

This is not the only instance of the quiet assumption of such high-sounding words. I say nothing for or against the use of incense in itself. It may be capable of being defended on other grounds. All I plead for is that it should not be defended on a false ground.

All symbolism is liable to abuse. Indeed, symbols are a kind of dumb language, and thus liable to misuse, even as uttered sounds.

Upward through symbolism the human soul has been raised to the knowledge of an unseen God; downward through symbolism it has sunk into mere materialism.

J. J. RAVEN.

FRESSINGFIELD VICARAGE,
SUFFOLK.



ART. VIII.—AN OCTOGENARIAN'S VIEW OF THE RITUALISTIC DISPUTE.

THE peculiarity of the position of one who is an octogenarian, and something more, in relation to our unhappy divisions, consists in this: that his memory carries him back to the period before the thirties—that is, to the rise of the Oxford School of theology, out of which was developed the ritualistic party. The writer has thus a clear recollection of the state of the Church before the rise of the present disputes. There were then two distinct parties, the old High Church or orthodox, as they perhaps preferred to call themselves, and the Evangelical or Low Church. The High Church element often consisted in little more than an extreme dislike of every form of Dissent, while the Low Church principle was mainly seen in a tendency to fraternize with Dissent, or at least with those whom they regarded as orthodox Dissenters. But it was in their theological views that the difference between the two parties was chiefly apparent, the so-called orthodox preacher, while giving a cold assent to the doctrine of the Trinity, contenting himself for the most part with moral teaching, dreading all approach to enthusiasm. The Evangelical, on the other hand, insisted much on personal religion, on justification by faith in the Atonement by the Son of God, and on the direct influence of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the sinner, and in a continuous process of sanctification. The difference between the two parties within the sacred buildings was apparent only in the utterances from the pulpit. There were doubtless two opposite doctrines on the efficacy of the sacraments, the one resting it on the mere *opus*

operatum, the other making it dependent on the faith of the recipient; but the form of administration of the Sacraments was subject to no alteration. The order of Divine Service was practically the same in all churches; the morning service on Sunday consisted of Matins with Litany, followed by the Communion Service with Sermon. The Holy Communion, however, was ordinarily administered not oftener than once a month; and on these occasions the non-communicants usually left the church at the conclusion of the sermon, the result of which was that the Communion proper came to be considered as commencing with the reading of the offertory sentences, and on non-Communion Sundays the morning service was supposed to end with the close of the sermon. The administration of the Lord's Supper at any other time, except in the case of private Communion, was quite unknown. Nor were there any party distinctions in the matter of music and singing. Every congregation availed itself of the best music it could secure, but the singing was confined to the metrical psalms and hymns, and chanting was only introduced at a later date, and then it was not connected with any theological differences, for it was adopted in some Dissenting chapels as well as in churches.

During the thirties the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" went gradually on, and more and more attracted the attention of religious circles and of the public press. The excitement was intensified by the avowal of one of the writers, published after his death by his friends—"We must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation"—and was brought to a head by a treatise undertaking to show that all the Thirty-nine Articles may be rightly subscribed by a man holding all Roman doctrine. It is not to be wondered at that ordinary Churchmen were thus disposed to look with suspicion upon a movement which led to such a result, and even to distrust High Churchmen, who only partially accepted it. In this way even a strict adherence to the rubrics was regarded with disfavour. It is, of course, a particular rubric—that known as the "Ornaments Rubric"—which forms the basis of the ritualistic position. We all agree that it is rightly made a point of conscience to "submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," and there is no doubt that this rubric has the full authority, both of Church and State, having been passed with the rest of the Prayer-Book by both Houses of Convocation in both the provinces of Canterbury and York, and having been made an Act of Parliament by the united consent of Kings, Lords, and Commons. But in order to obey this law, we must first ascertain its meaning. There are three words

