

will be the least in evidence, for it is the invisible and spiritual side of religion.

What place then has mysticism of this "inclusive" type in the Book of Common Prayer?

## 2. Place in PB.

It has the very place we might expect it to have. Its proportion is qualitative, not quantitative. It does not bulk largely on the surface, but it underlies the whole, and occupies the inner shrine. It might be supposed by some that the Prayer Book was predominantly framed on "institutional" and "intellectual" lines, and that the "intuitional" had but scant scope in it. To others the mystical "Ladder of Perfection" might seem the very backbone of the whole. There are three steps commonly described for this Ladder, viz., Purgation, Illumination, and Contemplation. They may be seen in the PB as involved in the three steps of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion, with all that they stand for.

Ideally, Baptism stands for "Purgation"—for "the mystical washing away of sin"—for "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness"—"that the old Adam in this child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him." It introduces the child into the whole ordered realm of the Institutions of the Church.

Ideally, Confirmation stands for "Illumination"—that, after due instruction and personal decision, the candidate may be strengthened "with the Holy Ghost, the Comforter," "lightened with celestial fire," and prepared for a life of conscious communion with God.

Ideally, Holy Communion stands for "Contemplation"—for "immediate awareness of relation with God," through union with Christ in His mystical Body the Church; that the Communicant may not only "obtain remission of sins," but also "all other benefits of His passion," including the "assurance" "that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son," and we pray "that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

This is a very brief and bald sketch of the sacramental framework wherein lies the "mystical element" in the PB.

## 3. Pervasive Influence.

No doubt, when we come to the MP and EP a less mystical note is struck, at least so far as is apparent on casual inspection or to formal use. Here again, however, much depends upon the stage of spiritual experience which has been reached; and the mystic will find the PB answer to all his needs, and feed his innermost soul.

It is not maintained that the Divines, to whom we owe our PB as it is, were in any strong sense mystics. It may be that they laid stress upon "the immediate access of the soul to God," rather than upon that immediate access of God to the soul, which is the heart of mysticism. None the less, the mystical spirit permeated the old Liturgies from which they quarried the bulk of their materials—this is specially true of the Greek elements in them: it is the basis of the

whole sacramental system: it comes to the surface in such Collects as those for Easter Eve, Ascension Day, or All Saints; and the true value of all the Services, that by which they are redeemed from deadness and formality, lies in the recognition of this element, "immediate awareness of relation with God." That customary pause at the opening of each service, for which there is "silence kept for a space, all devoutly kneeling," should bring the mystic touch of God upon the spirit of the believing worshipper, preparing him for acceptable service in Church; and that similar pause after the final benediction should send him out, with the peace of God's consciously realised and abiding presence reigning in his heart, for his service in the world. (Among modern English works on Mysticism in general these may be studied: Dr. W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (the Bampton Lectures for 1899), and other writings; Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, 1908; Dr. Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, first published 1856; Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, 1911.)—K3<sup>1</sup>.

D. HARFORD.

**NAME, CHRISTIAN.**—It is impossible to say when the custom of repeating the Name at Bapt. arose. Though now for cents. universal in the Ch., we are not aware of any liturgical direction for it, or recorded instance of it, earlier than the case of Peter Balsamus, martyr c. 311, who, if his *Acts* may be trusted, received the former name at his Bapt. It may well, however, be earlier, for in the scantiness of our information such a slight detail might well pass unnoticed. There are examples as early even as the 1st cent. of converts possessing what is apparently a new C. name,<sup>1</sup> e.g., *Theophilus*, St. Luke's friend, and *Lucina*, who constructed the so-called "Crypt of Lucina" in the Catacomb of Callistus at Rome (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* i. 1 3r). Again in the 3rd cent. we read of Cs. naming their children Peter or Paul in honour of those saints (Dionysius Alex., apud Eusebius, *HE* vii. 25 14). These names may have been given at Bapt., but there is no proof that they were.

In the 7th cent. we are, however, on firm ground. The form of Bapt. contained in the *Missale Gothicum* (Gallican, c. 700) runs "Baptizo te *ill.* in nomine," etc., where "*ill.*" obviously has the same meaning as the "*N.*" of our PB, and denotes that the minister is to repeat the name. So too, when the Saxon King Caedwalla was baptised at Rome on Easter Eve, 689, "at the time of his Bapt. the aforesaid Pope" (Sergius) "gave him the name of Peter" (Bede, *HE* 5 7). By this time the custom was well established, and has continued so ever since. The Ch. of Eng. lays great stress on it in her training of children, as the beginning of the Cat. shows. It is a thing in itself beautiful

<sup>1</sup> Professor Ramsay, *Letters to Seven Churches*, p. 305, thinks that the giving of a new bapt. name is as old as the date of the Apocalypse.

and likewise spiritually helpful that a man should be reminded of his C. profession and privileges every time he thinks of his name. (See further, BAPTISMAL OFFICES, § 17.)—I, K.

J. W. TYRER.

**NAMES, RECITATION OF.**—By the 4th cent., at any rate, it was usual to pray by name, during HC, for certain particular persons, and their names were commonly read out from a two-leaved tablet called a *Diptych*. This use of Diptychs has long ago ceased in the West. But there are three cases in which it is still customary in the Ch. of Eng. to name the special person (or persons) prayed for:—(a) the *Sovereign* and principal members of the *Royal Family*, in the STATE PRAYERS (this is expressly ordered in the PB); (b) the *Bishop*, on such an occasion as ENTHRONEMENT; (c) the *Sick*, when the prs. of the congregation are asked for them.—Hb.

J. W. TYRER.

**NARTHEX.**—An enclosed vestibule to a church, a survival of the primitive court of the catechumens. The finest existing specimen is at Vezalay, but a still grander one formerly existed at Cluny. The Galilee porch at Ely resembles a N., the so-called Galilee at Durham is, however, really a chapel.—R6.

CHARLES A. NICHOLSON.

**NAVE.**—N. is the name given to the body of a ch., being the place of the lay people, distinct from the quire and SACRARIUM. The Ns. of early basilicæ were reserved for baptised Christians, catechumens being admitted at times, and strangers not being allowed beyond the *atrium*, or porch, during the time of divine service. In many of the Roman chs. the quire occupied a low enclosure towards the upper end of the N., which opened directly into a transept or an apse without any structural chancel. Similarly in the early Norman abbeys and cathedrals the whole of the eastern limb was devoted to the purpose of a SACRARIUM, the quire occupying the space under the central tower and sometimes, as at St. Albans, Norwich, and Westminster, the eastern bays of the N. as well. Later fashions transferred the quire to the eastern limb of the ch., as was done at Canterbury in the time of Anselm, and large eastward extensions were made for this purpose.

