceremonial, and lead to the adoption of a

multitude of symbolic acts in detail, the effect of which in the sum may be to form a ceremonial which will be a work of art and a joy to the ecclesiastical *dilettante*, but will be outside that intangible, but very real thing, the spirit of the Church of England, and also out of touch with the deeper needs of the devout worshipper.

The full importance of this consideration will be felt only when it is recollected that our Church has set her hand to a task which no other Church has consciously put before itself. Speaking in the rough, it is not unjust to say that the worship of the Church of Rome is marked throughout with the consciousness of the corporate spirit, while that of the free Protestant bodies accentuates the prerogatives of the individual in the presence of his Maker. We have every reason to be grateful to both of these bodies for their unswerving testimony to the importance of these complementary truths. We have still more reason to be admiring lovers of our own Church for the courage and the wisdom which impelled her to try and combine them. She has undertaken a more difficult task than either of the other opposed bodies, and one that is undoubtedly a great experiment, the success of which can be shown by time alone. A primary element in insuring that success is to be found in the capacity of English Churchmen to first see the ideal

set forth by their Church, and then to act with the necessary blend of enthusiasm and self-restraint.

3. The last, but by no means the least, of our guides in determining our ceremonial is common sense. Common sense is the social instinct which puts us in the way of selecting the right means to the given end, and of using them at the right time, in the right place, and in the best way. It is a faculty, alas! only too rare:

> "Rarus enim ferme sensus communis in illa Fortuna."

It is, however, the one faculty which has the ultimate determining voice in all practical affairs. Without it courage and resolution are sterile, the most perfect system of government is precarious, and the best laws a dead letter. It is hardly too much to say that the want of it on the one side and the other is the chief agent in stirring up strife between brother and brother in religion, in perpetuating party divisions, even as the platform demagogue and the religious newspaper of the worser sort would find their audience leave them if common sense were in possession of the minds of men.

Common sense would save a man from the crass folly of declaring that "expediency" had no place in religious affairs, as if a fancied principle could be said to be known to be a principle at all till tried in

the court where "expediency" lays down the rules. It, too, would save us from being assured that everything authorized in mediæval times, and not formally abrogated, may properly be revived, in total disregard of any alteration in our *milieu*, and in our changed outlook.

For example, the minute observances of mediævalism, which might be tolerable where they were devised for men whose sole work was to be "religious," who had few external interests, and no duties to those without so far as worship was concerned, become altogether a burden and a distraction when transferred to the very different circumstances in which the secular priest of to-day finds himself. The Uses of York, Bangor, and Hereford were the product of the ingenuity and devotion of men living under rule, and fully met no doubt the wants of those who drew them up. But directly the attempt is made to impose their minutiæ on men and women who are living in the world, and are by training and ways of thought quite incapable of appreciating them, then common sense is right in her absolute refusal to allow a burden of this kind to be imposed on men merely to please the ecclesiastical doctrinaire.

Again, when we—and this applies in a special degree to the clergy—are tempted to thrust or insinuate our own private views of what is correct in

ritual, into whole congregations, common sense will remind us that not only are Bishops overseers of both those with Catholic minds and those with Protestant, but so are priests. The most correct ritual will fail of its end if it disturbs the peace of a devout congregation, and gives occasion for the mischievous activity of that most odious of social parasites, the professional agitator. What is right and proper under some circumstances becomes pernicious at other times. The good of the whole must be preferred to the good of the part, and even the Protestant prejudices of our flocks must be respected, and the possibility of some neglected truth being masked behind them taken into account, if we are to appeal to all, in order that we may win all.

Lastly, common sense will prevent us from confusing the smaller points of ritual with the greater truths which they are intended to illustrate. The Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is a fact, whether it be manifested visibly to the eyes of men in gorgeous ceremonial or in ceremonial that is plain to severity. It cannot be said that each and every item of the ceremonial in use is essential to the honour that is the due of our King, even though it is true that it may be made so by foolish attack. Accordingly, common sense must be invoked to tell us when to stand stiff and firm, and when to show

forth that sweet reasonableness which is one of the most precious, as it is one of the rarest of the fruits of the Spirit.

To sum up. Some ritual we must have to express our belief in the goodness of the Being we worship, and to satisfy the imperative law of our nature, which orders us to put into outward form the thoughts and feelings of our souls. The tests to determine whether any given form is good or bad, to be accepted or rejected, are those of authority, tradition, and common sense.

Our primary authority is that of the Church of England. That authority sanctions by her express directions the six points.

Where the Church of England is dumb we may lawfully appeal to the custom of the whole Catholic Church, or of any part of it, but not otherwise.

The spirit in which all members of the Church of England should approach this question is of even more importance than the conclusions they may come to, and this essay may fitly close with a quotation of some admirable words to be found in the Report of the Committee of Convocation on Ritual already referred to, in which this spirit is well expressed :

"Any attempt to establish the universal rule of a high ceremonial would be dangerous to the peace and well-

being of the Church. Equal danger would be incurred by any attempt to debar those who value a high ceremonial from the free use of it within the limits of the law ; especially if others were left to follow their own private interpretation of the rule of Church order."

When struck on the anvil of recent events, these words have a prophetic ring.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A BASIS OF AGREEMENT IN MATTERS LITURGICAL AND CEREMONIAL

By the Rev. H. E. Hall

This question which has for twenty or thirty years been amongst some of the foremost which have occupied general interest and attention, is at the present time becoming more and more pressing for solution. Suspicion and discord among the clergy, and uncertainty and restlessness among the laity, are some of the evils which arise out of the present chaotic state of things. It is only too common for one set of clergy, who feel very sure of the correctness of their own methods, to stigmatize another section as disloyal, because, though acting on exactly the same theory as themselves, they make some divergent applications of it. Charges of this kind cause a fictitious importance to be attached to divergent uses,

and add considerably to the unsettlement of the laity. It is a pressing need, therefore, to try and find some solution; and it is believed that such is possible, and may be found in the recognition of, and self-sacrificing obedience to, the fundamental principles —doctrinal and liturgical—on which the English Church rests.

I.

1. The English Liturgy is imposed on the clergy and laity of the English provinces by the English Provincial Synods. It is a distinct rite, valid and sufficient. Though in essence the same as the Roman rite (both being the service which our Lord ordained), it is a different rite, and must not be harnessed to it. The English rite has its own distinctive genius which, at any rate, comprises these two principles—

(*a*) Simplicity of form.

(*b*) Complicity of the people at every stage.

Those clergy who harness the English and Roman rites together confound them both. The English Liturgy is calculated to foster a deep personal religion, and personal participation in the sacred action performed, and a personal apprehension, and remembrance of the saving and meritorious death of our Saviour, which the service is instituted to

commemorate perpetually. It is sought to attain these ends by the blending throughout the English Liturgy the Liturgical action of the priest and the personal preparation and expectation or thanksgiving of the communicants and those present. This is the conception which underlies the introduction of a special preparation of the Communicants into the second part of the Liturgy, after the Oblation. These principles of the Liturgy have been obscured by, on the one hand, a tendency to cut out what may be termed the hortatory parts; and, on the other hand, by introducing variable parts of the Roman Liturgy, such as Graduals, Secrets, Communions, post-Communions, and the like, which the English Church deliberately laid aside in order to secure simplicity of form; and, by the secret or open recitation of the Latin Canon, repeating thereby that which is sufficiently provided for in the English Liturgy, and excluding the people from active participation in all that the priest does.

