

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Reviews.

*Ritual Conformity. Interpretations of the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, agreed upon by a Conference held at All Saints, Margaret Street, 1880-1881. Parker & Co. 1881.*

THIS pamphlet is the result of forty-eight conferences, spread over a year and a half, in which some of the leading Ritualists give their interpretation of all the rubrics in the Prayer Book. It shows signs of care and of compromise, and it is quite outspoken as to its recommendations. Though put forth unofficially, it will probably be accepted by numbers of Ritualists as their guide, philosopher, and friend.

In commenting upon this interesting pamphlet, the writer claims to be nothing more than a student of the Prayer Book and of the documents (historical and otherwise) which throw light on its composition; he is neither a lawyer nor legislator, neither doctor nor proctor, but simply an inquirer and searcher after Liturgical Truth.

It is proposed first to criticise certain interpretations which this pamphlet sets forth, and secondly to touch upon the thorny question of the "Ornaments Note;" and, as the pamphlet proceeds in a very business-like style, the criticisms of it will be conducted, as far as possible, after the same method.

Passing by the reference to "obscure" prescribed as an "ancient and devout usage" for the minister to follow on entering the church, but certainly not to be found in the rubrics, we arrive at the beginning of Morning Prayer, where the minister is to "read with a loud voice" one or more sentences. This order, one would think, hardly needed interpretation; but we are told that to "read" may mean a musical recital, and that as to "say" strictly means a monotone, "read" includes "some other mode of reciting the sentences, such as singing," &c. This method of interpretation does not at first sight tend to give one confidence in the interpreters; for if to read means to sing, then English words have lost their meaning, and black means white. But there is method in the interpreters' madness. The reason for their affirming that reading includes singing is that, in the older Prayer Books, there was a rubric authorising that "in such places where they do sing, shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune after the manner of distinct reading." Thus in old days and in singing places (*i.e.*, cathedrals, &c.), the lessons (with the Epistle and Gospel) were to be brought as near to distinct reading as possible, whilst in other places they were to be read. In the last revision the liberty of singing was altogether done away with; and it cannot be said, with any pretention to accuracy, that reading includes or means singing.

As to posture, the Bishops are quoted as having said, in the Savoy Conference, that where the minister speaks to the people, as in the lessons, it is convenient that he turn to them. The interpreters allow that the Sentences and Exhortation come under this head, but proceed, somewhat illogically, to the conclusion that the minister should not turn to the people, but should stand stall-wise—*i.e.*, sideways!

We now pass to the rubric which prescribes that the Absolution "is to be pronounced by the priest alone." The interpreters do not state what the word "alone" indicates—*viz.*, that the people who had been joining in the General Confession are to keep silence during the Absolution. We are told, however, that "a deacon officiating in the absence of a priest may not use this Absolution as a prayer." It certainly is not a prayer,

but a declaration, followed by an exhortation or bidding. Custom has ordered that the deacon shall never use the Absolution, but propriety only demands that he should not use it if a presbyter be present. It is the opinion of high authorities that the words priest and minister are used indifferently through the Prayer Book, the word presbyter having intervened in the Scotch Liturgy. "Minister" was the word used in the rubric now under discussion from the time this part of the service was introduced (1552) until 1604; and "minister" is the word still used in some very important rubrics—*e.g.*, at the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. If the word priest implies that a deacon is under all circumstances excluded, what would be the consequence? The *Gloria Patri* that follows the Lord's Prayer could not be uttered by the deacon, nor the versicles before the collect for the day, nor the Lord's Prayer and versicles after the Litany, nor certain portions of the Baptismal and Marriage Services. It seems plain that, generally speaking, the word priest or presbyter signifies officiating minister. When, however, a long-established custom prevails giving it a more limited signification, as in the case before us, it should not be broken through without the sanction of the Ordinary. It is curious that the rubric before the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of Evening Service had the word "priest" until 1662, when it was turned to "minister." In the canons the word "minister" generally means priest or presbyter, as distinct from deacon.

As to the *Amen* to be answered after prayers, the interpreters have omitted to mention that it is sometimes printed in italics and sometimes in Roman letters. There is a difference of opinion as to the reason, but a high authority has laid down, that in our present Prayer Book, where the *Amen* follows the Lord's Prayer in Roman letters, ministers and people say the whole Prayer together. This is certainly true in most cases, and probably in all. If so, it would decide against the common custom that the priest should say the Lord's Prayer and *Amen* alone at the beginning of the Communion. In fact, the rubric before the Lord's Prayer where it first occurs in Morning Service seems to be decisive on this point. In the 1604 Prayer Book the *Amen* was generally printed in Roman letters at the end of the Collects.

The interpreters have not commented on the fact that the rubric gives us permission to sing the *Benedictus*. In 1549 it was to be "used;" in the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604 it was to be "used and said;" and so in the Scotch Prayer Book; but in 1664 these words were dropped. It would be well at certain seasons to follow the old rule.

It may be noted in passing, that there is no direction for turning in any special direction at the recitation of the Creed; but there are two important additions to the rubric here, one of which the interpreters might have pointed out—*viz.*, the permission to *sing* the Creed, taken (as also in the case of the Nicene) from the Scotch Liturgy.

Custom must evidently have its way in such matters, as turning to the East in the Creed, the method of responding in the Psalms and Litany, and in the sole or congregational utterance of the General Thanksgiving. That this was not expected to be uttered by all the people is plain, first, from the absence of a rubric to that effect, and, secondly, from the absence of initial capitals at the beginning of short sentences, such as can be seen in the General Confession, the Creeds, and the Lord's Prayer (including that in the beginning of the Communion Service). It would be strange, however, if the united voices of the congregation should be silenced in those churches where the custom has sprung up.

Custom again may be allowed to rule in the Glory and the Thanks before and after the Gospel, the former having been ordered in 1549, and the

latter in the Scotch Liturgy, 1637, though there is no order for the outbursts of praise in our present Prayer Book.

Could the reintroduction of the sign of the Cross in the baptismal font be similarly justified? The interpreters say yes; affirming that it is admissible, because the words "Sanctify this water," introduced in 1662, answer to "Sanctify this fountain of Baptism," in the 1549 Prayer Book, when the cross was ordered to be made. But the use of the cross has been a bitterly contested ceremony, and therefore should not be reintroduced anywhere, without specific directions. Besides, the interpreters have hardly given due weight to the facts before them. In 1549 it was ordered that the water in the font should be changed every month, and a special service was provided for sanctifying the water. A considerable portion of this service was afterwards made use of in the prayers before Baptism, as we have them now, and the form for sanctifying the water was done away with. In the Scotch Prayer Book a sentence for the special sanctification of the water (when freshly put into the font) was reintroduced with rubrical directions, by Laud; but the sign of the cross was not added. The revisers of 1662 ignored Laud's formula altogether.

