

Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]

"EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUALISM."

(The "Churchman," January, 1913, p. 8.)

SOME years ago I happened to be at a church in an obscure part of London, the Vicar of which was what many would call an ultra-Protestant. I noticed that the Communion table stood out in the middle of the apse, and he informed me that he habitually stood behind it at the Communion Service, facing the congregation. I said with a smile: "I should not have thought you were the man to adopt the Papal position!" For is it not the fact that the Popes themselves have never adopted the Eastward position, but have continued to celebrate, when they do so, facing the people?

This Westward position is now suggested by the Dean of St. Aidan's College, in last month's CHURCHMAN, as one device for winning undergraduates to Evangelicalism, and counteracting the influence of the Sacerdotalists. I wonder what we Evangelicals would have said if High Churchmen, when they began their innovations sixty years ago, had happened to adopt this Westward position. I can imagine the denunciations from every Protestant platform of the new practice of the priest presuming to stand in the Lord's place, thus separating himself from the people, instead of humbly receiving the sacred tokens of Divine Love as one of them. I can imagine a fresh application of 2 Thess. ii. 4, where the "man of sin" is described as "sitting as God in the temple of God," words that have often been applied in controversial speeches and writings to the Papacy. I can imagine the suggestion being made that Evangelicals should adopt the Eastward position as a protest against such assumption, and also as identifying the minister with his people!

For on points like these our opinions are often merely conventional, and even accidental. Let me try another imagination. Suppose that a century ago Evangelicals had begun to decorate their churches with familiar texts, as they do sometimes decorate other buildings—the Mildmay Hall, for instance. And suppose that, when symbolism began to be indulged in, the idea had occurred of putting a cross up at the east end. I can imagine the response having been: "Oh, yes! and put under it Gal. vi. 14, or the first verse of 'When I survey.'" Then suppose the old-fashioned "high and dry" men of those days, not

liking this, had put up the Decalogue instead. I can imagine the Evangelical outcry, "They want to substitute the Law for the Gospel!"

I hope these little paradoxes will be excused. There is one thing which I cannot imagine, and that is that Mr. Dewick's proposal will be adopted. Our younger Evangelicals do not wish to mark themselves off so ostentatiously as a definite and narrow party. If they did, they might more reasonably follow another of Mr. Dewick's counsels—viz., get the architects to alter the arrangement of the churches. Let the old three-decker come back, standing in the very centre of the Eastward view, and effectually hiding the holy table. That will be the surest way of diverting attention from an "altar." And incidentally it will restore intelligibility to Cowper's lines, which I find modern readers quite fail to understand:

"Sweet sleep enjoys the curate in his desk,
The tedious rector drawling o'er his head,
And sweet the clerk below."

But Mr. Dewick is quite right when he says that "every new custom or ceremony adopted by the Anglo-Catholic party has been denounced by Evangelicals, but in many cases, after the lapse of a few years, these denunciations have given place to imitation." It is amusing to notice this even in very small things. For example, in my younger days Evangelicals always remained on their knees for the *Gloria in Excelsis*, but gradually High Churchmen taught them to stand up. No sooner had standing become almost universal in Evangelical churches than High Churchmen reversed their practice and went back to kneeling, which example we have again now followed!

On the other hand, let us not forget what High Churchmen have borrowed from Evangelicals. Hymns for instance. Devotees of "A. and M." have often sneered at Tate and Brady's versified Psalter, in happy unconsciousness that Tate and Brady, bound up with most Prayer Books, remained the only admissible selection for a "good Churchman" long after Evangelicals had been bold enough to sing "When I survey," and "Rock of Ages," and "All hail the power."

And let us recognize a far more important fact, that the substance of what a century ago was almost exclusively Evangelical teaching has permeated the Church. However serious the errors of the Sacerdotalists, many of them are now preaching Christ as the Saviour of sinners, which High Churchmen, even in my own younger days, certainly did not—as a body, at least. Most of their sermons, down to the middle of the nineteenth century, were mere moral essays, with now and then a strong insistence on the Church and the Sacraments. One would not then hear from them definitely "Gospel" sermons such as I have heard in recent years when, almost by chance, I have found

myself in an advanced church. The fact is that there is now a school of High Churchmen with whom spiritual interests are the first consideration. They adopt high ritual, not for its own sake, but because they really believe that it is spiritually helpful. And it is worth noting that they dislike much of that "moderate" ritual which Evangelicals are now imitating. They detest anthems and elaborate music; they advocate more simplicity in worship; they are even talking about putting the choir in a west gallery again! And they can use short extempore prayers in mission and intercession services. I for one profoundly disagree with parts of their teaching; but if in the essential matter of salvation by Christ alone they are, however imperfectly, walking in the steps of the old Evangelicals who cared above all for the souls of their people, I am not eager to complain if, on our side, some of the younger men are imitating them in what, after all, are only external matters.