One result of these liberties is, that whereas the Catholic Revival took its origin in and from the Prayer-book, and for years had as its object the bringing of the members of the English Church up to the standard of their own formularies, and by reference to the Primitive Church, to open men's eyes and hearts to the real significance of those

formularies, a not altogether undeserved suspicion has arisen that, instead of rising and helping others to rise to the standards of the Church, an attempt is being made to alter the standards themselves, and in a mediæval direction.

The time has come when some strenuous opposition to this condition of things should be raised, and the present writer believes that the most powerful and efficacious weapon would be for clergy to bind themselves together to celebrate the Holy Eucharist strictly according to the English rite, without omitting anything whatever without canonical sanction, and only introducing, inaudibly, private prayer at places where the Prayer-book may reasonably and fairly be considered to presuppose that such shall be employed, that is to say, at such places as before beginning the service, at the time of the priest's communion, and at the end of the service (briefly), before leaving the Altar.

2. The doctrinal basis, though of supreme importance, need not detain us long. It is, of course, the faith of Catholic Christendom, viz. that—

(*a*) The Spiritual Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Holy Sacament under the forms of bread and wine, and consequent upon Consecration ; and

(*b*) The commemorative sacrifice of the Body and

Blood of Christ in memory of His Death, and to apply its merits to the living and the dead, made at that point of the service (*i.e.* at the Consecration),—are the legitimate and complete doctrine of the English Church. By insisting on this doctrinal basis, it is not intended to censure or discredit those who in good faith, and owing to the distressing circumstances through which the Church of England has passed, have not yet realized the full expression of the Church's Sacramental teaching. Concerning such persons, one would desire to feel that in their *explicit* faith, or so far as they go, they assent to Catholic Truth; and that by using the Prayer-book they *implicitly* intend to hold all that the Church does, even though for a while they may not have the full realization of it. What is intended by insisting on the doctrinal basis, apart from the fact that no other basis than the whole Catholic Faith can serve for a concordat, is that it is not for one moment suggested that an appeal for a more strict adherence to the form of the Prayer-book Liturgy is made by those who are defective in Eucharistic doctrine. On the contrary, we, who hold the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist dear, next to the doctrine of our Saviour's Godhead, ask our brethren to reconsider some of their ways, lest by causing any disregard for the English Liturgy they hinder the action of the chief means for the

propagation of Eucharistic truth in this country, the means by which Keble, Pusey, and all we who followed them were taught to embrace it.

3. As regards liturgical principles, it seems to be both desirable and necessary to lay down four.

A. The first fundamental principle is the recognition of the authority of the Prayer-book, and its validity and sufficiency. The Prayer-book rests, as has been said, on the authority of the provincial Synods of Canterbury and York. It is therefore binding on the clergy and laity of those provinces.

The whole of the service, therefore, as it stands, unless otherwise ordered or sanctioned by competent canonical authority—the whole of the service as it stands must be loyally and faithfully rendered. This obligation is deliberately recognized by the clergy in the solemn declaration which they take to use the form (in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments) prescribed in the Prayer-book and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority, that is, since 1662. This declaration refers precisely to the form, *i.e.* to the words of the services in the Prayer-book. The declaration is to preserve the services in the shape in which they are laid down. The addition of ceremonies as helps to devotion rests on other ground altogether. The

rightfulness of a ceremony depends, as will be shown, on its being

(*a*) legitimately included under the Ornaments Rubric, or

(*b*) a really œcumenical or an English traditional custom.

But the declaration is not concerned with such. It refers expressly to the form alone. By the principles stated above, and by this declaration, the clergy are bound by the clearest obligation possible both to God and man, not to change the form of the services in the Prayer-book either by addition or omission, except as may be allowed by competent canonical authority.

B. A second fundamental principle which must be recognized if the Prayer-Book is to be faithfully expressed, is its constant reliance upon really œcumenical or traditional English custom. This is implied in Bishop Cosin's Works, vol. v. p. 65, and it is so obvious that it has been universally acted upon by the clergy of all schools. We may fairly say that when the priest is directed to do something, but no specific instructions are given him how to do it, it is intended that he should fall back on custom. For example, throughout the whole service wherein so few directions are given for the demeanour of the priest, we may fairly consider that

it is the priest's duty to conform himself to the traditional methods of the Church. The same principle may be applied to certain places in the service, such as—

i. The preparation of the Elements, and placing them on the Altar.

ii. The priest's own communion.

iii. The consumption of the Sacrament when the service is over.

But this principle must not be understood to sanction or in any way to refer to the introduction of supplementary prayers, the purport of which is already provided in the English Service. It is intended to only refer to such places in the service as are instanced above, where, but for reliance upon custom, the priest would be at a loss how to act, and at which the introduction of private prayers are so connected with necessary and prescribed acts that they cause no let or interruption to the course of the service.

C. A third fundamental principle is the determination of the true meaning of the Ornaments Rubric. In the Bishop of Lincoln's trial, the Bishop in the statement of his position maintained that by the Ornaments Rubric such ornaments of the Church and Ministers as were in use under the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. were lawful. But it has been shown

conclusively that the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. is not covered by the words of the Ornaments Rubric, "as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the Second Year of Edward the Sixth." The First Prayer-book was not in use until the third year. What seems to be undoubtedly the true meaning of the rubric is that the rubric entitles us to retain and use all the Ornaments which *belong to*, or are needful for, the services in the Prayer-book, which were in use in the year before the First Prayer-book, and so all those employed in the pre-Reformation rite, unless otherwise enjoined by the Order of Communion, or by Injunctions of Edward VI., in force in the year 1548. Those Injunctions had not any ecclesiastical authority when they were issued, but they subsequently received such by the Church adopting the standard, which they combined to set up, as her permanent standard in 1662.

D. A fourth fundamental principle is that the *Jus Liturgicum* is resident in the Bishop. This power is limited, however, by synodical action, so that while it is rightly invoked for things which are either untouched by such enactments, or are directly assigned to it, such as alternative uses permitted by the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, it must not be appealed to or be exercised to alter anything which the synod has imposed.

The *Jus Liturgicum* of the Bishop is rightly exercised in the issue of special public services for public occasions; but no single Bishop acting apart from the other Bishops, and especially from the Metropolitan,[1] has power to sanction such alterations of the Prayer-book service as the omission of the Commandments, the Exhortations, the Creed and *Gloria in excelsis*, and the like; nor could he authorize the recitation by the priest of Introits, Graduals, Secrets, Communions, post-Communions, restored from the old English or taken from the Latin rite; it is doubtful whether, in the face of the regulation concerning the use of the Sunday Collect, Epistle, and Gospel given at the end of "The order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read," any individual Bishop can authorize supplementary Collects, Epistles, and Gospels.

It is not strictly part of this subject, but it may be well here to note that the *Jus Liturgicum* extends to the authorization of services outside of those prescribed in the Prayer-book. It is irregular for any priest to introduce any service without the sanction of the Bishop. (Irregular—but not nearly so serious as an alteration of the Book of Common Prayer. As a matter of fact, all over Christendom devotional practices have grown

[1] Compare Gibson's *Codex*, vol. i. p. 259, note b.

up through "irregularity," and have been afterwards either sanctioned or forbidden. In a technical discussion like the present, however, it is needful to note the technical position.) It has been discussed of late how far the power of the Bishop is fettered by the synodical action which was involved in the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act. This Act, while granting certain liberties to the Bishops to permit certain adaptations of the Prayer-book Services on certain occasions, seemed to impose certain restrictions on their ordinary and inherent right of sanctioning other and additional services. By it the Bishop may only authorize supplementary services, if they are constituted out of the Bible and Prayer-book, with the permissive use of hymns. But, on examination of the Act, it will be observed that the additional services referred to are such public services as the parochial clergy desire to introduce to meet local needs. The Act guides the clergy as to the kind of public services which they may introduce, and the conditions for their introduction. As the Bishop of Hereford has said—[1]

"The act of 1872 has to do exclusively with those regular or open services which the Church people of a parish may claim as part of the regular ministry of the Church."