The interpreters rightly point out that the font should be filled with water "immediately before the Baptism." The directions of the rubric are, indeed, as explicit on this point as in the case of the Bread and Wine. The font is *then* (i.e., when the priest comes to it) to be filled; and the Bread and Wine are *then* (i.e., before the Church militant) to be placed on the table; and if the former rubric allows that the water should be poured in before the congregation assembles, the latter would grant the same liberty in the case of the Bread and Wine.

In the rubric before the Three Collects, in Morning Prayer, we find the words *all kneeling*. The interpreters (p. 18) think that this expression applies to the congregation only, and not to the minister. But this is not a natural interpretation, inasmuch as the people were already kneeling, and it is plain that the words "all devoutly kneeling" three rubrics earlier, include the minister; and the same is the case with the words "all kneeling" before the General Confession.

In 1549 there was a rubric ordering the priest to stand up before saying the Three Collects. This was afterwards done away with, and the words "all kneeling" were added at the last revision, in order to specify the posture then thought most suitable for the minister in prayer.

There is a slight inaccuracy on p. 28, where we read that "the practice of the people sitting during the reading of the Epistle, though not prescribed in the rubric, may be justified by ancient English custom." Though not prescribed, it is certainly implied, because all are directed to stand up before the Gospel begins, and it can hardly be supposed that they would remain on their knees during the reading of the Epistle.

The blunder on p. 31 is more serious. The statement runs thus:—"It seems reasonable that the (offertory) sentences may be sung as of old, and as was prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549. 'When there be clerks they shall sing one or many of the sentences above written, according to the length or shortness of the time that the people be offering.'" But how strange that the extract from the rubric of 1549 should thus suddenly be brought to a close by the interpreters, for it goes on in these words:—"or else one of them to be said by the minister immediately before the offering." Moreover, the restriction to "saying" was not introduced at the last revision, but has been ordered in the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604.

In discussing the rubric before the Confession in the Communion Service, it is suggested that the words "one of the ministers" do not absolutely exclude "a lay-clerk" from leading. If other rubrics might

be thus dealt with, there would be a good deal more for laymen to do than seems to be allowed. In this case, as in so many others, the Scotch Liturgy supplies an important link between the rubric of 1604 and that of 1662, giving the words "the Presbyter himself, or the Deacon," instead of the old words "either by one of them (*i.e.*, one of the people) or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself."

With regard to what is commonly called the "sanctus," we are told that a comparison with the books of 1549 and 1552 shows that the time at which the people should join in is at the words "Holy, &c." But the student will look in vain for the ground of this observation, unless it be that a new paragraph is introduced at the word "Holy" in the old Prayer Books. There is absolutely nothing in the rubric to justify it. So if it leans on anything it must be on custom.

On p. 37 we read:—

The custom of elevating the consecrated Elements . . . . was expressly prohibited in the Prayer Book of 1549. This prohibition, however, was withdrawn in 1552. The elevation cannot, therefore, be unlawful, though certainly it is not obligatory.<sup>1</sup>

Many will be thankful for this last small mercy; but is the statement of the case here exactly correct? We are told that the prohibition was withdrawn, but we are not told the circumstances under which the reference to elevation dropped out of the Prayer Book. Yet it ought to be told. In 1549, immediately after the Consecration, came a note, saying: "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, *without any elevation*, or showing the sacrament to the people." Then, without further rubric, came the prayer of memorial and presentation of themselves on the part of the congregation. In 1552 the word altar was struck out of the Prayer Book, and this prayer was removed from its old position and introduced after the Lord's Prayer, with slight alterations, being preceded by a new rubric. There can be little doubt that in removing the prayer the early rubric which intervened between it and the preceding prayer also dropped out. But does this justify the reintroduction of elevation? Will not the moral sense of the community affirm that, in the case of a ceremony of this character, and to which so much importance is attached, nothing but a direct order would justify its reintroduction? The Scotch Service here reverts to the old arrangement of 1549, but says not a word about elevation. In matters of *minutiae*, lack of direction may be supplied by common sense; a minister, for example, is not directed to hand back a baptized child to the god-parents; and it needs no rubric to decide whether he is to carry the infant in his arms for the rest of his natural life. But in matters of ceremonial, where doctrine is involved, men of candid judgment will allow that Omission must be taken as Prohibition.

In the remarks on the rubric concerning the reception of the communion we read—"This rubric with the 21st Canon obliges the celebrant to receive the communion every time that he celebrates." This is true, and the same has been the case in all the Reformed Prayer-books. But now for the reason, "He does so as a part of the sacrificial action, which is not complete unless a portion of the sacrifice is consumed by the offering Priest. For this reason he communicates himself, standing, as distinct from the congregation, and completing the essentials of the Sacrifice in his priestly character." Now, in the first place there is no direction for the minister to retain a standing posture when partaking of

---

<sup>1</sup> One might as well say that the omission of the words "in English," given before the Lord's Prayer (next after the creed), makes it now legal to say the prayer in Latin.

the Lord's Supper, either in our Prayer Book or in any of its predecessors; and in all of them the minister is said to "receive the communion," not to "communicate himself," in other words he is identified with the recipients in the act, and therefore he ought to occupy the posture of the recipients. Concerning this posture the "black rubric" at the end of the service is very clear. If the minister had been an exception to the rule as to receiving the communion in a kneeling posture the fact would probably have been mentioned. It may be replied that no direction is given for him to kneel, but the rejoinder is unassailable that no direction is given for him to abstain from kneeling, and the recipients as such are described at the end of the rubric as "all meekly kneeling." If, therefore, this note on the rubric is wrong as to the fact, it need hardly be worth while to inquire into the grounds advanced, but it is noteworthy that the ambiguous word *priest*, which is supposed by some to cover the idea of sacerdotalism, is not used in the rubric with reference to the celebrant. In 1549 we read "Then shall the priest first receive, &c.;" in 1552 it was turned to "minister" and so remained in 1559 and 1604: in 1637 the Scotch Liturgy substituted "Then shall the Bishop if he be present, or else the Presbyter that celebrateth;" and in 1662 the word "minister" stood as before. It can thus hardly be "an essential of the sacrifice" that the minister should partake.

On p. 40 we are told that "there seems to be no warrant, in the English use, for making the sign of the cross with the consecrated species, paten, or chalice"—the word "seems" is hardly needful, when there neither is nor has been since the Reformation any such direction. But why do the divines who have drawn up these notes speak on various occasions of the "species" of bread? It is done not once nor twice. Do they suppose that after consecration the bread has lost its substance? They cannot forget the statement in the "black rubric" which is as old as the Prayer Book of 1552, that "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances."

On p. 46 we are told that "the prohibition against carrying the unconsumed remainder of the consecrated elements out of the church involves the cleansing the vessels in church." This is not quite clear. If consuming the remainder involved cleansing the vessels, would not the direction have been given? Again, we are told that "the method of cleansing which is really intended to ensure the entire consumption of all that remains is not prescribed and the word 'reverently' leaves much to the discretion of the priest." But the word "reverently" is used not of any cleansing, but the eating of and drinking of the consecrated bread and wine which remains, by the priest and such others of the communicants as he shall then call to him.