EUGENE STOCK.

"THE PRAYER-BOOK DICTIONARY AND THE
ORNAMENTS RUBRIC."

(*The "Churchman,"* January, 1913, p. 29.)

IN an article under the above heading in the *CHURCHMAN* for January, objection was taken to the title of "fraud Rubric" being applied to the two Rubrics which appeared for the first time in the Prayer-Book published by the Government in 1559, dealing respectively with the "Ornaments of the Church and its Minister," and with the "accustomed place" for the officiant at Morning and Evening Prayer. The question is of importance, since on its solution depends whether the Ornaments Rubric of 1552, or that of 1549, was the one legally authorized "by the authority of Parliament" at the Reformation Settlement under Elizabeth. At first sight it must seem strange how any question of that kind could arise under the 1 Eliz., c. 2. For the Act begins by reciting that the book *remaining at the death* of Edward having been abolished by Mary, "to the great decay of the true honour of God," Mary's repealing Act was therefore repealed—not, however, as a whole, but "ONLY concerning the said book"—so that the First Book of Edward still stood entirely repealed. "The said book" thus legally reinstated was a schedule annexed to the 5 and 6 Ed. VI. (just as "the annexed book" was to the last Act of Uniformity), and was revived, as such, together with the statute of which it formed part. For, as the law then stood, the repeal of a repealing Act reinstated the original Act on the Statute Book. "Therein"—*i.e.*, in this Second Book of Edward—the Elizabethan Act made certain "alterations and additions" which were not made by Orders in Council, nor by Royal prerogative, but were directly "appointed by this statute." Clearly, therefore, we must look to the statute itself to find what those "alterations and

additions," so made, actually were. They are specified in Section 3 as consisting of "one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added at the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise." No alteration of any Rubric was authorized or permitted by that statute, unless (perhaps?) it could be shown that the Queen had "taken order" under the Act by means of a "Commission under the Great Seal for causes ecclesiastical." By these words of Section 3 the two Rubrics of 1552 were explicitly re-enacted under penalties, and no Sacrament, or Creed, or Prayer in the entire book had any other legal warrant. Yet a suggestion was made at p. 37, *supra*, that the words "none other or otherwise" merely meant "that no other book was to be employed": and this under the mistaken impression that in the first Act of Uniformity the same words (though in a different immediate context) had meant nothing more. That opinion, however, is a mistake with regard to both cases alike. "Otherwise" means "in other ways"—*i.e.*, with a ritual environment "other" than "such order and form as is mentioned in the said book." Ritualists similarly claim that, so long as "no other book was employed," incense, altar lights, and pre-Reformation customs remained lawful under the first Act of Uniformity. But the Archbishops ruled in 1899 that this was inadmissible, and that beside excluding other *books* "the words 'none other or otherwise' are clearly meant to exclude all variations," rubrical or textual.

Under these circumstances the burden of proof lies on those who contend that the omission and alteration of the two Rubrics above mentioned was not merely permissible, but had actually been "made by the statute" itself, which does not mention them, and which explicitly forbade any additional changes from the text of 1552 to be introduced. Not a particle of such evidence has ever been produced. The printed books issued by the Crown were not enacted at all: what was enacted was the schedule to 5 and 6 Ed. VI., with only the specified "alterations and additions" mentioned as made "therein," none of which in any way related to the two Rubrics in question. It is claimed (p. 36) that "the proviso must have been intended to make some change possible." No doubt; but a change from what? The re-enacted Rubric of 1552 had made it penal to wear in Divine service either "alb, vestment, or cope." The necessary and immediate result of that would be to throw out of ritual use those three dresses. Waste and "embezzlement" had resulted from the use of those same words in the same book under Edward. All such goods, legal and illegal alike, were by the common law of England already "held in use" by the churchwardens as trustees and responsible custodians of all Church goods. The mere fact that certain of the ornaments had become illegal for a "minister" even to "have," did not alter the tenure of parish property which the proviso required to continue to "be in use"

still, though no longer permissible for *ritual* use by the minister in Divine service. An intimation was therefore given by the proviso to those officials that the discarded goods were to "remain" and be still held in trust "until" the Royal Visitors came round to discharge the wardens, in the Queen's name, from further responsibility, and also to direct in her name what was to be done with such things as could no longer be ritually employed. That change alone it was which the proviso was "intended to make possible."