in it which demand careful examination—*such, retained, and shall*. It will be noticed that no particular ornament or ceremony is mentioned, but only a class of ornaments defined by the word *such*, and to explain what these are we are referred to an old Act of Parliament passed more than a hundred years previously. Next we notice that the ornaments thus referred to are to be *retained*. Now, by “retain” we mean keeping something we already possess, not recovering something which has been lost. We should therefore naturally assume that the ornaments in question would be those actually in use, at least, up to the time of the abrogation of the royal authority by the usurpation of Cromwell. Otherwise the word “restore” or “revive” would have been employed instead of “retain.” Lastly, the word *shall* implies compulsion, not permission; and it is evident that an Act of Uniformity must have been intended by the authorities both of Church and State to establish one uniform method of Divine worship, both in words and in ceremonies.

In these remarks I am making no attempt to define the meaning of the rubric; my point is rather that it cannot be defined by any individual, lay or clerical, but only by the proper authorities in Church and State, with the assistance of experts in law and history. Looking back upon the history of the past seventy years, I cannot help feeling that had it not been for the many innovations in ritual which have ticketed many Churches as *High*, we should have avoided much of the discord which now prevails. Certainly there have not been wanting signs of an approximation between the parties; for the High Church have become more Evangelical in their teaching, and the Low Church have shown more regard for ecclesiastical organization. I may mention in this connection that it was to the *Christian Observer* (about the year 1840), a recognised organ at that day of the Evangelicals, that I was indebted for my first apprehension of the important place which the Convocations of the clergy have always held in our constitution, and the need of their revival for the due self-government of the Church. It was also to a pronounced Evangelical, the father of the present Dean of Arches, that I was indebted for a book which impressed upon me the Scriptural authority for episcopacy, and it was the Evangelical Milner's Church History which first led me to value the early Fathers.

We have been groping all along after better methods of bringing face to face persons of opposite opinions for the open discussion of differences.

By the revival of the rural deaneries and the ruri-decanal chapter; by the creation of diocesan conferences, with both clerical and lay representatives from each deanery; by the

regular meetings of the Convocations of clergy, and the establishment beside them of consultative houses of laymen, and by the informal discussion of Church Congresses, we have been gradually educated towards a comprehension of corporate Church life.

But such corporate life is surely impossible so long as each individual priest makes it a point of conscience to regulate his practice by his own interpretation of an obscure rubric, and by his conception of what is consistent with the claims of Catholicity. There remains the hope that if it be found possible to construct an assembly representative of the whole national Church, both lay and clerical, the voice of such a body may by all, except extreme Churchmen, be accepted as conclusive.

J. B. ANSTED, M.A.

Notices of Books.

A Soul's Emancipation: a Record of Personal Experiences. By FRANÇOIS F. GRANJON. Translated from the French by ROBERT COLQUHOUN FAITHFULL, M.A. With an Introduction by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A., Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral. London: Elliot Stock. Pp. xiii + 207. 5s.

The author of this volume, M. Granjon, formerly a Roman Catholic priest, is now pastor in the Reformed Church of France at Puys S. Martin. His narrative, originally published under the title of "Le Roman d'une Conscience," is understood to represent in all essential respects his own history. It describes the education for the priesthood of the son of a factory overlooker in a provincial town, begun when the boy was eleven years of age, and systematically carried on through its successive stages till the time of his ordination. An interesting account is given of the young priest's life in various spheres of work, and of the circumstances under which, at the end of nine years, he finally resolved to declare himself a Protestant. Chancellor Lias, in a vigorously written introduction, emphasizes the moral of the story as showing the evil effects of the seminary system on those subjected to it, reducing the individual into a part of a vast machine, with neither a will nor a motive power of his own. He points out the danger of the attempts made in some quarters at home to copy in a certain measure Roman methods, with a view to filling up deficiencies in the ranks of our clergy, by the selection of youths from national schools, and their isolation at an early age for a purely professional (or even semi-monastic) training. We would add that M. Granjon's story discloses two other crying evils, one of them being the mischief done by garbled text-books in which the true history of Christian doctrines and institutions is suppressed. The other is the immense loss that France