In collegiate chs. the chapter services were not of a popular character, and, where these chs. stood in large towns, it became necessary to provide a self-contained ch. for the laity to worship in. This was done by the simple expedient of building a solid screen across the N. and fitting up a complete ch. for parochial purposes on its western side. This arrangement is seen at St. Albans, where the monks' quire extended three bays beyond the central tower. In order to provide room for a good-sized parish ch. west of the screen, the N. had to be made disproportionately long. But at Croyland and Malmesbury, where the quire stopped on the west side of the central tower, a N. of ordinary length was sufficient for parochial use. It must not, however, be assumed that all monastic

Ns. served as parish chs.; this was not the case for instance at Westminster, nor was it generally in the secular cathedrals such as those of York and Wells. The Ns. of these chs. were used ceremonially for the purposes of processions, also occasionally for preaching, and possibly for ordinary congregational purposes. They served likewise to contain chantry chapels, as at Wells and Winchester, and at St. Albans a series of altars was arranged between the pillars right down both sides of the nave. After the 16th cent. the services of the ch. were curtailed, and popular services ceased to be provided, so it became the fashion to use the quires of our collegiate chs. for all purposes, and thus their Ns. fell into disuse. After 1850, however, a great many of these Ns. came again into congregational use, a change which often involved the destruction of ancient screens and other valuable features of the buildings, but which was certainly better than abandoning them to desolation. The Ns. of our cathedrals may may well be used for part of the general congregation, but this certainly does not justify the removal of ancient screens and fittings for the sake of fancied expediency, the more so as such changes have in many cases produced very unexpected results, structurally, and from the point of view both of acoustics and of artistic effect.—R6.

CHARLES A. NICHOLSON.

**NEGLIGENCE.**—By *Negligences* the Lit. means probably not only sins which have been committed by carelessness rather than wilfulness, but also sins of omission in general—the leaving undone things which a Christian ought to do. Spiritual sloth is at the root of most Ns., and a study of the *Duty towards God*, as set forth in the Cat., will suggest the main lines in which such are to be looked for. Neglect of pr. and HC (HC Exh.<sup>2</sup>), carelessness about the observance of Sunday and other holy days of the Church, omission to guard against known temptations, or to withdraw from their influence if possible, are among the most frequent sorts of Negligence. Other examples of neglect condemned in the PB are procrastination in bringing children to Holy Bapt. (Bapt.<sup>2</sup>), and omission to make a will or settle one's "temporal estates" whilst in health (VS). See likewise the solemn language of warning against priestly N. in the Bp.'s Exh. in the Ordering of Priests; also the Exh. to Godparents in Bapt.,<sup>1</sup> and the charge to parents and employers to see that children are instructed in the Cat. (2nd Rubric aft. Cat.). The corresponding *Duty towards our Neighbour* will suggest risks of N. not less grave. What parish worker has not constantly heard as an *apologia pro via sua* that the speaker has "never harmed any one?" Sins of omission begin, and actual offences only follow, in home, business, and society.—K3.

A. R. WHITHAM.

**NEW PARISH.**—See PARISH, NEW.

**NEW YEAR'S DAY.**—The Julian calendar began with Jan. 1, and St. Ambrose says that Christians kept fast on that day to counteract the evil effects of heathen orgies (1. Different reckonings. (Serm. 2, de Kal. Jan.). For calendrical purposes it is the beginning of the year in PB, as in the Roman and Sarum books, and Dec. 31 is called in PB "New Year's Eve" (see EVEN). But we find other days taken as the beginning of the year. The

Greeks begin their calendar with Sept. 1, formerly with Sept. 24; the E. Syrians with Oct. 1, though their lists of saints' days often begin with Dec. 1; the Copts, Ethiopians and Armenians with Aug. 29. In early times we find much variation. The Philocalian Calendar, A.D. 354, began on some day between Dec. 13 and 25 (*DCG* 1 263). Christmas was the beginning of the year in England from the 7th to the 12th cent.; and so in France and usually in Germany about the same time, though Easter was in some places chosen for NYD. After the 12th cent. Mar. 25, as the conventional day of the Incarnation, was treated in England as NYD. until 1753, though days before Mar. 25 were usually given a double reckoning, as Feb. 1, 1637, 1637 being the civil, 1638 the historical year. Scotland adopted Jan. 1 under James VI, A.D. 1600 (Sir Harris Nicolas, *Chronol. of Hist.*, 1833, p. 38 ff.; for other countries see this valuable work). The Jews kept Nisan as the first month, and so the Roman-Syrian calendar accounted the corresponding month Xanthicus (cp. *Apost. Const.* 5 13, which makes our December the ninth, our January the tenth month). But in the Christian West March was often taken as the first month, as in the pre-Julian Roman calendar.

The E. Syrians have a service of benediction on the first day of each month, except in February which is "the month of afflictions." A service of prayer for the coming year on Jan. 1 is in accordance with human instincts, though it must be subordinate to the Octave of Christmas and

the festival of the Circumcision (see *FESTIVAL*, § 12). That it does not occur in PB may be due to the fact that even at the last revision Jan. 1 was not generally considered to be the beginning of the Church's year, though the PB calendar begins with it. There is no historical precedent known to the present writer for a midnight service bef. this day, but it is hard to see any *liturgical* objection to it. The Greeks now call this day *ἡ πρωτογενία, τὸ νέον ἔτος, ἢ πρῶτη τοῦ ἔτους*. In the Irish PB there is a special prayer appointed for NYD.—*g9.* A. J. MACLEAN.

**NICENE CREED.**—The Creed which is commonly known as the Nicene, and is now used

in the services of the Church, is 1. **The Council of Nicaea.** not altogether identical with the original Creed put forth by the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. The name given to our present Creed may, however, be justified on the ground that it embodies the great points of doctrine defined in the original Creed of Nicaea against the Arian heresy. It will be necessary to start with a short account of Arianism and the Nicene Council.

The *Arian heresy* sprang up first as a recoil from the opposite heresy of Sabellianism, *i.e.*, the denial of the eternal distinction of the Persons in the Godhead. Arius, an Alexandrian priest who had been trained in the school of Lucian of Antioch, accused his bishop, Alexander, of teaching Sabellianism. In his attack Arius went to the opposite extreme and taught that the Son was not very God, but only a superior creature intermediate between God and man. Since Arius taught the worship of this creature, his heresy was practically a recrudescence of pagan idolatry within the Church. The Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) was called together by the Emperor Constantine to settle the controversy

which raged round this question. When the Council met, an explicit Arian Creed put forward by Eusebius of Nicomedia was summarily rejected. Then Eusebius of Cæsarea came forward with a Creed which was said by him to be the Baptismal Creed of his church of Cæsarea. This Creed was quite satisfactory as far as it went, but it did not touch the points at issue. Its Biblical phraseology was found to be an insufficient test to exclude Arianism; the controversy was not as to the language of Scripture but as to its interpretation. The test-word in defining the nature of the Son was found in the term *ὑποούσιος*—of one substance (with the Father). A Creed was therefore drawn up on the basis of the Creed of Cæsarea, with this orthodox test-word inserted.

On the history and meaning of "substance," see Strong, *JTS*, Jan. and Oct., 1901. The term has materialistic associations in English which do not belong to the Greek.