It does not refer to any service which, for some

[1] Report of Diocesan Conference in the *Times*, Sept. 22, 1898.

special or public occasion, the Bishop may on his own initiative issue, nor to the private services of guilds, or other voluntary associations which he may allow to be held in church. For there are three kinds of additional services. There are, first, those which the Bishops may order for special and public occasions, *e.g.* for the consecration of churches, the coronation of the sovereign, any national or public occasion; there are, secondly, additional public services for the parishioners at large which the parish priest may wish to use, *e.g.* Lent or Mission services; and there are the private services of voluntary associations which the Bishop may allow to be held in church, *e.g.* Young Men's Associations, Communicants' Guilds, the Mothers' Union, etc. The second category only are affected by the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act.

These four principles may serve as a basis of agreement, and without so enforcing the three last as to endeavour to obtain a rigid uniformity, they will secure among all the clergy essential care in their sacred ministrations, and full Catholic beauty and liberty for those who rightly value their Catholic heritage.

II.

It is proposed in this part to comment on the English Liturgy, indicating how, according to traditional English custom, its principal parts should be done, and where, according to what has been laid down, the priest may make private supplementary prayers.

1. There is not any dispute about the fitness of saying some prayers before the service, for although the placing of the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for Purity in their present position may be derived from the fact that they were originally part of the priest's preparation before going to the Altar, they now form the commencement of the public service; and universal instinct, and custom sanctioned by all the Bishops, attest the fitness of some preparatory prayer on entering the presbytery and before beginning the Holy Service. The customary prayer, therefore, as found in the Old English Missals, would naturally be said.

After this preparation at a High Celebration, the Altar would be censed. Incense would be used at the other customary places. There is no doubt that incense was used in 1548. Its use is œcumenical. There is also sufficient evidence of its use in

post-Reformation times to show that it is amongst the things which were retained.

It is permissible for the choir to sing an introit or hymn during the priest's preparation. Hymns and anthems may be introduced "at any due time not letting . . . the service . . . thereby."[1]

2. The priest should stand at the Epistle side of the Altar for the beginning of the service. The rubric concerning the north side is now obsolete, the Altars being restored to their rightful position in the sanctuary.

3. The Commandments and *Kyrie Eleison* must always be said. There is neither authority nor precedent for their omission, and only the consentient action of the Bishops in the Provincial Synod could establish such. They form a solemn penitential preparation for the Holy Sacrifice, and together with the *Kyrie* at the end of each, correspond with the *Kyrie Eleison* of the Old English and present Latin rites, which can never be omitted. Whether those responsible for the introduction of the Commandments at this place intended to follow ancient precedent or not may be disputed, but the custom of reading a lesson of the Old Testament in the earlier part of the Liturgy is certainly ancient.

[1] See *Lambeth Judgment*, p. 54.

Mr. Palmer, in his *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii. p. 28, writes—

"We learn from Augustine that the lesson from the Epistle and Gospel were always preceded by a lesson from the Prophets or the Old Testament. The same may be said of the Spanish or Mozarabic Church, where to this day a lesson from the prophets is always read before the Epistle. The Ambrosian Liturgy, or the Liturgy of Milan, still retains the same custom."

These ancient precedents may to some degree reconcile us to the constant recitation of this portion of the Law of Moses. The recitation of the Commandments may be turned to a devout and profitable use, and, at any rate, we are in conscience bound to it, unless released by synodical authority.

4. The Prayer for the Queen must always be said, preceded by "Let us Pray."

5. It is not within the right of a priest to repeat "Let us pray" before the Collects, nor to introduce "The Lord be with you" before the "Let us pray," or at other places where it was formerly the rule.

6. It is permissible to say additional collects taken from the Book of Common Prayer.

7. Between the Epistle and Gospel, while the book is being flitted, it would be permissible for the priest or deacon to say the brief customary prayer.

Such does not hinder the course of the service. On the same condition, and coming under the general rule concerning hymns, it would be permissible for the choir to sing a short anthem or hymn.

8. The Creed according to the present Prayer-book may never be left out.

9. The sermon may be omitted, and may be preached separate from, and after the service, at the priest's discretion.[1]

10. The collection must be made and the alms presented before placing the elements on the Altar. The rubric seems to imply that the priest would say privately some brief words of prayer while presenting the alms.

11. After the collection, the priest is directed to place the bread and wine upon the Altar, and not being told how to do it, he should do it in the customary liturgical way.

The wine in the chalice should be mixed with water. It is not necessary to say prayers offering the bread and wine, as such is sufficiently done in the Prayer for the Church. The important thing, moreover, is the Act; the "Setting" of the bread and wine, not the saying of prayers.

12. After placing the elements on the Altar, the priest would cleanse his fingers, saying the customary

[1] See Act of Uniformity Amendment Act.

prayer. This ceremony seems certainly to have been provided for in the inventory of the things taken for the due celebration of the English rite in Spain on the occasion of King Charles I., then Prince of Wales, his visit to the Court of that country.[1] The things required for this ceremony are provided under the Ornaments Rubric.

13. After the Prayer for the Church Militant, the Long Exhortation should, at any rate, at times be read. It is true that a widely spread custom exists of omitting it. The custom is probably derived from the statement of the object of the exhortation in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., and from the explicit permission therein given that it might be omitted on week-days; for in the rubric preceding it in the First Prayer-book, it is clearly laid down that it was not intended to be necessarily used every Sunday, but only if in the sermon or homily the people were not instructed about the Holy Communion. In the rubric which follows it, it is laid down that when there is a daily Communion it shall be sufficient to read the exhortation once a month, and that in parish churches on week-days it may be left unsaid. These directions seem to indicate that the exhortation was looked on rather in the light of a sermon, and could be omitted or not, as

[1] Perry's *English Church History*, p. 399.

might tend to edification, at the priest's discretion. And this view seems to be countenanced by the fact that in the Coronation Service for George IV., and also for Queen Victoria, this exhortation was omitted.

But even so, there does not seem to be any warrant for always leaving it out, and treating it, as the practice now is, as obsolete. It is in itself very beautiful, and is specially directed to the furthering of personal religion and personal participation in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, which we have already seen is so significant a feature of the English rite. In the well-known *Eucharistic Manual* by Rev. George Prynne, the following words are prefixed to the Exhortation by way of direction :—

> " Listen attentively to this exhortation. It sets forth the blessedness of a right reception of the Holy Communion, and the dangers of an unworthy or careless reception, and urges us carefully to prepare our souls to partake in this Holy Sacrament, and to give high thanks to God for our Redemption through Christ, and for giving us the Holy Eucharist as the great memorial of Christ's Passion, and to be the means of our union with Him."

The objection that the recitation of this exhortation makes the service unduly long does not ordinarily apply. It is generally made by those who interpolate into the English rite large parts of the Roman. A

priest can, without haste, and without any omissions, and with six or seven communicants, celebrate according to the English rite, in twenty-five or twenty-seven minutes, and this, except in very busy centres, is not an undue time for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. There is this further reason for acting canonically with regard to it at this present time, that those clergy who take the most lawless liberties with the English rite shelter themselves by the precedent, which the omission of it is supposed to give them for leaving out parts of the service, either to shorten it, or because they prefer to put something in from the Latin rite.