Nothing is said by the interpreters concerning incense, either for or against. The chasuble is calmly taken for granted (p. 30), because, forsooth, the word *vestment*, which is to be found in the Prayer Book of 1549, "generally included chasuble, stole, maniple, albe, amice, and girdle" (p. 40 note). This precious piece of information is gathered from "the inventories and other authorities." Inventories strike one as a very poor authority for defining the exact nature of the "vestment" ordered to be worn whether in the days of Edward VI. or in our own times. Moreover, on looking at the place in the Prayer Book where the word "vestment" occurs, it seems to be an alternative name for a cope, or at any rate an alternative garment, and no one supposes that the cope is a sacrificial garment.

Altar lights are nowhere mentioned in any of the Prayer Books, but are said by the interpreter to rest on the King's injunctions (2 & 3 Ed. VI. cap. 1), and "if it be contended that Bishop Cosin is wrong in

his opinion that the injunctions were obligatory, we are thrown back upon the universal custom of the Catholic Church, which undoubtedly required lights to be used on the altar for the office of Holy Communion." To this it may be answered that if this custom was primitive it would have received formal sanction in post-Reformation documents, but we look in vain for such sanction.

The position of the priest at the holy table has much exercised the minds of the interpreters. We read (p. 26) that—

In those Churches where the Table was placed with its long sides north and south, the Priest moved with the table and stood . . . . at the centre of one of the long sides . . . . and looked to the south instead of the east. But when Archbishop Laud pressed the restoration of the table to its ancient position . . . . some of the High Church clergy placed themselves at the north end of the table. . . . They were at once met with the reply that side and end were not convertible terms, and it was urged that the rubric could not be complied with at all unless the table were set with its long sides north and south.

The interpreters further say:—"It seems absurd that when the altar is restored to its place the priest should not be restored to his." But the fault seems to have originated with Laud. The Scotch Prayer Book, which is due to Laud, has the following rubric:—"The Holy Table having at the communion time a carpet and a fair white linen cloth upon it with other decent furniture meet for the high mysteries then to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the chancel of the church, where the presbyter standing *at the north side or end thereof*," &c. There is no doubt, therefore, that if Laud's views had been carried out by our revisers in 1662, the rubric would have had no reference to the body of the church and none to the side of the table. As Laud's rubric has been overruled, why should not the practice he inaugurated be overruled also, and why should not the table be so arranged that the minister might stand "stall-wise?" If this be objected to, why should we not revert to the still older custom, and let the minister stand between the table and the east end, facing the congregation as he consecrates?<sup>1</sup>

The interpreters say nothing about the word "oblations" before the Prayer for the Church Militant. It is taken from the Scotch Liturgy. They tell us that the bread and wine should be placed "humbly as an offering" on the altar. Passing over the question-begging and "altar," it may be noted that while the Scotch rubric ordered the presbyter to do so, that order has not been introduced into our rubrics; nor does there seem any authority in our service as it now stands for calling the bread and wine an offering.

The words used by the interpreters concerning mixing water with the wine are remarkably strong. They run thus:—

This usage (that above referred to) is properly associated also with the primitive custom (prescribed to be used in 1549) of "putting thereto a little pure and clean water." The preparatory action of mixing water with the wine

<sup>1</sup> There is a little book now lying before the present writer, called "A Course of Catechizing, being the Marrow of all Orthodox and Practical Expositions upon the Church Catechism, and of all Controversies upon the Church Customs and Observances. Second edition. 1674." It is written from what would be called an old-fashioned High Church point of view, and is exceedingly interesting. Among other questions it is asked, Why doth the Priest stand on the north side of the table? Answer, To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the east. There are numerous quaint pictures in the book, and amongst them one of the Table placed not altar-wise, but with its narrower end toward the east.

(besides being connected with the original Act of Constitution) was undoubtedly the custom of the time when this Church and Realm received the order of ministering the Sacrament, and it has never been prohibited in the Prayer Book. The practice is, therefore, a performance of the ordination vow of the English Priesthood, "so to minister the Sacraments as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God." A few drops of water are sufficient for compliance with the usage, and in no case should the quantity of water exceed one-third of the whole.

The original and inspired account of the act of institution does not specify the mixing of the water with the wine. If this took place at all, it was not as a ceremony, but according to the custom of the country, where wine is supposed not to have been drunk unmixed. It would be well if that were the custom in this and all countries, but as this is not the case, there seems to be no authority for having diluted wine at the Lord's Supper. If it is to be diluted, let it not be done ceremonially by the pouring in of "a few drops," but let it be done thoroughly. At any rate, the rubric being withdrawn which authorised the ceremony, it would be wrong to revive the custom without the sanction of the Ordinary.

We now come to the question of non-communicating attendance; and we are told that "the rubric seems to direct a change of place to be made by the communicants, and indicates not the general withdrawal of the rest of the congregation, but the separation of the intending communicants into a part of the church by themselves." Whether this direction so interpreted is generally carried out by any section of the Church might be worth inquiry. The rubric appears in its present form for the first time in our Prayer Book. It is followed by an exhortation, the substance of which came in an earlier part of the service in 1549. It is followed by the invitation to draw near. This invitation has gone through a remarkable change. From 1549 down to 1604 it closed thus:—

Draw near, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to Almighty God, before this congregation here gathered together in His holy name, meekly kneeling on your knees.

In 1604 the sentence began, "Draw near *with faith*," and the reference to confessing *before the congregation* was done away with. Was this last there should be a misunderstanding as to the meaning of the words? They could not have been misunderstood in our older Prayer Books as referring to a non-communicating congregation, for those Prayer Books contained a remarkable exhortation to people not to remain unless they were going to partake. In 1552 the passage (in the Exhortation to the Negligent) ran thus:—

And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else, than a further contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay, when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this holy communion with others. I pray you what can this be else, but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision?

After more to the same effect, the exhortation continues:—

Wherefore rather than ye should do so depart from hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I beseech you to ponder with yourselves from whom ye depart; ye depart from the Lord's Table; ye depart from your brethren, and from the banquet of most heavenly food.



Such was the mind of the Church of England from 1552 till 1662, by which time non-communicating attendance must have been practically done away with. The words now quoted were in that year omitted, the cause for their continuance having probably ceased to exist. Those who feel inclined to re-introduce the system of non-communicating attendance would do well to meditate on the exhortation now quoted. The Homilies contain a well-known passage to the same effect.

With regard to bread to be used at the Lord's Supper, the rubric says: "It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usually to be eaten." The interpreters say that these words "shall suffice" do not exclude "a higher alternative," and they quote the Scotch rubric, of 1637, as "expanding the true meaning." The Scotch Liturgy undoubtedly inserted the words in brackets, ("though it be lawful to have wafer bread"). But the Revisers (1662), refused to follow in Laud's steps, and reverted to the rubric which had stood since 1552, thereby, to say the least, implying that bread was to be used. In the face of this fact it would be decidedly uncanonical to depart from the ordinary usage without the direct sanction of the Ordinary.