The creed adopted at Nicaea ran as follows:

We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten—that is, of the substance of the Father—God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; who for us men and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate and was made man; suffered and rose again the third day; ascended into heaven; is coming to judge the quick and dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

The promulgation of the Creed of Nicaea marks a new epoch in the history of Church doctrine. Hitherto the various Churches had their own local Baptismal Creeds, differing on small points, but agreeing on fundamentals. The new Creed was not intended to supersede these Baptismal Creeds. It was not intended primarily for catechumens but for bishops. It was a strictly theological Creed, to be used as a test of episcopal orthodoxy. Hence the anathema which was appended, condemning Arian teaching. (See Turner, *Hist. and Use of Creeds and Anathemas*, 1906, p. 28.)

It will be noted that the Creed of Nicaea (following the Creed of Cæsarea) ends abruptly with the words "And in the Holy Ghost." There is evidence that clauses on the Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection and eternal life, are to be found in very early Baptismal Creeds in both E. and W., and it is most unlikely that the Baptismal Creed of Cæsarea made no mention of these points. Probably Eusebius only quoted as much of his Creed as related to the question at issue, and the bishops, in drawing up the Creed, did not see any need to go farther, since this new Creed was not intended to take the place of the Baptismal Creed. This is the view of St. Basil, *Ep.* 78.

We have not space to deal with the question of the relation of the Nicene Creed to the original teaching of Jesus—how far the new definitions develop or distort the primitive Gospel. Hatch (*Hibbert*

*Lectures*, 1885, p. 1), contrasting the Sermon on the Mount with the Nicene Creed, says the one belongs to a world of Syrian peasants—the other to a world of Greek philosophers. Harnack and the Ritschlian school also hold strongly the view that the Nicene Creed represents the *Hellenisation* of the Gospel by Greek philosophy. The Anglican position is well put by Liddon (*Bampton Lects.*, Lect. VII): "The Nicene Council did not vote a new honour to Jesus Christ which He had not before possessed: it defined more clearly the original and unalterable bases of that supreme place which from the days of the Apostles He had held in the thought and heart, in the speculative and active life, of Christendom."

It was not till after many struggles that the Creed of the Council of Nicaea was accepted by the whole Church. In the course

## 2. From Nicaea to Chalcedon.

of time many of the local Baptismal Creeds were enlarged by the insertion of the Nicene definitions concerning the nature of Christ. It was also found necessary, as fresh forms of heresy arose, to introduce some additional clauses into the Creed.

(1) *The heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra*. Marcellus had been one of the champions of the Nicene faith, but later he seems to have taught a kind of Sabellianism, saying that the Logos would eventually cease to have distinct personality and relapse by a movement of "contraction" into the bosom of Divinity and be finally absorbed in the Godhead. This was, in other words, to deny the eternity of Christ's reign. In the Creed of Antioch, 341, we have a clause inserted against Marcellus, and in the Baptismal Creed found in the *Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (348) we find the clause since adopted into the enlarged Nicene Creed, "whose Kingdom shall have no end" (cp. Lk. 1 33).

(2) *Apollinarianism*. In the Creed given in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius (373 or 374) we have a clause inserted probably against Apollinarianism, which denied the completeness of Christ's humanity, "(and was incarnate) of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary."

(3) *Macedonianism*. In the same Creed (that in the *Ancoratus*) we find a paragraph (virtually identical with that in the Creed of our Communion service) added in expansion of the simple statement of the original Nicene Creed, "and in the Holy Ghost." These additional clauses were probably directed against Macedonianism which denied the full Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

*The Relation of the Enlarged Creed to the original Creed of Nicaea*. Epiphanius appears to claim that the Creed which he gives in the *Ancoratus* was the original Creed drawn up at Nicaea, but his statements are confused and untrustworthy. It has now come to be accepted among scholars since Hort's careful investigation (*Two Dissertations*, 1876) that this Creed given by Epiphanius is not so much an enlarged Nicene Creed as the local Creed of Jerusalem enlarged by the insertion of the Nicene clauses on the pre-Incarnate Christ, and the expansion of other clauses to meet later heresies.

It will be convenient to describe this revised

Jerusalem Creed as C., since it is generally known as *Constantinopolitanum* from the belief, which will be presently dealt with, that the enlargement of the original Nicene Creed took place at the Council of Constantinople in 381. The original Nicene Creed we shall designate as N.

Doubts have been cast on Hort's theory by Bp. Gibson, *The Three Creeds* (1908), pp. 169 ff., where the question is dealt with in detail. Dr. Burn in *The Nicene Creed* (1909), pp. 27 ff., replies in support of Hort. It may also be mentioned that Hort's theory has been called in question recently by Prof. Lebedeff of Moscow, who holds, with some modification, the traditional view that the enlargement of the Creed took place at the Council of Constantinople. He is of opinion that Epiphanius' text has been deliberately altered and is not to be relied on. He thinks that Epiphanius gave the original Nicene Creed and that the later text is an interpolation. His arguments are not regarded as convincing.

If we accept the view that the enlarged Creed in its full form was in existence in 373 or 374, it is impossible to maintain the view which was held until recent times that the enlargement of the Creed was made at the Council of Constantinople, 381. The Council of Constantinople (381) and the Council of Ephesus (431) appear simply to have ratified N. We have no evidence of the use of C. from its publication in the *Ancoratus* till the Council of Chalcedon, 451. At this Council both Creeds were read and adopted, and the authority of the Council of Constantinople is claimed for the enlarged form (C.), but this claim seems to have been based on a mistake. It has been suggested that C. may have received some sort of official sanction at Constantinople and that possibly it was submitted by St. Cyril of Jerusalem as a test of his orthodoxy, which was, there is reason to believe, under suspicion.

Another theory is that of Kunze (*Das Nicänisch-Konstantinopolitanische Symbol*, p. 35), that C. was the Creed used at the baptism of Nektarius, patriarch of Constantinople, who was baptised and consecrated during the Council, of which he became president (see Burn, *op. cit.*, p. 34). The Creed which Nektarius professed at his baptism might naturally be expected to become the Baptismal Creed of his city.

It is clear at any rate that the Council of Constantinople never meant C. to be substituted for N. It was some considerable time later that this substitution took place. C. "was only gradually brought into general use after its promulgation at Chalcedon, and for some time yet in both E. and W. was still regarded as distinct from N. and given the second place; it was not until much later that the confusion between the two Creeds arose and the name of the 'Nicene Creed' was transferred to the later and fuller form" (Bp. Gibson).

It has been maintained by some scholars, such as Harnack and Seeberg, that the test-word of the Creed, *homo-ousios*, when it was finally accepted by the Church, had changed its meaning and had become really equivalent to *homoi-ousios* (of like substance). This was said to have been brought about by the Antiochenes and Cappadocian Fathers,

St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory of Nazianzus, who are alleged to have surrendered the Nicene position and to have been followed by the rest of the Church at the Council of Constantinople. Thus, "a new orthodoxy was founded which was substantially semi-Arian." This view is convincingly dealt with by Bethune-Baker, *Texts and Studies* 71.