Now, so long as the exhortation stands in the Prayer-book, the most that can be canonically allowed in the way of its omission is to consider that custom (observed and sanctioned by the Bishops, and derived from, and so determined as to its scope by the rubrics concerning the exhortation in the First Prayer-book) has been authoritatively allowed to modify the rubric concerning its use in the present Prayer-book. By this means its periodical use would be retained, and any undue burden, which its daily recitation might inflict in some places, be removed.

In support of this view, we may compare the *Lambeth Judgment* (pp. 54, 55) concerning the use

of hymns. It is there shown how canonical custom has carried on what had been allowed by statutory enactment in the first Act of Uniformity, although the permission had not been re-enacted in subsequent Acts.

"The singing in none of these places" (which had been mentioned) "is permissible by the words of any statute or rubric, but no court or authority would consent to declare it illegal, because the prevalent use of it is by the principles of law a very safe assurance that it is not illegal. The once statutable proviso gives an account of its origin."

Custom, in the same way, has carried on the provisos concerning the use of the exhortation given in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI.

The absence of any similar custom carrying on similar regulations in the First Prayer-book for the use of the Creed and the *Gloria* differentiates their case, and makes their omission unlawful. Still less can the recognition of what really amounts to canonical custom in the case of this exhortation be used as a precedent for omitting other parts of the service which could never at any time since their introduction into the English Prayer-book be omitted.

14. After the Long Exhortation, the Short Exhortation, the Confession and Absolution, and the

Comfortable Words must be always said. Their omission can not on any grounds whatever be allowed. The plea that they may be omitted when there are none to communicate can not hold, for although on occasions when the rubric requiring notice to be given by intending communicants is not enforced, we are not bound to inquire if there are some present who are going to communicate, we have no right to so wholly abandon the Church's desire[1] and principle that there should be a convenient number to communicate with the priest at each Eucharist as to omit those parts of the service which apply to communicants on the plea that we expect none.

15. After the *Sanctus*, the *Benedictus* is often sung. But, under existing English Church Law, its use after the Consecration and before the *Agnus Dei* would be less open to attack as being at that time no interference with the course of the service. It often happens in Continental churches that it is sung after the Consecration; and it has often been pointed out in justification that the children sang those words to our Lord after He had come into the temple.

16. After the Prayer of Humble Access, and

[1] Compare *Council of Trent* (Sess. xxii. cap. vi.), "*Optaret quidem sacrosancta synodus ut in singulis missis fideles . . . sacramentali etiam Eucharistae perceptione communicarent.*"

having ordered the bread and wine, the priest would, according to the rigorous interpretation of the rubric, proceed at once to the Consecration. The breads should be consecrated on the Paten.[1] This need not preclude the use of a Ciborium if needed owing to the number of Communicants.

17. Immediately after the Consecration, the priest should proceed to his own Communion. In connection with this he would use short private prayer, and, following œcumenical custom, be at liberty to make, in addition to the Fraction ordered in the Consecration Prayer, a further Fraction, and also the symbolic action figuring the Resurrection of our Lord, know as the Solemn Immission or Commixtio. A Fraction at this point is universal in the Catholic Church, and is in its theory preparatory to distribution.[2] S. Augustine, writing about the Sacrament, says, "when It is blessed and sanctified, and is broken for distribution."

After this the priest would say secretly, although the choir and people may sing it, the *Agnus Dei*, and the three prayers from the Old English Missals, and then proceed to communicate himself under both kinds.

[1] There is an old English precedent for this (Const. Abp. Edmund A.D. 1246).

[2] Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii. pp. 144 *seq.*, and compare the rubric about the breaking of the breads at the end of the First Prayer-book.

The first part of the former canon is now the prayer for the Church.

The priest would therefore make his applications of the sacrifice at the right places in that prayer. The actual canon in the English rite is the Consecration Prayer. The last part of the former canon is represented by the first post-Communion Prayer. This, however, need not always be said, the Prayer of Thanksgiving being added as an alternative use, and left to the priest's discretion.

In connection with the arrangement of the English Liturgy, it is useful and reassuring to set down the well-known Catholic doctrine concerning the sacrifice, what is of its essence, and what is only declaratory, and the like:

"The essence of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist consists precisely in the Consecration, whereby in virtue of the Words of Jesus Christ, His Body and Precious Blood are placed really on the Holy Table, mystically separated under the species of bread and wine. By this action taken precisely and without anything added by the priest, Jesus Christ is really offered to His Father, inasmuch as His Body and His Blood are placed before Him actually clothed with the signs representing His death. . . . The Prayer which accompanies the Consecration whereby the Church declares that she offers Jesus Christ to GOD . . . does not belong to the essence of the Sacrifice, which can absolutely subsist without the prayer."

18. This method, described above, with the prayers referred to, seems most in accordance with the spirit and intention of the Prayer-book. It follows the rubrics, and it brings out in as full a manner as possible the validity and sufficiency of the English rite. To introduce the whole or parts of the Latin canon as of obligation, or as necessary *ex devotione*, cannot be maintained. It is unnecessary for liturgical purposes, and it is tantamount to a confession of inadequacy in the English rite. It is earnestly to be desired that the practice adopted by some may be allowed to die out.

19. During the communion of the people, the choir may sing the *Agnus Dei* and suitable hymns, or, a short anthem.[1]

20. After the communion of the people, and, according to the usual interpretation of the rubric, with the Blessed Sacrament placed on the Altar and reverently covered, the priest proceeds with the service as it stands to the end.

21. The *Gloria in excelsis*, according to the present Prayer-book, must never be omitted.

22. After the Blessing, the priest consumes what remains of the Blessed Sacrament, calling to him some of the communicants if it should be necessary. He should then proceed to cleanse the vessels in

[1] Compare First Prayer-book Edward VI. *in loc.*

the usual liturgical way. The consumption of the Sacrament and the Ablutions are appointed at this point of the service, and not after the communion of the people. After the Communion, the priest is directed to replace the Blessed Sacrament on the Altar, and cover It with a fair linen cloth.

The sixth post-Communion rubric does not afford any escape from this position, for the "if" in the rubric does not suggest an alternative use in taking the ablutions, but refers to such a quantity of the Consecrated Elements being left as to be an occasion of temptation to an irreverent priest to carry It home with the unconsecrated bread and wine for his own use. The whole rubric refers primarily to a Puritan abuse, but taken with the previous direction about placing the Sacrament on the Altar and covering It, it shows that that direction did intend that the Sacrament should remain on the Altar till the end of the service. This is not, as is often thought, an unprecedented practice. It is very like the existing practice of the Eastern Church, and has also ancient precedent.

After having cleansed the vessels, the priest would say, before leaving the Altar, the customary prayer—"May this my bounden duty, etc."

23. In the Old English rite, the Gospel *in principio* was said. Whenever the church had a vestry,

it was said by the priest on his way back to the vestry, as the Bishop is directed to do in the Roman Pontifical at the present day. This, being only an additional portion of Holy Scripture, is certainly permissible if recited privately by the priest. But since it can not be maintained that the Prayer-book presupposes its use, it is best that it should be said returning to the vestry.