Nor must it be forgotten that wafer-bread is one thing, and a wafer another. The unleavened Passover cakes may be called waferbread, but they are as large as a plate, and are broken up. The old Rubric of 1549 was very strong on this point. It ordained that "the bread prepared for the Communion be made through all this realm after one sort and fashion, that is to say, unleavened and round as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more thicker and larger than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces; and every one shall be divided in two pieces, at the least or more, by the direction of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

There is only one more interpretation calling for special attention, viz., that which discusses the confession and absolution in the Visitation for the Sick. The following is the statement on the subject, (p. 60.):—

The significant introduction in the last revision of this direction to "move" the sick person to make a special confession of his sins, recalls the fact that the practice of confession had then been interrupted for many years, and required exertion for its revival. In "moving" the sick person is included instruction upon the nature and details of sins, as well as help to discover them, such as the suggestion of questions on the commandments, baptismal obligations, marriage vows, &c. The expression "special confession" does not mean a *partial* confession, but a confession which goes into detail, and the priest should not absolve the sick person unless his confession comprehends, besides the weighty matter which had immediately prompted it, *all matters which ought to press upon his conscience*, and can be recalled to mind by his utmost efforts.

There is more to the same effect, extending to persons in health the directions given concerning persons in sickness. Here is a pretty state of things; and it is as well that it should be brought forward in this plain and public way, because this publicity will effectually prevent sick persons from sending for their minister, or even permitting him to enter their houses.

The old rubric of 1549 ran thus:—

Here shall the sick person make a special confession, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions.

In 1552 the reference to private confessions was left out, and the words "after this sort" were substituted for "after this form." So it stood also

in 1559 and 1604. The only change in the Scotch Liturgy of 1637 was the Substitution of "Presbyter or Minister" for priest. But in 1662 two notable changes are introduced. Are they in the direction of severity or of relaxation? The interpreters calmly lead their readers to suppose that the former is the case, whereas the contrary seems as clear as words can make it. Instead of the dictatorial "Here shall the sick person make," we find a phrase that leaves him open to act as he chooses,—“there shall the sick person be moved to make &c.,” and instead of simply affirming that the priest shall absolve him, the qualifying words are added, “if he humbly and heartily desire it.”

As for putting the sick person through the torture suggested by the interpreters, and holding a possible refusal of absolution *in terrorem* over them, it need only be said that the idea is odious and repulsive to every Protestant Churchman, and is bitterly repugnant to the whole teaching of the Prayer Book, and to the whole tenor of Scripture. Moreover, it has been emphatically reprobated by the Bishops of our Church.

R. B. G.

(To be continued.)

*The Charges delivered at his Primary Visitation.* By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., First Bishop of Liverpool. Pp. 50. W. Hunt & Co.

*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester, at his Primary Visitation in 1881.* By ANTHONY W. THOROLD, D.D., Ninety-eighth Bishop. Pp. 96. John Murray.

THE first Bishop of Liverpool; the ninety-eighth Bishop of Rochester. Such a statement is suggestive. There is adaptability in the grand old Church; it is vigorous as well as venerable.

The Bishop of Liverpool, in the opening passage of his first Address, sounds a clear and worthy note:—

My rev. and lay brethren, [he says] we are gathered together to-day on an occasion of much interest and real solemnity. This is the primary visitation of the first Bishop of a new English Diocese. How many visitations may be held, and how many Episcopal Charges delivered before the end of all things, no man can tell. Let us pray that there may be always found in this Diocese a trumpet which shall give no uncertain sound, and a Bishop who shall promote the real interests of the Reformed Church of England.

“No uncertain sound.” Whatever else may be said in disparagement of Dr. Ryle’s episcopal utterances, upon the point of clearness, at all events, no exception will be taken; the ἀδρῆλον φωνήν cannot, by any critic, be quoted against them.

The first division of the Bishop’s Charge was delivered in the pro-Cathedral of St. Peter, Liverpool, on Oct. 19; the second in the parish church of All Saints’, Wigan, on Oct. 20. A considerable portion, of course, relates to the diocese. Its population; its peculiar features; its obvious needs; its financial position; its existing organizations; these and other such matters, are discussed. The National Church and the See of Liverpool; what are the facts?

From the Bishop’s statement, made in summing diocesan statistics, we quote one passage:—

The spiritual provision which the Church of England has hitherto made for the 1,100,000 inhabitants of our Diocese appears painfully inadequate. In touching this subject, I would have it distinctly understood that I do not ignore the good work which has been done by our Nonconformist brethren. I thankfully acknowledge the service they have rendered to Christ's cause in Liverpool. Nor can I forget the praiseworthy zeal with which the Romish Church has provided for its adherents. Still, after every deduction, I think it is impossible to deny that there are myriads of dwellers in our Diocese for whose souls no means of grace are provided, and whose condition urgently demands the attention of Churchmen. If the Established Church of this country claims to be "the Church of the people," it is her bounden duty to see that no part of "the people" are left like sheep without a shepherd. If she claims to be a territorial, and not a congregational, Church, she should never rest till there is neither a street, nor a lane, nor a house, nor a garret, nor a cellar, nor a family, which is not regularly looked after, and provided with the offer of means of grace by her officials.

What is to be done? In the first place, the Bishop asks for a large multiplication of living agents: the Church in the diocese of Liverpool is "frightfully undermanned."<sup>1</sup> Secondly, twelve new churches are required for the city; several important towns in the diocese need new churches.

One favourite answer to the plea for more churches, says the Bishop, is the unhappy fact that there are existing churches which at present are not filled. Upon this fact, which recently published statistics have brought before the readers of the provincial and the metropolitan press, his Lordship's comments, unavoidably perhaps, are cautious and concise.

In the *CHURCHMAN* of September last we remarked, that "the statistics as to the absence of working men from public worship 'at church' or 'at chapel' in the metropolis, and in other great towns, cannot be weighed by any true Christian without feelings of sorrow and alarm." In London, it is said, many churches have been built of late years in populous districts: the preaching may be dull or doctrinally defective; the services may be cold; there may be a sad deficiency of pastoral visitation: anyhow, *where are the working classes?* Similarly, as to Newcastle, Liverpool, and other large and important towns. Such a state of things, view it how one may, is most serious.