After the Council of Chalcedon (451) the enlarged Creed (C.) comes gradually into general use, though it had not yet received the final form which it was eventually to take in the W. Church.

### 3. After Chalcedon.

The Nicene Creed was not well known in the W. till a later period. It comes, however, into clear view in the W. at the Third Council of Toledo, 589, when King Reccared signalled his rejection of Arianism by calling a synod of the Spanish Church and adopting the Nicene faith. The form as recited at the synod appears to have had two additions to the form as promulgated at Chalcedon:

(1) *God of God*. This clause had been in the original Creed of Nicaea (N.), but had been subsequently omitted.

(2) *And the Son (et Filio or Filioque)* was added in the clause on the procession of the Holy Ghost.

Burn (in *JTS*, Jan., 1908) produces evidence from some of the most important MSS. of the Spanish Councils at the Escorial and at Madrid to show that the Council never added the words to the Creed at all. Some MSS. omit them altogether, others put them in the margin. Burn seems to think that the Creed itself was recited without the *Filioque*, but that it was used in the anathema appended, and then found its way by a copyist's error into the text of the Creed, and the error spread.

It had been usual for W. theologians since the days of St. Augustine to speak of the Holy Spirit as "proceeding from the Father and the Son," and this statement now found its way into the Creed which was henceforth used in the Communion Service of the Church of Spain. Before the end of the 8th cent. the *Filioque* clause had been introduced into the Creed as used by the Frankish Church, and it was vehemently defended by Charlemagne against a statement made at the Second Council of Nicaea (787) by Tarasius of Constantinople, who had asserted his belief in the Holy Ghost as "proceeding from the Father *through* the Son."

In the *Stowe Missal*, one of the earliest remaining Service books of the Irish Church (9th cent.), the Creed is found without the interpolation, but the *Filioque* has been added in the margin by a later hand.

In A.D. 809 the *Filioque* clause was definitely sanctioned at a Council held at Aachen by Charlemagne, who requested Pope Leo III to order its introduction generally. Leo refused on the ground that he had no authority to alter anything in the Creed. In 1014 the Emperor Henry II persuaded Pope Benedict VIII to admit the Creed with the *Filioque* clause into the Liturgy.

There is no essential doctrinal difference between the E. and the W. on this point, though the *Filioque* still marks a cleavage between the two great parts of Christendom.

The Nicene Creed has come to be the special Creed of the Eucharist, just as the Apostles' Creed is specially the Creed of

### 4. Liturgical Use. Baptism.

(1) *In the East*. The Nicene Creed was introduced into the Communion Service by Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch (476-488), and later by Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople (512-517). It is not clear whether it was the original form (N.) or the enlarged form (C.) which was then used. Dr. Burn (*op. cit.*, p. 37) and C. H. Turner (*op. cit.*, p. 50) think it was C. Bishop Gibson (*op. cit.*, p. 157) seems to favour N. In 565-6 the fuller form (C.) was officially adopted by the Emperor Justin II, and henceforward it seems to have been generally used throughout the Greek Church, and soon to have assumed the title as well as the position of the original Nicene Creed.

It is said (by John of Biclarum) that Justin ordered that the Creed should be sung before the Lord's Prayer, *i.e.*, after the Consecration. But apparently there is no evidence for the Creed occupying this position in the E. liturgies. The usual place for the Creed in E. liturgies is early in the Liturgy of the Faithful in connection with the kiss of peace, which it sometimes precedes (Syrian, Egyptian and Nestorian Liturgies), and sometimes follows (as in the Liturgy of Constantinople). See Brightman, *E. Liturgies*, p. 574.

It may be added that the Nicene Creed gradually took the place of the different local Baptismal Creeds in the E. It was afterwards introduced into the Hour Services, and it has now come to be the only Creed used by the orthodox Greek Church. At the Council of Florence (1438) the Greeks disclaimed knowledge of the Apostles' Creed.

(2) *In the W. Church*. In the W. the Nicene Creed has never been generally adopted as a Baptismal Creed. (It was so used at Rome in the *Traditio Symboli* from the 6th to the 10th century.)

In the Mozarabic or Spanish Liturgy the Nicene Creed is sung before the Lord's Prayer. In other parts of the W. Church it occupies the place found in the English PB, immediately after the Gospel. But the English Church alone orders its use at every celebration. In the Roman Church it is only used on Sundays and greater festivals. In the First PB of Edw. VI we find this note, "When the Holy Communion is celebrated on the workday or in private houses: then may be omitted the Gloria in Excelsis, the Creed, the Homily and the Exhortation." This note was omitted in 1552. The Nicene Creed has never been given a place in the Hour Services of the W., but it may be mentioned that the American PB permits the alternative use of either the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed at MP and EP.

The earliest translation of the Nicene Creed appears to be that which Cranmer made for the First PB of Edw. VI. It omits the clause "whose kingdom shall have no end." Bp. Dowden (*Workmanship of the PB*, p. 106) has shown that the omission was probably not an accident but was due to critical inquiry. Cranmer found that he had been mistaken on this point and restored the clause in the PB of 1552. The clause on the Church varies from the correct text; there is no authority for the insertion of the words "I believe."

Bp. Gibson (*op. cit.*, p. 175) suggests that Cranmer inserted "I believe" before "one catholic and apostolic Church" to mark a distinction between believing in the Holy Ghost and believing the Catholic Church, *i. e.*, believing that it exists. The distinction is actually made by Cranmer himself in his *Annotations upon the King's Book*.

The other variation in this clause is the omission of "holy" before "catholic." This omission was also probably due to an attempt at criticism, since Bp. Dowden (*op. cit.*, p. 104) has shown that in some early editions of works on the Councils the word is found to have been omitted by some mistake. It is a misfortune that as a result of this mistake one of the "notes" of the Church should be lacking in the Creed of our Communion Service.

See APOSTLES' CREED; in addition, *The Nicene Creed*, A. E. Burn (1909). On the relation of the Nicene Creed to other E. Creeds and to the Old Roman Creed, see Sanday, *JTS* 11 and 39.—U2.

J. SPENCE JOHNSTON.

**NOCTURN.**—An office consisting of Pss. each with its Antiphon, and three lessons each followed by its Respond. At Mattins on ordinary week days and minor festivals and throughout the Octave of Easter there was only one N., but three on Sundays and festivals generally. The Ns. were preceded by the INVITATORY and a metrical hymn, and followed on Sundays and festivals by Te D., except in Adv. and from Septuagesima to Easter. In the modern Roman use the Respond after the last lesson is omitted when Te D. is said. It should be noted that by "Mattins" is often meant Ns. and Lauds together, but sometimes Ns. only. In the *Monastic Brev.* there are on ordinary week-days two Ns., the 1st having three lessons, but the 2nd none; while on Sundays and festivals there are three Ns., each of which has four lessons. The name N. implies the time at which Mattins were originally said, *viz.*, at midnight. But the hour gradually became later, and in modern times it has become customary to recite both Mattins and Lauds overnight, except in the stricter monasteries, where they are still said at some time between midnight and 4 a.m. (See HOURS OF PRAYER).—B2. A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**NOMINATION.**—(1) *To a benefice.* N. and Presentation to a Benefice commonly go together. N. is the selecting and naming the Clerk who is to be presented. Presentation is the formal application, usually by deed, to the Bishop to institute and induct the person so nominated. Commonly the same person nominates and presents. But in a few cases one person nominates and another formally presents, on the requisition of the person who nominates. The effective right of patronage is thus in the nominator,

though the legal patron is the presenter. Instances sometimes occur, in the case of Colleges, where some benefactor has given to the College the right to nominate to a benefice of which he is patron, while reserving to himself and his heirs the right to formally present the nominee of the College.