24. The recitation by the priest of Introits, Graduals, Secrets, Communions, and post-Communions, is not permissible, as has been clearly shown above, nor is it within the power of a Bishop to sanction them. Introits and other anthems may, however, be sung by the choir under the same rule and condition as hymns. The retention of at least some antiphons to the canticles in Matins and Evensong seems to be invited by the notification, in the Kalendar on December 16, of the antiphon *O Sapientia*, the first of the great antiphons said from the 16th until Christmas Day. Office hymns at Matins and Evensong seem to be suggested by the rubric before the *Venite*, a view which it is commonly said can be confirmed by post-Reformation primers of the time of Elizabeth, and of the Caroline Divines.

III.

We pass now to the consideration of certain changes for which synodical authority would be required. There are some suggested which could not be entertained, for they would amount to a revision of the Liturgy, and would destroy the simplicity of form which is one of the express objects of the English Prayer-book. There are others which, though not rendering the form more complex, would yet amount to a revision of the Liturgy, and which, therefore, though possibly good in themselves, seem at any rate at present inopportune. Then there are some which we believe to be reasonable, in some parishes needful, and very likely to be granted.

This third set, which may reasonably be entertained, comprise—

i. Permission to say the *Kyrie Eleison*, or, if preferred, in the English words, as in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., and to omit the Commandments.

ii. The provision of an authorized book of Supplementary Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for permissive use.

These changes might well be allowed, and if authority was granted by the Provincial Synods to each Bishop to license them in particular churches

where local circumstances seemed to favour them, there would be no difficulty over their introduction, nor fear of their being abused.

IV.

The last section of our subject concerns ceremonial.

The Prayer-book, as we have seen above, presupposes that everything prescribed shall be done in a Catholic and traditional way. This is clear from Bishop Cosin's Works, vol. v., referred to above, and also from what we know was Archbishop Laud's practice, and is in harmony with the spirit of the Old English Service-books, which relied on custom, and which would now be considered very scanty in their directions. Under our existing circumstances, however, any treatment of this subject must necessarily be tentative. The best, perhaps, that can be done is to state that what is needed is the gradual restoration of what may be termed a reformed English use. That is to say, the traditional English use, into which, so to speak, the Prayer-book was cast, but corrected, both by reference to primitive usages and by the explicit directions of the Prayer-book itself. It is needless to say that this is work which must be done by devout experts. The most that can be attempted here is a statement of some of the principles which

are recognized as essential to a true settlement of this question, together with one or two suggestions how clergy may act provisionally pending more complete and authoritative instructions.

1. The first principle, in addition to the directions contained in the service, must of course be the Ornaments Rubric. By this the chancels, their arrangement, and ornaments, are to be conformed to the standard of 1548. This standard is now proximately ascertained through the patient labour of the archæologists and ritualists.

2. The next leading or ruling principle to guide us is the recognition of our inherent right to all really œcumenical customs—that is, customs which obtained before the division of East and West, and have for the most part, at any rate, been retained in some shape or other. Examples of these are the Fraction after the Consecration, the Commixtio, the mixed Chalice, etc.

3. The next leading or ruling principle is the recognition of real and significant English customs. Turning to the east in the Creed, and the order in processions, are examples of these. Some customs, like bowing to the Altar, and at mention of the Holy Trinity or of the Incarnation, have lived on both in country churches and in some cathedrals. It is the work as well as the delight of Ritualists to gather

the evidence of these together, and so bring about their general restoration.

The sequence of colours has been much disputed, but without insisting on it as though it had been the universal use in England, the most general use seems undoubtedly to have been white and red. Where Churches could afford it, they would have a set of gorgeous vestments and a corresponding altar cloth, and probably also a better as well as a less good red set, and a penitential red set for Advent and Lent. The red frontal which, until the ceremonial revival of the last twenty years, was to be found in almost every church in England, is evidence of the widespread use which this sequence of colours had obtained. When the reason for these two colours is known to be that they are the colours ascribed to our Blessed and Divine Lord in Holy Scripture,[1] their acceptance is generally effected without difficulty.

4. The one thing which remains, namely, the government of the demeanour and positions of the priest and his assistants, is more difficult to determine, for in many respects the tradition has been lost in England. The best sources probably to go to in order to revive it are the Gallican rites, and those of some of the religious orders, such as the Dominicans

[1] Compare Song of Solomon, "My beloved is white and ruddy."

and the Carthusians. But, as a matter of fact, when the rubrics in the Communion Service and the provisions of the Ornaments Rubric are all allowed their proper force, the remaining regulations required for the government of the priest and his assistants are very much alike in all Western rites, and much useful guidance can in consequence be obtained from such books as the *Manuale* or the *Enchiridion Liturgicum* in use in the Latin Church.

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

A Selection of Works

IN

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

London: 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
New York: 91 and 93 FIFTH AVENUE.
Bombay: 32 HORNBY ROAD.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Venble. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR
THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.
THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.
THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Barnett.—THE SERVICE OF GOD: Sermons, Essays, and Addresses. By SAMUEL A. BARNETT, Warden of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel; Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Select Preacher before Oxford University. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.

A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

AN ADVENT WITH JESUS. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction for Church People. *Small 8vo, limp, 1s.; cloth gilt, 2s.*

Bathe and Buckham.—THE CHRISTIAN'S ROAD BOOK. 2 Parts. By the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE and Rev. F. H. BUCKHAM.

Part I. DEVOTIONS. *Sewed, 6d.; limp cloth, 1s.; cloth extra, 1s. 6d.*
Part II. READINGS. *Sewed, 1s.; limp cloth, 2s.; cloth extra, 3s.; or complete in one volume, sewed, 1s. 6d.; limp cloth, 2s. 6d.; cloth extra, 3s. 6d.*

Benson.—Works by the Rev. R. M. BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE FINAL PASSOVER: A Series of Meditations upon the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Small 8vo.*

Vol. I.—THE REJECTION. 5*s.*
Vol. II.—THE UPPER CHAMBER. Part I. 5*s.* Part II. 5*s.*
Vol. III.—THE DIVINE EXODUS. Parts I. and II. 5*s.* each.
Vol. IV.—THE LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE. 5*s.*

THE MAGNIFICAT; a Series of Meditations upon the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.*

SPIRITUAL READINGS FOR EVERY DAY. 3 *vols. Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

I. ADVENT. II. CHRISTMAS. III. EPIPHANY.

BENEDICTUS DOMINUS: A Course of Meditations for Every Day of the Year. Vol. I.—ADVENT TO TRINITY. Vol. II.—TRINITY, SAINTS' DAYS, etc. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each*; *or in One Volume*, 7*s.*

BIBLE TEACHINGS: The Discourse at Capernaum.—St. John vi. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE WISDOM OF THE SON OF DAVID: An Exposition of the First Nine Chapters of the Book of Proverbs. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE MANUAL OF INTERCESSORY PRAYER. *Royal 32mo.*; *cloth boards*, 1*s.* 3*d.*; *cloth limp*, 9*d.*

THE EVANGELIST LIBRARY CATECHISM. Part I. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.*

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bickersteth.—YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER: a Poem in Twelve Books. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter. *One Shilling Edition*, 18*mo. With red borders*, 16*mo*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Crown 8vo Edition (5*s.*) *may still be had.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *4to.* 21*s.*

THE COMPENDIOUS EDITION OF THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Forming a concise Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *Crown 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21*s.*

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PARTIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21*s.*

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: its History, Principles, and Results. 1574-1662. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 34*s.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.—*contd.*

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW. Being an Exposition of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church of England. Revised by Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart., D.C.L., and G. EDWARDES JONES, Barrister-at-Law. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE: Being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two Vols. small* 8*vo. Sold separately.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3*s.* 6*d.* THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: a Handbook of Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, etc., etc. *Paper cover*, 16*mo.* 1*s.* *Also the Larger Edition*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of Durham.