We quote the Bishop of Liverpool's plea for more churches:—

"Fill your old churches," is the cry, "and then we will build you new ones." Allow me to say that this is an excuse and not an argument. I am not referring to Liverpool especially, when I say that so long as patrons appoint unfit

---

<sup>1</sup> Only 200 incumbents and 140 curates for 1,100,000 people. There is little in the way of endowment. "My own opinion," says the Bishop, "is most decided, that the Church of England is never in the right position, and can never do her duty as the "Church of the people," and do herself justice, until she has no parochial districts, as a general rule, with a population of more than 5,000; and until, for every such parochial district, she has a presbyter in charge. Even 5,000 is a large number if a clergyman is a thorough pastor and a house-going man. But allowance must, of course, be made for a certain proportion of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, who are looked after by their own ministers."

clergymen who have no gifts suited to their position, and so long as the Church makes no provision for pensioning off invalided or superannuated clergymen, so long there will always be found some empty churches. But empty churches at one end of a city are no reason why we should not build new churches at another. All ministers are not equally adapted to all sorts of parishes and population. Only exercise common sense in the choice of a clergyman, and let him be a man who wisely and lovingly preaches, lives and works the Gospel, and I am certain he will never preach to empty benches. There are many proofs in this Diocese that I am saying the truth. But, alas, when people have little will to help Christ's cause, they never want reasons to confirm their will! Too many seem to forget that, in the matter of church building, or in any work for Christ, duties are ours, and results are in the hand of God.

When addressing particularly the incumbents of great colliery parishes, the Bishop, in language which carries one's thoughts back to his description of the state of things before the revival of the last century, gives most excellent advice:—

Encourage [he says] and invite every right-minded layman near you to come forward and give you his help. Never, never be afraid of enlisting the aid of the laity. Cast away for ever the old tradition that religious work is to be left to the clergy alone. Boldly make use of "lay" talent, and you will never be without "lay" talent to use. Trust the laity, and the laity will trust you. Stir up every Christian man and woman in your congregation, who has a few hours to spare in the week, to give you some voluntary aid. Break up your huge parish into well-organized territorial districts, and give to each helper his own special district. Urge your helpers to get together people wherever they can, in a shed, or a cottage, or a barn, and to give the simplest and most elementary Christian instruction, plain, kindly talk about Christ, simple extempore prayer, and hearty, lively singing. Do this, and persevere in doing it, and I am sure you will not labour in vain. Do this, and persevere in doing it, and, in process of time, the Mission-room, the Church, and the regular parochial district will be the happy result, and, what is far better, a harvest of saved souls.

Concerning a cathedral, the Bishop, not forgetting his "Church Reform" letters, speaks of the "theory," the ideal, of a cathedral establishment. But, as a practical man, he comes to the point. "Let us count the cost." Truro has a rich Exeter canonry; Liverpool has no endowment, no site; and the expense would be enormous. Above all, Liverpool needs living agents, needs new churches. "My first and foremost business, as Bishop of a new diocese," says Dr. Ryle, "is to provide for preaching the gospel to souls now entirely neglected, whom no cathedral would touch." "Nevertheless," he adds, "if any one comes forward with a princely offer like that of the ladies who have built Edinburgh Cathedral,—or if any one will do in Liverpool what has been lately done at St. Patrick's and Christ Church Cathedrals in Dublin, or at St. Finbar's in Cork,—I shall be deeply grateful."

The great ecclesiastical questions of the day are of such a "burning" character that a man cannot handle them without coming into collision with somebody's cherished opinions. But a diocese has a right to ex-

pect its Bishop to say what he thinks at his Visitation; and in Liverpool, we judge, no proper expectations were disappointed.<sup>1</sup>

The present position of the Church of England, says Bishop Ryle, is perilous; "more critical and perilous than it has been at any period during the last two centuries." Nevertheless, "reason and sanctified common sense" may yet prevail. "So long indeed as the Church is true to herself, and to the great principles of the Reformation, so long . . . the laity will not allow her to be disestablished. She will be tested by her fruits."

The Bishop's observations on the present "crisis" deserve to be studied with care: he states the main and plain facts of the case, and he shows the danger of drifting away from legal and long-established landmarks. Nor does he omit to notice the shortsightedness or the apathy of those who, really disliking a quasi-Roman ritual, weaken the hands of their brethren who deem it their duty to resist it.

With the party of whom I am now speaking, says his Lordship, "the whole value of ceremonial consists in its significance as a visible symbol of doctrine. The evidence of leading men before the Ritual Commission, the language continually used in certain books and manuals about the Lord's Supper, all tend to show that the question in dispute is, whether in the sacrament there is a propitiatory sacrifice as well as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and whether there is a real *presence* beside that in the hearts of believers. These are not trifles, but serious doctrinal errors, and points on which I am persuaded the bulk of English Churchmen will never tolerate the least approach to the Church of Rome. To use the words of the late Bishop Thirlwall, 'The real question is, whether our communion office is to be transformed into the closest possible resemblance to the Romish Mass.'"—(*Thirlwall's Remains*, vol. ii. 233.) (See also Note 2 at the end.)<sup>2</sup>

This is, indeed, *the question*. Would to God that all loyal Churchmen realized its significance!

As to myself, says the Bishop, "my mind is made up. I mean to abide by the decisions of the Courts of Law, so long as those decisions are not superseded and nullified by Parliament, or reversed. I see no other safe or satisfactory course to adopt. A Bishop who sets himself *above the law*, and ignores its decrees, is launched on a sea of uncertainties, which I, for one, decline to face. I cannot forget, that as a chief officer of the

<sup>1</sup> We notice with pleasure, taking the portion of the Charge which relates to the Revised Version, that the views which have been advanced in the CHURCHMAN agree with the opinions of so sound a scholar, and such a master of English, as Dr. Ryle.

<sup>2</sup> NOTE 2.—The following evidence was deliberately given by that well-known clergyman, the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome, before the Royal Commission, on Ritual:—

"2606. 'Is any doctrine involved in your using the chasuble?' 'I think there is.'

"2607. 'What is that doctrine?' 'The doctrine of the sacrifice.'

"2608. 'Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?' 'Distinctly so.'

"2611. 'Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?' 'Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice.'

"Church, I am specially bound to set an example of obedience to the powers that be, and to acknowledge the Queen's authority in things ecclesiastical as well as temporal." And, "with a settled resolution to be just and fair, and kind to clergymen of every school of thought, whether High, or Low, or Broad, or no party," the Bishop entreats his Clergy, for peace's sake, to keep within the limits of the judicial decisions on the great points which have been disputed, argued, and determined in the last few years.<sup>1</sup>

We cannot refrain from quoting one portion of Bishop Ryle's remarks upon a Ritualistic Congregationalism :—

Shall we adopt the notable plan of throwing open the whole question of usages in the Lord's Supper, and allowing every clergyman to administer it with any ceremonies he likes? This, I suppose, is the policy of "forbearance and toleration" for which many have petitioned, though how such a policy could be carried out, in the face of the last decisions, I fail to see, except by a special Act of Parliament. A more unwise and suicidal policy than this I cannot conceive. You would divide every Diocese into two distinct and sharply-cut parties. You would divide the clergy into two separate classes—those who wore chasubles, and those who did not; and of course there would be no more communion between the two classes. As to the unfortunate Bishops, they must either have no consciences, and see no differences, and be honorary members of all schools of thought, or else they must offend one party of their clergy and please the other. This is indeed a miserable prospect! "Forbearance and toleration" are fine, high sounding words; but if they mean that every clergyman is to be allowed to do what he likes, they seem to me the certain forerunner of confusion, division, and disruption (See Note 3 at the end).<sup>2</sup>

Those portions of the Bishop's Charges which lay stress upon preaching the Gospel, are, we need hardly say, exceedingly valuable. We have read them with intense thankfulness and unmingled satisfaction.