But it is further urged (p. 36) that the new "Rubric [?]" simply repeated the substance of the proviso." On the contrary, there is not a word in the proviso (Section 25) which relates to any ritual use by the clergy. Every single word in the "fraud Rubric" which even hints at such use in Divine service is entirely absent from Section 25 of the Act, and has been interpolated by the unknown author of the printed substitute. This may be shown in two ways: First, by printing the statutory Rubric passed by Parliament alongside of the "fraud"; secondly, by printing the statutory Rubric as one single paragraph with the proviso, proving that they can be read together as one consistent statement.

Statutory Rubrics of 1559.

The morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in such places of the Church, Chappel, or Chancel, and the Minister shall so turn him as the people may best hear. And if there be any controversie therein, the matter shall be referred to the Ordinary, and he or his deputy shall appoint the place, and the Chancels shall remain, as they have done in times past.

And here is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministrati-
on, shall use
neither Alb,
Vestment, nor Cope:
but being Archbi-
shop, or Bishop, he
shall have and wear
a Rochet: and being
a Priest or Deacon,
he shall have and
wear a surplice only.

Elizabeth's alteration.

The morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in the accustomed place of the Church, Chappell, or Chancel,

except it shall be otherwise deter-
mined by the Ordinary of the Place:

and the Chancels shall remain, as they
have done in times past.

And here is to be no-
ted, that the Minister at
the time of the Commu-
nion, and at all other
times in his ministrati-
on, shall use
such ornaments in the Church
as were in use by Au-
thority of Parliament in
the second year of the reign
of King Edw. VI.
according to the act of
Parliament set in the be-
ginning of this Book.

It will be seen that the second "fraud Rubric" went beyond the "proviso," as forming Section 25, of the Act, which was "set in the beginning" of the printed Prayer-Book of 1559—

1. By requiring that "the minister shall use" the ornaments.
2. By adding that they were to be used "in the Church."
3. By specifying "times of ministrati-
on."
4. By substituting "as were in use" for the words "as was in this Church of England."
5. By recognizing a distinctive dress for "the Communion," apart from "all other times in his ministrati-
on."

—besides *falling short* of the proviso by omitting all reference to any “other order” being taken by the Commissioners.

If the *statutory* directions had been printed in full, all would have been plain. The two combined directions would then have read :

“And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet: and, being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only. 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 the Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, *until* other order shall be therein taken *by the authority of the Queen's Majesty*, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm.”

It will be seen that no contradiction was here implied or involved, seeing that the discarded ornaments might still be made use of by any *other* persons or in any *other* way than the one forbidden, and that even the “retention” of these things was merely temporary and provisional “until” other order could be taken by the Queen's Commissioners.

With the “fraud Rubric” such a combination would, of course, be quite impossible. It ordered a difference to be made between the dress of ministration at all “other services” from that prescribed for the Communion. It forbade, therefore, the surplice ever to be worn at Holy Communion, a practice which the First Prayer-Book did not permit, while it authorized the Romish incumbents to wear their distinctive sacrificial vestment at the Reformed “Supper of the Lord!”

No mere proviso could have power to revoke or repeal the enactment to which it related. No action corresponding with the “fraud Rubric” resulted from it. Not one of Elizabeth's Bishops officiated as directed by the First Prayer-Book, or ever used a pastoral staff. Elizabeth herself never permitted the ritual of 1549 to be adopted in her chapel, nor was the cope introduced under the new Act until the death of Henry II. of France. International courtesy then led to a fancy service resembling a dirge being celebrated in copes. This was not under the Act of Uniformity. Even under the tremendous strain to which Elizabeth was subjected by the wrecking on March 13 of her first Bill for Uniformity by the Committee of the House of Lords (who, under the guidance of the Bishops, struck out the first Protestant service-book), Elizabeth boldly replied by having her first Easter Communion celebrated by her own chaplain, clad in “surplice only,” at a table removed from the east wall, which bore no crucifix, lights, or other “altar”-like decorations, and thus proclaimed her preference for the ritual standard of 1552. It was not until October that panic seems to have seized the Queen, who realized her imminent peril from the accession to the throne of Scotland of the wife of Francis II., the new King of France. Then, but not till then, were introduced the crucifix with lights burning before it at Evensong, the table was put back against the east wall, and the new device of clothing the Epistoler and