(2) *To a Curacy.* An assistant Curate before being licensed by the Bp. must obtain a formal N. from the incumbent of the parish he is to be licensed to serve. Such N. does not give him any claim to be licensed, that being wholly in the discretion of the Bishop.—ra. E. G. WOOD.

**NON-COMMUNICATING ATTENDANCE.**—As the question whether those who do not propose to communicate at a particular celebration of HC ought to be allowed to remain throughout the service has been, and is still, much debated, it has been thought best to treat it in this art. on lines simply historical.

We begin with (1) *the Institution*: it is admitted on all hands that there were no non-communicants there; and it will not be disputed that this celebration was intended to be the norm to which all future celebrations should conform as far as possible. (2) *Apostolic practice*: there is no evidence during the 1st cent. that there was any innovation on this point in the Apostolic Ch.; this covers the whole of the cent., since St. John is believed to have survived until the end of it. (3) *The practice of the 2nd cent.*: the earliest reference to the custom of the 2nd cent. is found in the *First Apology* of Justin Martyr (c. 155); in his well-known account of the weekly worship of the Ch., which was held "on the day called Sunday," he describes the nature of the Communion Service, and says that "when our prs. are ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers in like manner (additional) prayers and thanksgivings . . . and the people assent by saying Amen, and there is a distribution made to each (c. 67). (4) *The practice of the 3rd and 4th cents.*: in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which are believed by Liturgiologists of different schools to have assumed their present shape during the 4th cent., we find an elaborate Communion Office, with many "rubrics" as we now call them; one of them contains a direction that the bp. should first communicate, then the other clergy and clerical orders, "then the children," and lastly "all the people in order"; another rubric orders that "when all have partaken, then let the deacons carry what remains into the vestry" (*Apost. Const.* 8 13). These various testimonies are decisive as to the practice of the primitive Church.

When the Christian Religion was adopted by Constantine, and when, in consequence, numbers of persons flocked into the Ch. whose religious convictions were not very deep, many of them began to feel their unworthiness to communicate, and contrived to slip out before the distribution of the elements began. Very strong efforts were made to prevent this abuse, as it was then felt to be. The earliest

2. Origin of Non-Communicating Attendance.

rebuke of this practice is found in canon 2 of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), which runs thus: "All who come into the ch. of God and hear the holy Scriptures, but do not remain with the rest during the prs., or decline to receive the Euch., are cast out of the Ch." Chrysostom (c. 400) severely rebukes those who remain and do not communicate, telling them that they had declared themselves to be not unworthy by not departing with those who were in penitence, and that, if they stayed and did not partake, they were as unworthy of the prs. in which they had joined as of the reception which they declined (*Hom. 3 in Eph.*). Council after council endeavoured in vain to compel all present to stay and receive the elements according to the practice of earlier ages. The result was that NCA. was finally substituted for departure. The number of communicants by degrees grew steadily fewer and fewer until, after repeated efforts to secure a communion of each Ch. member at the greater Festivals, or at least thrice a year, the Lateran Council in 1215 was compelled to be content, so far as ordinary lay folk were concerned, with communion once a year, at Easter. [Cp. LORD'S SUPPER, §§ 10-13.]

It must be borne in mind that one object of the Ch. of Eng. during the Reformation period was to restore the habit of frequent

### 3. Practice of Communion, since Reformation.

the great mass of Christian folk, had fallen into abeyance. In order to obtain this result, our Reformers celebrated the Communion less frequently, and invited non-communicants to take part every Sunday in the ordinary prs. of the Ch. Whether this policy be considered wise or not, it did at least gradually increase the number of regular communicants. We proceed to enumerate the steps which were taken. (1) Under the First PB of Edward VI non-communicants were expelled from the *choir* during the HC, but allowed to remain in the church. The directions of the rubric are that "so many as shall be partakers of the HC shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire," while "all other that mind not to receive the said HC shall depart out of the quire." (2) In the Second PB of Edward VI a strong remonstrance against NCA. was inserted in a new Exh. (our present Exh. 2). After stating that not to communicate is to "offend God sore," it proceeds: "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 . . . yourselves." No pause is ordered for non-communicants to withdraw, but presumably they withdrew immediately after they were ordered to depart; there seems, however, some reason to believe that they may have departed after having made their offerings. (3) In the Revised PB of 1662 the passage which forbade non-communicants to remain was struck out of the Exhortation: this has led some to suppose that the prohibition was

removed. But two reasons are given against this supposition: (a) NCA. remained practically unknown in our Ch. until the beginning of what has been called the "Catholic Revival" in the mid-Victorian period. (b) Bp. Wren, president at the revision of 1662, says expressly that "the gazers and lookers-on are wholly out of use," so that the expressions relating to them might be left out, "because the non-communicants generally do use to depart without bidding." And Bp. Morley, another of the Revisers, says of HC that "none were permitted to be present in the Primitive Ch. but such as are receivers and partakers of it."

The advocates of NCA. base their approval of it on the fact that HC has two aspects,

### 4. The Arguments on each Side.

(a) the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ really present under the veils of the bread and wine, and (b) the pleading of the Sacrifice of Christ, once offered for mankind upon the Cross: and that it were unreasonable to prevent those who for reasons of their own felt themselves unable to communicate at any particular celebration from remaining during the prs. of the Ch. and the Presentation and Pleading of the Great and Adorable Sacrifice. To this it is answered: (a) the only proper way in which that Sacrifice can be presented and pleaded is that which the Lord Himself has ordained, namely, by partaking of it; (b) the spectacle of a congregation assembled in Christ's Name to celebrate the Sacr. He ordained is, when the majority present decline to do what He plainly commanded, by no means an edifying one; (c) those who do not feel able to communicate should, as Chrysostom argues, regard themselves as under penitence, and should, in consequence, modestly depart; (d) if no pause is made for the withdrawal of non-communicants, the heretic, the unbeliever, and the self-excommunicate are practically invited to remain—a practice which the early Ch. energetically resisted, and which in these times does not always make for edification. Reasons may, however, be given for NCA. in special circumstances; e.g., when those who wish to remain have communicated at an earlier service, or on great public occasions such as Coronation or the Consecration of a Bp., or in the case of candidates who are being prepared for Confirmation and may therefore be permitted to stay throughout the service (as the highest grade of penitents did in the early Church).—R2. J. J. LIAS.