<sup>1</sup> The changes of laws and customs, as the prelate, with statesmanlike sense, shows clearly, have rendered certain rubrical requirements inexpedient. Further, as regards obedience to rubrics, there is no parallelism between acts of omission and acts of addition. "To place on the same level the conduct of the man who, in administering the Lord's Supper, introduces novelties of most serious doctrinal significance, and the conduct of the man who does not observe some petty obsolete direction, of no doctrinal significance at all, is to my mind," says Dr. Ryle, "contrary to common sense."

<sup>2</sup> NOTE 3.—"We cannot but respect the courage and openness with which the leaders of the Ritualistic movement avow their designs, and disclose their plan of operation. They inform us that their party is engaged in a 'crusade against Protestantism,' and aims at nothing less than 're-Catholicizing the Church of England, and that with a view to this ultimate object they are agitating for disestablishment.' After this, it must be our own fault if we are not on our guard. But when the same persons put in a plea for toleration, I do not know how to illustrate the character of such a proposal more aptly than by the image suggested by one of themselves, of 'two great camps.' It is as if one of these camps should send to the other some such message as this :—'We are on our march to take possession of your camp, and to make you our prisoners; but all we desire is, that you should let us alone, and should not attempt to put any hindrance in our way.'"—*Bishop Thirlwall's Remains*, vol. ii. p. 307.

The Bishop of Rochester's Charge is divided into six chapters: "Four Years," "The Diocese in 1881," "Wants," "Counsels and Directions," "Church Problems," "The Out-look."

Rochester diocese, with its three archdeaconries, 291 parishes, and 572 clergy, has a population of 1,800,000. The number of sittings is 214,575; the average church attendance has been, morning 120,289, evening 131,462. There are 17,749 "Church Workers;" 161 parishes have "Diocesan Lay-Preachers or Readers."

The results of the Bishop's inquiries are printed in a shape that may coax even haters of statistics to glance at them. As a specimen we subjoin the table which relates to Divine Worship:—

No. of Parishes.	Daily Service at least once.	Weekly Communion.	Holy Communion on Saints' Days.	Evening Communion.	Week-day Evening Service.	Public Catechising.
291	58	117	79	100	114	178

Having arranged the results of an examination of some 2,000 pages of statistics, the Bishop thus concludes:—

Without wishing to use inflated language about our own prospects as a diocese, or the immediate future of the English Church, I have a deep conviction that we have a vast work and a great opening in front. Our opportunities are immense, equalled only by our responsibilities. God help us to weigh and use them both. The progress of mental culture and refinement is, on the whole, not unlikely to tell in favour of a Communion (supposing that there is a Church of the living God), which has a history not quite inglorious, an ancestry of divines, of which most Christians are proud, a liturgy both devout and stately; and the unimpaired deposit of the Catholic Faith. Nevertheless, even more depends on our diligence, and our reasonableness, and our charity, and—our holding fast the Gospel.

A map of the diocese is given; and it appears that thirty-four Churches and thirty-nine Mission Chapels are thought to be required. The Diocesan Conference, after a full debate, resolved that ten new churches are immediately required. How is the money to be got? Our lay-brethren, says the Bishop's *ad clerum*, refer us to the City churches, "empty and always likely to be empty: work that mine well." The voice of the laity, as the Bishop gives expression to it, is much to the point: there is a pertinent protest, *e.g.*, against "magnificent buildings." His lordship concludes:—

There are also very many good, reasonable, and wealthy persons, both men and women, who, for their Saviour's honour and their country's welfare, honestly desire to enable the Church of the nation to attain her proper level of duty and service; but only on these two conditions: that the churches which they build, or help to build, shall not presently be turned into what simple

people cannot distinguish from mass-houses; and that the incumbent of a parish shall not make his own self-will the instrument of tyranny over his flock.

Referring to the evangelization efforts of Nonconformists, laymen as well as ministers, the Bishop says:—"We can observe closely, criticize fairly, learn candidly; sincerely praying for them that the Divine Redeemer of souls will overrule their honest efforts for the glory of His name." And, further, we must honestly ask ourselves [the italics are our own] "*if there is nothing more that the Church can do on her own lines and by her own methods?*"

Our own opinion is, that the Church can do many things more on her own lines. There is, e.g., the urgent need of elasticity as regards the Services; simplifying and shortening are really needed. Again, there is the question of a Lay Diaconate. Further, on the particular point now brought before us, there is the securing for poor populous districts, either by bringing men from over-manned dioceses like Norwich, or by accepting earnest candidates with a generosity suited to the times, an increased supply of clerical power.

Many earnest and spiritually-minded laymen who have not had a University education are admirably fitted for Mission work. At present, as we hear from many quarters, an appeal to a Bishop is in vain: "he must get a degree, or at least go to a Theological College for two years."

We gladly quote, as stating the need, the earnest words of Bishop Thorold:—

We have much to do yet; indeed, have we as yet really begun to do it? We have reached individuals, but have we touched the masses? Single homes have welcomed the Saviour; to the millions He is practically an unknown name. My own deep, growing conviction is this, that if we would not see the mass of the working people hopelessly surrendered either to a gross animalism or dismal unbelief, we must throw our prejudices to the winds, and organize a brotherhood of Christian workers, which with simple creed, resolute purpose, real sacrifice, and fervent devotion, shall march under the Church's banner, and preach her Gospel for the salvation of souls to Christ.

Upon the subject of Evening Communion Bishop Thorold speaks with force, and with a refreshing firmness: the remarks upon celebrating the Lord's Supper in the evening seem to ourselves, indeed, one of the most striking and practical passages in the Charge.