Gospeller in copes to match that of the celebrant was adopted with the deliberate design of misleading the "Catholic" powers as to her intentions. She even pretended to be about to introduce these things in every parish church, and also to marry the Archduke. Both pretences were abandoned as soon as they had served their purpose. But none of them are evidence of the meaning of her Act of Uniformity; quite the contrary. The cope was never worn in the manner directed by the First Prayer-Book, but the surplice at Holy Communion was enforced everywhere by every authority in Church and State from 1559 downwards, as I have shown in "Were Mass Vestments worn under Elizabeth's Act?" and in direct violation of the rules of the First Book of Edward. The "fraud Rubric" confessedly had no "authority of Parliament": that was definitely ruled in the Ridsdale Judgment, and without that "authority" its substitution for the statutory Rubric of 1552, no less than the entire suppression of the latter, was nothing less than a fraud. The same remark applies to the Rubric which substituted the "accustomed place" of Marian usage, and disallowed the jurisdiction of the Archdeacon and Chancellor, or other "deputy" of the Bishop, which the statutory Rubric of 1552 had recognized.

Another evidence of fraud is that many of the ornaments of 1549 could not possibly be "used" ritually under the Second Prayer-Book. The oil vessels for unction at Visitation of the Sick, or in Infant Baptism; the pyx in which the consecrated bread was carried out of church; the "corporas" on which that bread was consecrated could not "be in use" in the ritual sense. The two Archbishops ruled that "if no ceremony be prescribed, the so-called 'ornament' has no place."

Then, again, the thirtieth injunction, by prescribing the usages of the "latter year of the *reign* of King Edward" flatly contradicted the language of the "fraud Rubric." For that regnal year, which commenced on January 28, 1553, the "seventh year of Edward," witnessed the exclusive use of "surplice only," the cope being then forbidden by name. In the extract from Soames, given on p. 33, he erroneously dates this as Edward's "fifth" year—a double mistake. For the Act was passed April 14, 1552—*i.e.*, in the sixth year of Edward—and for the first ten months of that year did not come into force at all. He also states that the injunctions were issued by "a Commission under the Great Seal," whereas they state on their forefront that they were "ministered to her loving subjects" by the Queen herself, "by the advice of her most honourable Council"—a totally different body from the "Commissioners under the Great Seal for causes ecclesiastical, who alone were authorized to take other order in the matter of ornaments." Soames wrote in 1839 before the rise of ritualism, and had no share of the "new light" which subsequent litigation and the foreign State Papers have since furnished.

The statement that the proviso was "due to the Queen" (p. 33) is

unwarranted. Parker's account (Parker Correspondence, 375) refers only to Section 26, which did not deal with ornaments, but only with additional rites and ceremonies. The difference between taking "other" order (*i.e.*, giving administrative directions) and "publishing" some document containing "further" orders should not have been overlooked.

As to the "Interpretations" so-called, Canon Harford has justly remarked that there is "no real evidence that they were ever published, enforced, or obeyed by anybody" (Dict., p. 520, note 2). On p. 704, note 2, he also disposes completely of the foolish notion that copes were worn in "the latter year of King Edward's reign."

From internal evidence the spurious "Rubric" is convicted. The author of it supposed that the "authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward II." governed and prescribed the ornaments which "were in use" in that year. But not only was that not the case, but the Act (which passed only in the last week of that year) had for its express object to put an end to, and to render penal, the use of the (non-parliamentary) ritual of that year which was legally continued till Midsummer Day in the third year. The statutory proviso, on the contrary, merely asserts that the existence of the simplified ritual of 1549 rested solely on a parliamentary basis, and the reason for such an "Erastian" insistence I have shown in "Craving for Mass Vestments," pp. 66-73. The very words "according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book" show that the so-called Rubric must have been of later date than the passing of the Act, and would have been quite superfluous if, like the rest of the book, it were itself of statutory authority.

J. T. TOMLINSON.



Notices of Books.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI, AND JONAH. By H. G. Mitchell, D.D.; J. M. Powis Smith, Ph.D.; and J. A. Bewer, Ph.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

The present volume is contributed by three American scholars. Dr. Mitchell comments on Haggai and Zechariah, Dr. Smith on Malachi, and Dr. Bewer on Jonah.

After giving a concise and lucid account of the doings of Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius I. (Hystaspes) as a historical background to the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, Dr. Mitchell carefully examines and rightly sets aside Koster's revolutionary theory which denies the historicity of Cyrus's decree and the return of the exiles in his reign. In a subsequent chapter, the genuineness of the Book of HAGGAI is accepted, and we are told that "the book is so brief that it seems almost ridiculous to suspect its unity" (p. 28).