**NONCONFORMIST.**—Bishop Hooper has been called the "father" of English nonconformity because of his strenuous opposition to consecration in the old "Pontifical vestments" enjoined by the PB of 1549. He claimed that they were the "inventions of Antichrist" on account of their association with the Popish religion, and were not merely "things indifferent," because "we ought to have express Scripture for what we do in holy things" (Strype, *Life of Cranmer*, c. 17). The same attitude was adopted in Elizabeth's reign by the Puritans with regard to the use of the surplice for divine service and the square cap and tippet for ordinary apparel,

which were required by the Act of Uniformity, 1559, and a determined Nonconformist party was soon formed. "Scripture," they urged, "ought to be the only rule of our actions, and consequently the Ch. orders we observe being not commanded in Scripture are offensive and displeasing to God" (Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, Pref. 73). These Nonconformists, therefore, refused to wear the obnoxious "habits" which they styled "Aaronic vestments" and "rags of Popery," and also objected to several of the ceremonies enjoined by the PB, such as the sign of the cross in baptism, the custom of kneeling at communion, and the use of the ring in marriage, which they claimed were necessarily defiled from their connection with the superstitious worship of the Romish Ch. (see PURITANS). Finding it impossible to abolish these objectionable impositions, they demanded that their use should at least be optional, as they in no way dissented from the doctrinal teaching of the Ch. and had no intention of forsaking their ministry. For several years they persisted in their refusal to conform to the discipline and ceremonies, until Elizabeth ordered the bps. to resort to strong measures to establish "a uniformity of order in every ch." Accordingly, as a result of the "Advertisements" issued in 1566, a number of the Nonconforming clergy were deprived, others were forced very reluctantly to conform, while many avoided the objectionable ceremonies by acting as lecturers and chaplains in private families.

In spite of continuous persecution the majority of the Puritan Ns. refused to leave the Ch., and thus on the accession of James I the "Millenary" Petition, supposed to have been signed by 1,000 of their clergy, was presented to the King, praying that the use of the surplice and the objectionable ceremonies might not be made compulsory. The Hampton Court Conference of 1604, which met as the result of this petition, gave them no redress, and during the reigns of James I and Charles I all attempts at Nonconformity were so sternly repressed that numbers of the Puritan clergy were deprived, imprisoned, or compelled to emigrate to the North American colonies. During the Civil War the N. party, owing to the influence of the Scots, were persuaded to adopt Presbyterian tenets, although the majority of them were not opposed to the principle of episcopacy. Thus, at the Savoy Conference in 1661, they were prepared to accept Abp. Usher's scheme of modified episcopacy, consisting of suffragan bps. and diocesan synods, which had been proposed to the Long Parliament in 1641. Richard Baxter, who was their chief spokesman, distinctly stated that they had no quarrel "with the doctrines of the PB" (*Life and Times* 223), and the grievances which they presented were similar to the demands made at Hampton Court in 1604.

These were, however, refused, and the Act of Uniformity (1662), besides requiring every clergyman to give "his unfeigned assent and consent" to everything contained in the PB, also compelled all those who had only received Presbyterian orders to seek re-ordination from a bp. In consequence a large number of the Presbyterian or N. clergy were ejected from their livings and joined the general body of DISSIDENTS. The majority were, however, still firmly attached to the principle of an exclusive national religion, and thus attempts were made, but unsuccessfully, in 1667 and 1689 to "comprehend" them again in the Ch. Even after the passing of the Toleration Act numbers of the Dissenters continued to attend their parish churches to receive the Sacrament, and this "occasional conformity," although bitterly opposed by the High Churchmen, was the indirect means of reconciling many of them to the Ch.

The survival of the old N. spirit, which, unlike the attitude adopted by the modern Dissenter, was not in any way hostile to the principle of a national establishment, continued till quite the middle of the 18th cent., and in 1748 proposals were again made for reuniting Dissenters and Churchmen.

During the 19th cent. the altered usage grew up which has made the term Ns. in ordinary speech identical with Dissenters. [Cp. *DECH on Nonconformity*.]—A1. C. SYDNEY CARTER.

**NONE.**—The office to be recited at the 9th hour, *i.e.*, 3 p.m., but in practice earlier, as we see from the common meaning of "noon." In choir on ordinary days N. was said immediately aft. the principal Mass, but in Lent bef. it. (See *HOURS OF PRAYER*.)—B2. A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**NON-RESIDENCE.**—An Incumbent is bound to reside in the house of residence, if there be one, and if not then within the parish. If, for good reasons, the latter is impracticable, the bishop can grant a licence of non-residence specifying the house wherein he is permitted to reside. Such licence is revocable at the discretion of the Bp. Licence for NR. may also be granted in the case of the illness of the incumbent, or of a member of his family, proper certificates being furnished. In such case a curate in charge must be appointed on the nomination of the incumbent. The licence is for a definite period only, but may be renewed, in certain cases, with the consent of the Metropolitan. If an incumbent is non-resident without licence, he can be called back into residence by the Bp., and if the monition be disobeyed the benefice will be *ipso facto* vacated. A return of the non-residents in each diocese in England and Wales has to be made annually by the Bp. to the King in Council.—ra.

E. G. WOOD.

**NORTH SIDE OF THE TABLE.**—The words "the Priest standing at the north side of the Table" first appeared in "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper" in 1552 ("The Order of . . ." is a modern printers' error). In 1549 the words were "The Priest standing humbly afore the middes of the Altar." Under the Sarum Use the custom had been for the priest to begin Mass at the south end of the front of the Altar, hence the NS. position was completely new. The phrase, which in the Amer. PB has been altered to "right side," is a technical term based, as the Ridsdale Judgment pointed out, on "the almost universal eastward position of chs. in Eng.," and it retains the same meaning with regard to the Table even when, as in the Purchas case, 1870-1, the Holy Table stood at the west end of the church.

The removal of altars had already begun bef. it was enforced by an Order in Council in 1550, and the word *altar* was expunged from the PB of 1552. The Tables were movable, the Order appended to the Royal Injunctions of 1559 stating ". . . that the Holy Table in every ch. be decently made, and set in the place where the Altar stood . . . so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacr. is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be placed in good sort within the Chancel. . . . And after the Communion done from time to time, the same Holy Table to be placed where it stood before."



The restriction of the Table to the chancel by this Order was, however, disregarded, and it is not recognised either in canon 82 of 1604 or in our present statutory rubric. By the time of James I custom had brought prayer-desk and pulpit down into "the body of the ch.," and had placed the Holy Table, east and west, lengthwise in the central alley between the pews. But, as Bp. Harold Browne wrote in a Pastoral letter in 1875, "Neither here nor ever afterwards, by canon, rubric, or Act of Parliament, was there any injunction whatever by which the Table, which had always stood north and south, should be turned round through an angle of 90° and stand east and west." Laud had the right to require the Table to be removed to the east wall when not required for Communion, and there was reason for this in face of prevalent irreverence; but he exceeded his rights when he insisted on its being railed in as a fixture "altarwise." The Puritans on their side had exceeded their rights when they allowed the Table to remain "in the body of the ch." when not required for Communion.