On the observance of Rubrics, the Bishop says:—

It seems to me that the entire Church has of late made a distinct advance in its appreciation of the importance of observing rubrics, both out of respect to authority and a desire for peace. That was a significant sentence, as sincere as it was significant, in Bishop Perry's memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury,—"We fully recognise the authority of the bishops to exact a rigid observance of the rubrical law of the Church from all parties within her pale:" while many will quite consistently fail to "perceive how justice can require such an observance of rubrical law as would place the revival of obsolete rubrics involving non-essential principle in the same category with long discarded ceremonial." [If, not without some reluctance, I venture to indicate distinctly, I hope temperately, what procedure on your part may help for peace, while also edifying the



Church generally, you I know will not be slow earnestly to consider as before God your duty in the matter. Only, when your course seems plain, be sure to consult your people, and while discreetly inviting confidence in yourselves claim sympathy for your brethren. A certain sacrifice of feeling may be necessary; and a brief misconception must be risked: but past experience convinces me that in the great majority of cases your motives will be appreciated and your counsel followed. Rubrics may perhaps be roughly distributed into three classes, of worship, edification, and faith. Under the first are the rubrics of daily prayer, baptism during Divine service, reading the offertory sentences, with the prayer for the Church Militant, and the suitable observance of Saints' days. Where the income makes the staff adequate, still more if the congregation wish for it, at least one daily service is a rightful privilege. In mother churches the parish has a real claim for it. Nothing so diminishes the dignity of Holy Baptism as huddling it into a corner of the day when the church is empty and the worshippers few. The prayer for the Church Militant, with the offertory sentences, adds barely four minutes to the service. A slight curtailment in the music would make it easily practicable: still it should be introduced with caution. Among Rubrics of Edification shall I be thought fanciful in placing that which enjoins the presenting and placing the elements on the Holy Table immediately before saying the prayer for the Church Militant? Edifying, because suggestive of an obvious truth.

At this sentence, we pause. We are not sure that we understand it; but we may at least venture to point out that the Bishop, through an inadvertence, has incorrectly referred to the rubrics. While the first rubric says "*humbly present and place,*" the second simply says "place." We have no desire to express any opinion upon the rubric to which the honoured Prelate has referred—we do not forget the Liddell judgment in 1857; but we must confess that the doctrinal difference between the rubric as to the alms and the rubric as to the elements, historically speaking, seems to us significant.

We continue our quotation. His Lordship says:—

While the great number of communicants has in some churches made it convenient that the words to the communicant should be said to a railful at a time, instead of singly to each, I cannot doubt that the latter is the intention of the Church, and that it is desirable to follow it when possible. The rubric of faith is that which enjoins the public saying of the Athanasian Creed on certain days. It appears to me that it is a clergyman's duty simply to observe the Church's orders, and that he is not responsible for what he may consider to be their indiscreetness. As to the black gown, it is absolutely immaterial. Personally, I prefer the surplice, for it prevents an unnecessary change of habit at an awkward moment; but I am not aware that any formal judgment has ever been given on the matter; and it involves no principle. As to surpliced choirs: f the choirs themselves like the surplice, why not gratify them?

Understand, says the Bishop, I do not insist, but I advise. "The alteration, where needed, can be gradual, but let it be faced. No doctrine need be diluted, no principle compromised, no pledge broken; simply the Church obeyed, and fair-play done, and the sense of justice satisfied."

These suggestions seem to us, as a whole, sagacious and seasonable. When there is a collection, *e.g.*, the prayer for the Church Militant is the

proper sequel of the offertory. Concerning Saints' Days, again, where a congregation may be secured, and the clergyman is not overworked, we have always held a strong opinion. We are not able to agree with the Bishop, however, that there "ought to be" a celebration of the Holy Communion every Sunday in town churches. To use his Lordship's own words,—Is it "*the intention of the Church?*" We think not. It may be, however, that the Bishop refers to the larger town parishes.

In the Chapter headed "Church Problems," Dr. Thorold remarks that the Ritualists repudiated the decision of the Courts *when it went against them*. "It may be inferred from the circumstance of the appeal being made by themselves to the Final Court, that had it gone for them, they would have accepted it, and then the dispute about jurisdiction would not have arisen. But when it went against them, to accept it was found to be putting the Church under Cæsar."

As regards a distinctive vestment for the Eucharistic service, the Bishop points out (p. 66) that the claim to use a special vestment "will never succeed in dissociating itself, in the minds of ordinary Churchmen, from the theory of an objective Presence." Again, in chap. vi., "The Outlook," he remarks:—"There is a plain tendency to develop a new Eucharistic theory, differing not only from the teaching of our own formularies, but from anything that the Catholic Church has ever yet taught or known."<sup>1</sup> Canon Trevor's book on the "Catholic Doctrine" of the Eucharist, his Lordship well says, is worth the careful study of any who doubt the seriousness of the case. It is indeed a remarkable book. Canon Garbett's "The Voices of the Church," we may add, a learned and laborious work, also proves how the Ritualists have advanced far beyond Anglicans and High Churchmen, properly so-called. The case is, indeed, serious. But it is not only ritual. Auricular Confession is "more eagerly pressed, and more diligently practised, by an advanced school among us every year."

Referring to the Royal Commission, "a strong Commission," the Bishop says:—"I earnestly hope they will take time enough for coming to a decision."

The English Church, like other public bodies, has its irreconcilables, who serve a very useful purpose, but whom nothing will ever conciliate or satisfy, except sheer liberty to do just what they please. They cannot too soon understand that it will never be granted them; and that if we cannot win their assent we do not fear their violence. But there are many, very many, who do not say much, and neither fret nor bluster, but who are seriously uneasy at the present relations between the Church and the Civil power, and who feel that some rectification of the existing balance of authority should at least be considered. They are worth conciliating, for they are among the most dutiful and valuable of the Church's sons; and if the new Commission can adequately persuade them that due attention has been given to what they feel to be solid grievances, a substantial service will be done. But there is still a more excellent

<sup>1</sup> It is a pity, perhaps, that the sentence on p. 67 stands alone, unexplained. In his anxiety to do justice towards those who differ from him, the Bishop puts into their mouths a statement as to ritual which symbolizes "a doctrine of the Eucharist which the Church had nearly lost, but ought not to lose."

way. "If a Church is full of errors and foolish practices, while it is possible to attack those follies outright, showing conclusively how foolish they are, it is possible and surely better to wake up the true spiritual life in the Church, which shall itself shed those follies, and cast them out; or at least rob them of their worst harmfulness."

Several other passages in this Charge we had marked for extract; but we must forbear. The Charge, we doubt not, will be widely read. It is full, persuasive, dignified, and will bear reading more than once. Of its intense earnestness, of its literary grace, of its large-heartedness, of its administrative ability, of its fervent spirituality, not a word need here be written.

---

*The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church.* By F. E. WARREN, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1881.

IN an article in the September CHURCHMAN we considered the leading peculiarities of the Celtic Church of Ireland, and traced the course of legislation by which it was brought into conformity with the pattern of the rest of the Western World, and into connection with, and then into bondage to, the See of Rome. Lately, a flood of light has been cast upon one department of this subject by the publication of the researches of Mr. Warren into the ritual and liturgy of the Celtic Churches of Britain and Ireland, illustrated by that extensive liturgical learning of which he is the known possessor. It is no small gratification to the Celtic student that this study has been taken up by one who has viewed the whole field of liturgical knowledge, and who, as an English scholar, will command the attention of a class of readers beyond the reach of any Irish or Scottish writer, no matter how eminent.