THE LIFE OF LOVE. A Course of Lent Lectures. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed from the Cross. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED. *Small* 8*vo. sewed*, 6*d.* 32*mo. cloth*, 1*s.*

Boultbee.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH: And other Studies in Church History. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS. St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. *Small* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Browne.—WEARIED WITH THE BURDEN: A Book of Daily Readings for Lent. By ARTHUR HEBER BROWNE, M.A., LL.D., Rector of St. John's, Newfoundland. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., sometime Bishop of Winchester. 8*vo.* 16*s.*

Campion and Beamont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Carter.—Works by, and edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest.
18*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 2*s.* Bound with the Book of Common Prayer, 3*s.* 6*d.* Red-Line Edition. *Cloth extra, gilt top.* 18*mo*, 2*s.* 6*d. net.* Large-Type Edition. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest, 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.* *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD: a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SIMPLE LESSONS; or, Words Easy to be Understood. A Manual of Teaching. I. On the Creed. II. The Ten Commandments. III. The Sacrament. 18*mo.* 3*s.*

A BOOK OF PRIVATE PRAYER FOR MORNING, MID-DAY, AND OTHER TIMES. 18*mo. limp cloth*, 1*s.*; *cloth, red edges*, 1*s.* 3*d.*

NICHOLAS FERRAR: his Household and his Friends. With Portrait engraved after a Picture by CORNELIUS JANSSEN at Magdalene College, Cambridge. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

MANUAL OF DEVOTION FOR SISTERS OF MERCY. 8 parts in 2 vols. 32mo. 10*s.* Or separately:—Part I. 1*s.* 6*d.* Part II. 1*s.* Part III. 1*s.* Part IV. 2*s.* Part V. 1*s.* Part VI. 1*s.* Part VII. Part VIII. 1*s.* 6*d.*

HARRIET MONSELL: A Memoir of the First Mother Superior of the Clewer Community. With Portrait. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

PARISH TEACHINGS. First and Second Series. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.* *each sold separately.*

SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTIONS. *Crown* 8*vo.*

THE HOLY EUCHARIST. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE LIFE OF GRACE. 3*s.* 6*d.*
OUR LORD'S EARLY LIFE. 3*s.* 6*d.*
OUR LORD'S ENTRANCE ON HIS MINISTRY. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.*

THE DOCTRINE OF CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, drawn from the Holy Scriptures and the Records of the Church of England. *Fcp.* 8*vo.* 9*d.*

VOWS AND THE RELIGIOUS STATE. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

[*continued.*

Carter.—Works by, and edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford—*continued.*

COLLECTS, EPISTLES, AND GOSPELS, Suggested for Use on certain Special Occasions and Holy Days. *Crown 8vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

FAMILY PRAYERS. 18*mo.* 1*s.*

RETREATS, with Notes of Addresses. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 21*s.* STUDENTS' EDITION. *One Vol. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* POPULAR EDITION. *One Vol. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Creighton.—A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY FROM THE GREAT SCHISM TO THE SACK OF ROME (1378-1527). By Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Six volumes. Crown 8vo.* 6*s. each.*

DAY-HOURS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE. Newly Revised according to the Prayer Book and the Authorised Translation of the Bible. *Crown 8vo. sewed,* 3*s.* ; *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DAY-HOURS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, being the Service for certain Holy Days. *Crown 8vo. sewed,* 3*s.* ; *cloth,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. *Each* 2*s.* 6*d.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
CHILCOT'S TREATISE ON EVIL THOUGHTS.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.
HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
LEAR'S (H. L. SIDNEY) FOR DAYS AND YEARS.
FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

* *These two in one Volume.* 5*s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. *Each* 1*s.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

* *These two in one Volume.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 24*s.*

JESUS THE MESSIAH : being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM UNDER TITUS. *8vo.* 18*s.*

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. *8vo.*

GALATIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*
EPHESIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*
PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. 10*s.* 6*d.*
THESSALONIANS. 7*s.* 6*d.*
PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. *8vo.* 12*s.*

ENGLISH (THE) CATHOLIC'S VADE MECUM: a Short Manual of General Devotion. Compiled by a PRIEST. *32mo. limp,* 1*s.*; *cloth,* 2*s.*

PRIEST'S Edition. *32mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Epochs of Church History.—Edited by Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.
THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.
THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.
THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D.
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.
THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.
THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A.
HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A.
THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.
THE COUNTER REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt. D.
WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.
THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By the Rev. H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

EUCHARISTIC MANUAL (THE). Consisting of Instructions and Devotions for the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. From various sources. *32mo. cloth gilt, red edges.* 1*s.* *Cheap Edition, limp cloth.* 9*d.*

Farrar.—Works by FREDERICK W. FARRAR, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

THE BIBLE: Its Meaning and Supremacy. *8vo.* 15*s.*

ALLEGORIES. With 25 Illustrations by AMELIA BAUERLE. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

CONTENTS.—The Life Story of Aner—The Choice—The Fortunes of a Royal House—The Basilisk and the Leopard.

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition. Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
The Larger Edition (7s. 6d.) may still be had.

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Geikie.—Works by J. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich.

HOURS WITH THE BIBLE: the Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. *New Edition, largely rewritten. Complete in Twelve Volumes. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

OLD TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

CREATION TO THE PATRIARCHS. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

MOSES TO JUDGES. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

SAMSON TO SOLOMON. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

REHOBOAM TO HEZEKIAH. *With Illustrations.*

MANASSEH TO ZEDEKIAH. With the Contemporary Prophets. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

EXILE TO MALACHI. With the Contemporary Prophets. *With Illustrations.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

THE GOSPELS. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST. *With Map. 2 vols.*

LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. *With Maps and Illustrations. 2 vols.*

ST. PETER TO REVELATION. *With 29 Illustrations.*

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST.
Cabinet Edition. With Map. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 7*s.*
Cheap Edition, without the Notes. 1 *vol. 8vo.* 5*s.*

A SHORT LIFE OF CHRIST. *With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*; *gilt edges,* 4*s.* 6*d.*

OLD TESTAMENT CHARACTERS. *With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

LANDMARKS OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

ENTERING ON LIFE. A Book for Young Men. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRECIOUS PROMISES. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.*

GOLD DUST: a Collection of Golden Counsels for the Sanctification of Daily Life. Translated and abridged from the French by E.L.E.E. Edited by CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Parts I. II. III. Small Pocket Volumes. *Cloth, gilt, each* 1*s.* Parts I. and II. in One Volume. 1*s.* 6*d.* Parts I., II., and III. in One Volume. 2*s.*

*** The two first parts in One Volume, *large type*, 18*mo. cloth, gilt.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Parts I. II. and III. are also supplied, bound in white cloth, with red edges, in box, price 3*s.*

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., D.D., Canon of Westminster.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

GREAT TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Edited by the Rev. W. U. RICHARDS. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

Hall.—Works by the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

THE VIRGIN MOTHER: Retreat Addresses on the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary as told in the Gospels. With an appended Essay on the Virgin Birth of our Lord. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION AND OURS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hall.—THE KENOTIC THEORY. Considered with Particular Reference to its Anglican Forms and Arguments. By the Rev. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Instructor of Dogmatic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Harrison.—Works by the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D., Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society.

PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANITY AND SCEPTICISM. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: a Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE REPOSE OF FAITH, IN VIEW OF PRESENT DAY DIFFICULTIES. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hatch.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., late Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Heygate.—THE MANUAL: a Book of Devotion. Adapted for General Use. By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, M.A., Rector of Brighstone. 18*mo. cloth limp*, 1*s.*; *boards*, 1*s.* 3*d.* *Cheap Edition*, 6*d.* *Small* 8*vo. Large Type*, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

GOD'S CITY AND THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM. *Cr. 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

PLEAS AND CLAIMS FOR CHRIST. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

CREED AND CHARACTER: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hollings.—Works by the Rev. G. S. HOLLINGS, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE HEAVENLY STAIR; or, A Ladder of the Love of God for Sinners. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

PORTA REGALIS; or, Considerations on Prayer. *Crown 8vo. limp cloth,* 1*s.* 6*d. net*; *cloth boards,* 2*s. net.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE DIVINE LIFE, THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, AND THE TRANSFIGURATION. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. Suggested by Passages in the Collects for the Sundays in Lent. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE WISDOM OF GOD. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.*

PARADOXES OF THE LOVE OF GOD, especially as they are seen in the way of the Evangelical Counsels. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.*

ONE BORN OF THE SPIRIT; or, the Unification of our Life in God. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hutchings.—Works by the Ven. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A. Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton.

SERMON SKETCHES from some of the Sunday Lessons throughout the Church's Year. *Vols. I and II. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each.*

THE LIFE OF PRAYER: a Course of Lectures delivered in All Saints' Church, Margaret Street, during Lent. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST: a Doctrinal and Devotional Treatise. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CROSS. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE TEMPTATION. Lent Lectures delivered at St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Hutton.—THE CHURCH OF THE SIXTH CENTURY. Six Chapters in Ecclesiastical History. By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Cambridge. *With* 11 *Illustrations. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Hutton.—THE SOUL HERE AND HEREAFTER. By the Rev. R. E. HUTTON, Chaplain of St. Margaret's, East Grinstead. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to come. Collected chiefly from English Writers by L. P. With a Preface by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A. *Seventh Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON.

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 *vols.* 8*vo.* 20*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 8*vo.* 10*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 8*vo.* 10*s. net.*

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 *Vols.* 8*vo.* 20*s. net.*

Jennings.—ECCLESIA ANGLICANA. A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE ORDER AND CONNEXION OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING, as set forth in the arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the Year. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

THE PERFECT LIFE: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Also a Cheap Edition*, 32*mo.* 1*s.*; *or cloth gilt*, 1*s.* 6*d.*; *or with red borders*, 2*s.* 6*d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. 16*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d.* *Also a Cheap Edition*, 32*mo.* 1*s.*; *or cloth gilt*, 1*s.* 6*d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo.* 5*s.*

JOY: A FRAGMENT. With a slight sketch of the Author's life. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Nine Vols. Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis XV., known also as the Mother Térèse de St. Augustin.

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By PÈRE GRATRY.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

[*continued.*

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR—*continued.*

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Also *Cheap Edition*, 32*mo*, 6*d. cloth limp*; 1*s. cloth boards.*

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. Also *Cheap Edition*, 32*mo*, 6*d. cloth limp*; and 1*s. cloth boards.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S 'THOUGHTS.'

Lepine.—THE MINISTERS OF JESUS CHRIST: a Biblical Study. By the Rev. J. FOSTER LEPINE, Curate of St. Paul's, Maidstone. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.

LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford; the Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols.* 8*vo. Vols. I. and II.*, 36*s. Vol. III.*, 18*s. Vol. IV.* 18*s.*

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF ST. PAUL. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS, 1860-1889. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

CLERICAL LIFE AND WORK: Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES: Lectures on Buddhism—Lectures on the Life of St. Paul—Papers on Dante. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. 8*vo.* 14*s.*

SERMONS ON OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF CHRIST. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

[*continued.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.—*continued.*

CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

PASSIONTIDE SERMONS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* [*The Crown* 8*vo. Edition* (5*s.*) *may still be had.*]

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS. *Crown* 16*mo.* 1*s.*

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.

THE HISTORY OF MARRIAGE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN, IN RELATION TO DIVORCE AND CERTAIN FORBIDDEN DEGREES. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instruction in Church. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE APOSTLES, as traced by St. Luke in the Acts. Being Sixty Portions for Private Study, and Instruction in Church. A Sequel to 'Footprints of the Son of Man, as traced by St. Mark.' *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 12*s.*

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MacColl.—Works by the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Canterbury.

THE CONDITIONS OF OUR LORD'S LIFE UPON EARTH. Being the Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896. To which is prefixed part of a First Professorial Lecture at Cambridge. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY. Four Lectures delivered in St. Asaph Cathedral. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.* *Cheap Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Maturin.—Works by the Rev. B. W. MATURIN, sometime Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.

SOME PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

PRACTICAL STUDIES ON THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

Medd.—THE PRIEST TO THE ALTAR; or, Aids to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum. By PETER GOLDSMITH MEDD, M.A., Canon of St. Alban's. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. *Royal 8vo.* 15*s.*

Mortimer.—Works by the Rev. A. G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia.

JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION: Thirty Addresses for Good Friday and Easter. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE: A Manual of Theological Instruction for Confirmation and First Communion. *Crown 8vo.* Part I., 7*s.* 6*d.* Part II., 9*s.*

HELPS TO MEDITATION: Sketches for Every Day in the Year.

Vol. I. ADVENT to TRINITY. *8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. TRINITY to ADVENT. *8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

STORIES FROM GENESIS: Sermons for Children. *Crown 8vo.* 4*s.*

THE LAWS OF HAPPINESS; or, The Beatitudes as teaching our Duty to God, Self, and our Neighbour. *18mo.* 2*s.*

THE LAWS OF PENITENCE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross. *16mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS IN MINIATURE FOR EXTEMPORE PREACHERS: Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

NOTES ON THE SEVEN PENITENTIAL PSALMS, chiefly from Patristic Sources. *Fcp. 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER: with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

LEARN OF JESUS CHRIST TO DIE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching the way of Preparation for Death. *16mo.* 2*s.*

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. *Two Vols.* 8*vo.* 24*s.*

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1865. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6d.

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. 8*vo.* 6*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

A REVIEW OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s* 6*d.*

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral.

PRIESTLY IDEALS; being a Course of Practical Lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral to 'Our Society' and other Clergy, in Lent, 1898. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE GOSPEL OF EXPERIENCE; or, the Witness of Human Life to the truth of Revelation. Being the Boyle Lectures for 1895. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE: being Sermons preached on various occasions. *New and Enlarged Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SPECULUM SACERDOTUM; or, the Divine Model of the Priestly Life. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on the Spiritual Life. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE MAN OF GOD. *Small* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRAYER BOOK: Its Voice and Teaching. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. 2 *vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.*

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. each. Cheaper Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' *Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. Cheaper Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD *Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. Cheaper Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. Cheaper Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. Cheaper Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

*** *A Complete List of Cardinal Newman's Works can be had on Application.*

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE SAVIOUR KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ottley.—ASPECTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: being the Bampton Lectures for 1897. By ROBERT LAWRENCE OTTLEY, M.A., Vicar of Winterbourne Bassett, Wilts; sometime Principal of the Pusey House. 8*vo.* *New and Cheaper Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

OUTLINES OF CHURCH TEACHING: a Series of Instructions for the Sundays and chief Holy Days of the Christian Year. For the Use of Teachers. By C. C. G. With Preface by the Very Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, sometime Bishop of Montreal.