On this arose the earliest known dispute as to the meaning of the phrase NS. In 1627 Williams, Bp. of Lincoln, wrote to the Vicar of Grantham: "This table is not to stand altarwise and you at the north end thereof, but table-wise, and you must officiate at the north side of the same by the Liturgy"; and Peter Smart said in his sermon in Durham Cath., July 27th, 1628, "there are but two sides of a long table and two ends." The Puritans thus endeavoured to prevent the removal of the tables from the body of the ch. to the east end under the pretext that, a table having only two sides, the rubric could not be obeyed except when the table was set lengthwise. Those who were on the side of Laud maintained, as Bp. Wren said in his *Parenthalia*, that "custom of speech led" those who framed the rubric "to call the North end or North part of the Table, the NS. thereof." Wren himself was accused by the Commons in 1640 for "kneeling and consecrating at the west side of the Holy Table." Cosin was impeached in 1641 for having been "used to officiate at the west side thereof, turning his back to the people." Wren's excuse was that he had done so once, five years bef., because on that occasion the elements "stood upon the table further from the end than he, being but low of stature, could reach over his book unto them," but on that one occasion "he did stand at the NS." both bef. and after. Cosin replied, "he denieth that he did ever officiate with face purposely towards the east; but he constantly stood at the NS. or end of the Table." It is thus clear that both Wren and Cosin in 1641 admitted the illegality of the eastward position. In the Scottish PB of 1637 we find the phrase "NS. or end"; it is also found in the *Durham Book*, i.e., "Cosin's corrected copy of 1640-61," and in the "*Bodleian fair copy*" of 1661. In the *Annexed Book* the rubric had first NS; this was altered to "north part," but altered back to "north side." Under this rubric the "NS. or end position" was so universal that Bp. Chas. Wordsworth wrote in 1876: "There was not a single Anglican writer upon the subject, so far as I could discover, from 1662 to 1843, who had taken the other side, except Scandret (1708) and John Johnson (1714), who however, though inclined to suggest it as tending to recommend their peculiar views of the Euch. sacrifice, yet are really witnesses against it in point of fact." Yet by 1871, the date of the Purchas Judgment which condemned it, the Eastward Position had, as the Report of the Royal Commission of 1906 points out, "become widely prevalent."

The interpretation of this rubric came before the Court in the Lincoln Judgment of 1890.

Bp. King, following recent writers, had adopted the theory that NS. means the northern portion of the west side. He said that "down to the Cr. he stood or knelt as required by the rubrics in front of the Holy Table and at the northern part thereof, this being the NS. of the Table as directed by the rubric." This was held by the Court "to be inconsistent with the continuous history of the rubric." The Court confessed that "Neither to Heylin, nor Bp. Williams, nor Wren, nor Cosin, in explaining NS., did it occur to find it on the west front." Yet the Court refused to condemn that position on the plea "that a certain liberty in the application of the term existed," and "such existing liberty it is not the function of a Court, but only of legislation, to curtail"—a decision which would seem to make a return to a primitive Westward position behind the Table to be also not illegal in the Ch. of Eng. The Judgment also affirmed that "the imputed sacrificial aspect of the Eastward position is new and forced, and can take no effect in rendering that position either desirable on the one side or illegal on the other." It is, however, true that the adoption of that position is a return to the position of 1549, which was repudiated in 1552 simultaneously with the abolition of Altars and the substitution of Tables.

Certain changes made in the rubrics in 1662 have given rise to further controversy. A new rubric (corresponding to one in the Scottish PB of 1637) was placed bef. the Pr. for "the whole state of Christ's Ch. militant here in earth," which directed the Priest to "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." The rubric before the Pr. of Consecr. was likewise amended and enlarged. In the *Durham Book* we can trace the successive alterations of the earlier rubric. Bef. 1662 it ran: "Then the Priest standing up shall say as followeth." The new rubric was first written, "when the Priest hath so ordered the Bread and Wine placed upon the Table as that he may with the more ease and decency take them into his hands, standing up he shall say, as followeth." The next step was to add the words "standing before the Table" and to erase the words "placed upon the Table"—phrases which contain a reference to the earlier rubric newly added. The words "standing up" were also erased as the priest would have already risen from his knees to order the bread and wine. The correct PUNCTUATION which is found in the *Annexed Book*, ". . . cup into his hands; he shall say . . .," marks the division of the rubric into the new and the old sections. In the *Sealed Books* the semicolon is replaced by a comma, and this printers' error has continued to the present time.

The second dispute as to NS. was based on the words of this rubric and arose about 1708-10. The

### 3. Legal Interpretations.

### 4. Rubric bef. Pr. of Consecration.

statement was made that the words "standing before the Table" referred grammatically not only to the ordering of the elements, but also to the whole subsequent Prayer. Johnson of Cranbrook asserted this; Nichols and Wheatly denied it. Lewis of Margate, in 1717, spoke of the Eastward Position as a "whim" "lately introduced." The Report of the Royal Commission of 1906 shows that in 1843 the custom was exceedingly rare, and quotes Pusey as writing in 1851 that Newman to the last consecrated at the north end. Pusey himself, although, like Keble, in favour of it, had not adopted the eastward position in 1871 when it had become widely prevalent.

In 1871, on an undefended appeal in the Purchas case, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council declared the Eastward position to be illegal. It was, however, strongly urged that

**5. Legal Decisions.**

this decision, compared with the judgment in the Macknochie case in 1868, involved, as Canon Liddon wrote, "two contradictory constructions of the same words"; and in 1877 it was reversed by the Ridsdale Judgment, which decided that the rubric would be satisfied should the minister "order the elements," either "standing on the NS. and looking towards the south," or "standing on the west side and looking towards the east," and that "beyond this and after this there is no specific direction that, during this Pr., he is to stand on the west side, or that he is to stand on the NS." This legal decision would also, obviously, make the primitive Westward position, standing behind the Table, to be not illegal in the Ch. of Eng. The Lambeth Judgment of 1890 refers to this decision, when it speaks of the Eastward position in the Consecration Pr. as "admitted to be lawful"; and the Royal Commission Report of 1906 says that by it the Judicial Committee declared "the Eastward position during the Pr. of Consecr. to be in accordance with law, provided it did not render the MANUAL ACTS invisible to the congregation."

It must be carefully noted that these decisions of 1871, 1877 and 1890, do not affirm in favour of the Eastward as against the N. side or end position. What they actually do can best be stated in the words of a Pastoral letter of Abp. Benson, Dec. 6, 1890. He said: "I would then ask you to observe generally that the conclusions reached are simply the decision that such and such an act is, or is not, expressly or by necessary implication forbidden by the law of our Ch.—is, or is not, on immediate or ultimate consequence actually penal by that law as it now stands. It is evident that decisions of this character are far from throwing the weight of the Court's authority upon the side which it does not find to be illegal"; and he added in a later portion of the letter "those simplest forms are liturgically true," a statement which includes a reference to "the north side of the Table." [For a different view, see EASTWARD POSITION.]

—R2. FREDC. F. GRENSTED.