Mr. Warren has treated the subject in a manner worthy his reputation. He has opened up a new branch of knowledge; and, so far as his use of the scanty materials at his command is concerned, he has left nothing to be desired. Until the appearance of his book, the only facts known were that the Celtic Churches had a ritual of some kind, and that it was different from the Roman. From his examination of undoubted writings of the seventh and eighth centuries—viz., the Books of Mulling, Dimma, the "Antiphonarium Benchorensis," with the "Stowe Missal," the "Book of Deer," the "Book of Armagh," and some St. Gall MSS. of the ninth, compared with later manuscripts, and illustrated by literary and archaeological remains, he has been able to sketch for us an outline of the liturgy and ritual of the Celtic Churches, and he has been able to give us, what we never had before, a definite conception of their worship and its peculiarities. We regret that he does not seem to have had before him Mr. King's works, "The Primacy of Armagh" and the "Primer of the History of the Holy Catholic Church in Ireland." Especially in the latter, this eminent writer touches in several places upon the ground trodden by Mr. Warren, and, indeed, somewhat anticipates his results.

Mr. Warren brings out in a very striking manner, in his introduction, the independence of Rome that characterized the early churches of these islands. He shows that they were independent in origin, mission and jurisdiction. He gives instances of the sturdy spirit that was manifested by Celtic churchmen. The case of Bishop Dagan, to be found in "Bede," is well known,—how this Irish bishop refused, not merely to eat and drink with the Roman bishops, but even to eat and drink in the same house. More remarkable still was the conduct of Columbanus at a later period. His language to the then pope "implied assertion of exemption from the

jurisdiction, and a claim to be allowed to criticize freely, and from the independent standpoint of an equal, the character and conduct of any Roman pontiff." Mr. Warren sums up the position taken by Columbanus in the following words :—

The language which he used to Boniface IV. is not that of a subordinate, but is couched in terms the freedom of which may not have been resented then, but would certainly be resented now. He laments over the infamy attaching itself to the chair of St. Peter in consequence of disputes at Rome. He exhorts the Pope to be more on the watch, and to cleanse his See from error, because it would be a lamentable thing if the Catholic faith was not held in the Apostolic See. He says that many persons entertain doubts as to the purity of the faith of the Roman bishop. He allows a high post of honour to the See of Rome, but second to that of Jerusalem, the place of our Lord's resurrection. He upbraids the Roman Church for proudly claiming a greater authority and power in divine things than was possessed by other Churches merely because of a certain fact recorded in the Gospels, and denied by no one, that our Lord entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven to St. Peter, and points out that the prerogative of the keys stands upon a different basis, and must be wielded on other grounds.

The position thus taken by her eminent son on the Continent gives an idea of that of the Church at home, in Ireland, towards the Papal See.

Mr. Warren further proceeds to show the Eastern origin and the Gallican connection of the Celtic Church.

With regard to the liturgy and ritual he gives us many interesting particulars. Celtic churches were small, and "were not named after departed saints, but after their living founders." The Celtic service was remarkable for several peculiarities. The Irish were charged with differing from the rule of other Churches, and celebrating the Holy Eucharist with a great number and variety of collects and prayers. The Lord's Prayer was not introduced as in the Roman missal; and from this arises, Mr. Warren shows, "one of the strongest proofs of an Ephesine rather than a Petrine origin of the Celtic liturgy." The sermon came next after the Gospel. The benediction was given with the right hand, and in the Eastern manner. Prayers for the dead are found dating from the fifth and sixth centuries. "There are no instances recorded of the modern practice of praying to departed saints, although there was a strong and devout belief in the efficacy of their prayers for those left on earth."

Two colours seem to have been in use—purple or red, and white. The altar is stated by Mr. Warren to have been sometimes of stone, sometimes of wood. But we have evidence<sup>1</sup> that to the time of the Synod of Dublin, 1186, the custom of the Church of Ireland was to have communion tables of wood; and in that synod, such tables were prohibited, and stone altars were ordered to be erected.

Mr. Warren gives us several particulars as to the dress of ecclesiastics. Celtic bishops wore a little-known ornament, called a *rationale*, in the same position, and having the appearance of the breastplate of the Jewish high priests. Many specimens of the pastoral staff of ancient times still exist; and if we are to take the pastoral staff of St. Moloch as typical of early use, it was something else as well as a ritual ornament. It "is a blackthorn bludgeon, with traces of a metal covering;" and seems to have been better adapted for enforcing discipline in a rough and ready way than for ornamenting a procession. Irish bishops seem to have worn crowns instead of mitres. With regard to some other points, such as bracelets, the comb, and the fan, Mr. Warren will be the first to admit that there is really no conclusive evidence of their ritual use. In order to exhaust his

<sup>1</sup> THE CHURCHMAN, vol iv. p. 433.

subject, Mr. Warren has mentioned them, and anything that even remotely refers to them; but there is really nothing in it.

No passage has been discovered referring to the use of incense in the Celtic Church; nor is there trace of incense in the early Gallican Church.

With regard to confession, Mr. Warren's observations are very interesting, and but corroborate and confirm the opinions that must have been formed by every candid student of Celtic literature. There is no trace of it as a preparation for the reception or celebration of the Eucharist. A confessor was *amncara*, or son's friend. Confession was public rather than private; it was optional rather than compulsory. Absolution was only pronounced after the imposed penance had been fulfilled.

Many other points of curious interest might be noted. The creed given in the "Antiphony of Bangor" is different in wording from all other forms known to exist, and its position resembles that of the Mozarabic rite, which points to a special connection, as does also the prominent position given to the Benedicite.

The foregoing is an abstract of the picture of the ritual of the Church of St. Patrick, drawn for us by a most competent hand. We see that in every respect it agrees with what we have already stated. The Church of St. Patrick was Eastern, not Italian; regarded St. John and Ephesus more than St. Peter and Rome, and maintained for many a year an attitude towards the Roman See distinctly hostile. Of course we find many of the corruptions of the age, but we find also much to remind us of the primitive simplicity of Apostolic days. In considering the teaching of the Church of St. Patrick, and of its members, we find how unlike it is to the doctrine and practice of Modern Roman Catholicism, and how much nearer it is to the teaching of its descendant, the Reformed Church of Ireland.

C. S.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Records of the Past.* English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments, published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. XII. Egyptian Texts. S. Bagster & Sons.

The present volume, which completes the present series, says Dr. Birch, in a brief preface, "closes the translations of the principal Assyrian and Egyptian texts." A new series, it is hoped, will be undertaken, in due course. Meantime, the great benefit which *The Records of the Past*—twelve volumes—have conferred on the advance of the researches into the mythology and literature of Egypt and Assyria must be gratefully acknowledged. We set a high value on this series. By an inadvertence which we regret a notice of the closing volume has been delayed.

*Early Britain.* By GRANT ALLEN, B.A. Pp. 234. S.P.C.K.

"It was not the Roman mission which finally succeeded in converting the North and the Midlands. That success was due to the Scottish and Pictish Church." The Italian monks who accompanied Augustine did a great work, no doubt; but due credit should be given to the men of Britanic feelings who derived their Orders from Iona. So writes the author of the interesting book before us, which contains a good deal of information about these matters. On Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature there are well-written chapters.