PLAIN SERMONS, to which is prefixed a Memorial Portrait. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

PEACE AND ITS HINDRANCES. *Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* *sewed*; 2*s.* *cloth.*

THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened. *Fcap.* 8*vo*, *large type.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Cheap Edition.* *Small type*, *limp*, 1*s.*

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. *New Red Rubric Edition.* 32*mo*, *cloth.* 2*s.* *Common Edition.* 32*mo.* 1*s.*

OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. First Series. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Second Series. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

LARGE TYPE EDITION. Two Series in one Volume. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THOUGHTS FOR HOLY WEEK. 16*mo*, *cloth.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

DECISION. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE HOME BEYOND; or, A Happy Old Age. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE LABOURING MAN'S BOOK. 18*mo*, *large type*, *cloth.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Oxenham.—THE VALIDITY OF PAPAL CLAIMS: Lectures delivered in Rome. By F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, D.D., English Chaplain at Rome. With a Letter by His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Paget.—Works by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER: Sermons. With an Introductory Essay. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January 16-18, 1888. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

Percival.—SOME HELPS FOR SCHOOL LIFE. Sermons preached at Clifton College, 1862-1879. By J. PERCIVAL, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Hereford. New Edition, with New Preface. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Percival.—THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS. Treated Theologically and Historically. By HENRY R. PERCIVAL, M.A., D.D., Author of 'A Digest of Theology,' 'The Doctrine of the Episcopal Church,' etc. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

POCKET MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR THE HOURS, ETC. With the Collects from the Prayer Book. *Royal* 32*mo.* 1*s.*

Powell.—THE PRINCIPLE OF THE INCARNATION. With especial Reference to the Relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His Human Consciousness. By the Rev. H. C. POWELL, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford; Rector of Wylye and Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. 8*vo.* 16*s.*

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., and the LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN. *Crown* 8*vo.*

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE PSALMS. 5*s.*
ISAIAH. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE MINOR PROPHETS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
ACTS TO REVELATIONS. 6*s.*

PRIEST'S PRAYER BOOK (THE). Containing Private Prayers and Intercessions; Occasional, School, and Parochial Offices; Offices for the Visitation of the Sick, with Notes, Readings, Collects, Hymns, Litanies, etc. With a brief Pontifical. By the late Rev. R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L., and Rev. J. EDWARD VAUX, M.A., F.S.A. *New Edition, Revised.* 20*th Thousand.* *Post* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

Pullan.—LECTURES ON RELIGION. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Lecturer in Theology at Oriel and Queen's Colleges, Oxford. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Pusey.—LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford; the Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II.*, 36*s*. *Vol. III.*, 18*s*. *Vol. IV.* 18*s*.

SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Cuddesdon; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *8vo.* 12*s*. 6*d*.

Randolph.—Works by B. W. RANDOLPH, M.A., Principal of the Theological College and Hon. Canon of Ely.

THE THRESHOLD OF THE SANCTUARY: being Short Ch[illegible] on the Inner Preparation for the Priesthood. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

THE LAW OF SINAI: being Devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments delivered to Ordinands. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

Rede.—Works by WYLLYS REDE, D.D., Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, and Canon of the Cathedral, Atalanta, Georgia.

STRIVING FOR THE MASTERY: Daily Lessons for Lent. *Cr. 8vo.* 5*s*.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: a Lost Link in the Chain of the Church's Creed. With a Preface by LORD HALIFAX. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

Reynolds.—THE SUPERNATURAL IN NATURE: A Verification by Free Use of Science. By JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS, M.A., Past President of Sion College, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. *New and Cheaper Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

Sanday.—INSPIRATION: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. By W. SANDAY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. *New and Cheaper Edition, with New Preface. 8vo.* 7*s*. 6*d*.

Scudamore.—STEPS TO THE ALTAR: a Manual of Devotion for the Blessed Eucharist. By the Rev. W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A. *Royal 32mo.* 1*s*.

On toned paper, with red rubrics, 2*s*: *The same, with Collects, Epistles, and Gospels*, 2*s*. 6*d*; *Demy 18mo. cloth*, 1*s*; *Demy 18mo. cloth, large type*, 1*s*. 3*d*; *Imperial 32mo. limp cloth*, 6*d*.

Simpson.—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

Strong.—CHRISTIAN ETHICS: being the Bampton Lectures for 1895. By THOMAS B. STRONG, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Durham. *New and Cheaper Edition.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Tee.—THE SANCTUARY OF SUFFERING. By ELEANOR TEE, Author of 'This Everyday Life,' etc. With a Preface by the Rev. J. P. F. DAVIDSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Earl's Court; President of the 'Guild of All Souls.' *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. *Eight Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. each.*

THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS.
A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.
OUR LORD'S NATIVITY.
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year).
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year).
THE HOLY WEEK.
OUR LORD'S PASSION.
OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS. *Two Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. each.*

PLAIN SERMONS ON CATECHISM. *Two Vols. Cr.* 8*vo.* 5*s. each.*

Wilson.—THOUGHTS ON CONFIRMATION. By Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College. 16*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Wirgman.—THE DOCTRINE OF CONFIRMATION CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO HOLY BAPTISM AS A SACRAMENTAL ORDINANCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: with a Preliminary Historical Survey of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. By A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L., Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Wordsworth.—Works by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., sometime Bishop of Lincoln.

THE HOLY BIBLE (the Old Testament). With Notes, Introductions, and Index. *Imperial* 8*vo.*

Vol. I. THE PENTATEUCH. 25*s.* Vol. II. JOSHUA TO SAMUEL. 15*s.* Vol. III. KINGS to ESTHER. 15*s.* Vol. IV. JOB TO SONG OF SOLOMON. 25*s.* Vol. V. ISAIAH TO EZEKIEL. 25*s.* Vol. VI. DANIEL, MINOR PROPHETS, and Index. 15*s.*
Also supplied in 12 *Parts. Sold separately.*

[*continued.*

Wordsworth.—Works by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., sometime Bishop of Lincoln—*continued.*

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Original Greek. With Notes, Introductions, and Indices. *Imperial 8vo.*

Vol. I. GOSPELS AND ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. 23*s.* Vol. II. EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE, and Indices. 37*s.*
Also supplied in 4 Parts. Sold separately.

A CHURCH HISTORY TO A.D. 451. *Four Vols. Crown 8vo.*

Vol. I. TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325. 8*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. FROM THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA TO THAT OF CONSTANTINOPLE 6*s.* Vol. III. CONTINUATION. 6*s.* Vol. IV. CONCLUSION, TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451. 6*s.*

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS: a Manual of Instruction on the Church and the Anglican Branch of it. *12mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THE CHURCH. *16mo.* 1*s. cloth.* 6*d. sewed.*

THE HOLY YEAR: Original Hymns. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. and* 1*s. Limp,* 6*d.*

,, ,, With Music. Edited by W. H. MONK. *Square 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH. *32mo.* 1*s.*

Wordsworth.—Works by JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: Four Visitation Addresses. 1891. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE ONE RELIGION: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the Nations, and revealed by Jesus Christ. Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in 1881. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

UNIVERSITY SERMONS ON GOSPEL SUBJECTS. *Sm. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

PRAYERS FOR USE IN COLLEGE. *16mo.* 1*s.*

10,000/11/98.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press.