**NOTICE.**—The formal announcing to anyone of a matter of which he is or might be ignorant. A

notice should be in writing and delivered to the person affected, unless statute makes this unnecessary in a particular case. The notice that must precede any ecclesiastical suit is called CITATION.—A4.

R. J. WHITWELL.

**NOTICE BOARD.**—A board prominently placed outside a church and inscribed with the hours of services, names of clergy, etc. Formerly divers Acts of Parliament were read in the churches, but the statute 7 Will. IV and 1 Vict., c. 45, § 2, provided that thereafter such acts must be posted on or near the church door. N. boards, being near the main entrance, are commonly accepted as equivalent to the church door for displaying such acts and other statutory notices (e.g., voters' lists, papers relating to election of guardians, etc.).

Usually other N. boards are fixed within the church porch to publish announcements of more temporary interest.—R5. S. REDMAN.

**NOTICES IN CHURCH.**—That the Ch. of Eng. regards the HC as the most important of her services, and relies on a considerable attendance of her members at the celebrations thereof, would seem to be implied in her fixing upon it as the proper time for giving out public notices, as indicated in the rubric which immediately follows the Nicene Creed in HC. The custom of making such announcements at Mass may be traced back in our own branch of the Ch. Catholic at least to the 14th cent., and to several cents. earlier in other parts of the Christian world, with variations in the prescribed form, and a certain liberty of discretion to the local ministrant. Confining ourselves here to the prescriptions of the PB, the history of the existing rubric may be briefly stated as follows. The First PB contains no instructions on the point, but in the issue of 1552 we find the germ of the present rubric in one that was then inserted, ordering the Curate to "declare unto the people whether there be any holy days or fasting days the week following"—a declaration which he was to make *after* the sermon. In 1662 the position was reversed, the notices then being appointed to *precede* the sermon, and amplified by the inclusion of the "BANNS of Matrimony," since omitted, as well as the "BRIEFS, CITATIONS, and EXCOMMUNICATIONS" still retained in the stereotyped form of instructions, though seldom or never occurring in modern practice.

As to the Banns of Marriage, there is an apparent inconsistency in the directions of 1662, in that the forementioned rubric enjoins their publication before the sermon, while that in the matrimonial rite itself gives the time as "immediately before the sentences for the Offertory." It is unlikely, however, that the same set of compilers would have contradicted themselves; and the inference is that the rubric in the second case was simply intended to provide for occasions when there was no sermon, as not infrequently happened, and still happens sometimes. By the Marriage Act of 26 George II, c. 33, s. 1, provision was made for the possibility of there being no regular Sunday Eucharist in the order for the publication of Banns "upon three Sundays preceding the Solemnization of Marriage, during the time of Morning Service, or of Evening Service if there be no Morning Service in such Church or Chapel upon

any of those Sundays, immediately after the Second Lesson." Obviously we are here confronted with a prescription at first sight at variance with the rubric, which has led to some diversity of practice in the time of publication. It is argued, however, that by the Act of Uniformity the rubrics have the force of statute law, and that in the particular case they have by no means been annulled or repealed by the said Marriage Act, the only object of which was to permit the notification of Banns at other times than the rubric directs, without superseding it. In this view the interval between the Creed and the sermon in the Communion Office is still the proper time for giving out the Banns with the other notices, a custom which is adhered to wherever a full sense of eccles. obligation prevails. In this matter the modern printers of the PB, though more or less excused by the Ritual Commission of 1870 (*vide* their Fourth Report, p. 18), have been censured for accommodating their text to the position, in defiance of the authority really binding upon them. "They have not only chosen to put their own construction on the statute, which undoubtedly is a false one, but they have, in order to carry out their false construction, actually omitted altogether that portion of the rubric after the Nicene Creed which directs the publication of the Banns, and also substituted a new rubric of their own at the commencement of the Marriage-service, although the statute says nothing which in the remotest degree authorises any alteration of the rubrics, but rather guards against any unnecessary deviations from them" (see the legal opinion of Dr. A. J. Stephens, as stated in his *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*).

Whatever time is preferred locally for the public notices, they are usually, and almost necessarily, made to include others than those directly specified in the PB; e.g., the days and hours of special services, the names of special preachers, a list of the sick or dying for whom prayers are desired, etc., in all of which the minister is by custom left to his common sense and the exigencies of his parish, in spite of the express limitation of the Rubric, but in accordance with the spirit of liberty characteristic of the National Church.—A4. G. WORLEY.

**NOTORIOUS OFFENDERS.**—Canon 109 provides for the presentment of "Notorious Crimes and Scandals" in Ecclesiastical Courts. For the text of the canon see art. CLERGY DISCIPLINE ACT, 1892, § 2 n., by which its enumeration of "crimes and scandals" practically becomes statutory, so far as relates to the conduct of the *clergy*. As regards the *laity*, the procedure by Presentment is now obsolete. But the first rubric in HC gives powers of discipline to the minister. Canon 26 provides that "No Minister shall in any wise admit to the receiving of the HC any of his Cure or Flock, which be openly known to live in sin notorious without repentance, Nor any who have maliciously and openly contended with their neighbours, until they shall be reconciled." And lay offenders against canon 109 "shall not be admitted to the HC till they be reformed." This power of repulsion is carefully guarded by the above rubric, and is confined to cases in which (a) the offence is open and notorious, (b) the congregation is thereby offended; and must be preceded by a "calling" of the delinquent by the min. to "advertise" him of his intention. The min. "so repelling any . . . shall be obliged to give an account . . . to the Ordinary within 14 days after . . ." And the Ord. shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon. The question

has been discussed in several modern cases, particularly *Jenkins v. Cook* (L.R. 4 Adm. and Eccl. 463, 1 P.D. 80), and *R. v. Dibdin* (L.R., 1910, P. 57) where the man repelled had married his deceased wife's sister. [Cp. RITUAL, § 36, H<sup>3</sup> n.]—P.D. R. J. WHITWELL.

**NUNC DIMITTIS.**—The Song of Simeon (Luke 2 29-32) falls into three divisions:

(1) *V. 29*: The acknowledgment of permission to depart as of a sentinel after a long watch, or, according to Eastern usage, of a guest after a visit. (2) *Vv. 30, 31*: The sign by which the permission is given—the Messianic deliverance now before Simeon's eyes—ordained of God to appear at this time before all peoples, extending to them the position of privilege. (3) *V. 32* amplifies the last words, explaining the salvation as *light* for a revelation to Gentile darkness and *glory* to the Chosen People from whom it shines forth.

This, the shortest of the canticles, is at once the tenderest—in its expression of quiet confidence which comes from the personal appropriation of God's promises—and the deepest—in its insight into the purpose of those promises, not for the narrow circle of the chosen race alone, but for the whole world.

The ND, though not included among the nine chief Canticles of the Church occurs in the collection following the Pss. in Cod. A. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (4th cent.) it is ordered for Vespers, and was so used in the 6th cent. at the monastery of Abbot Nilus on Mount Sinai; it forms the *Ἀπολυτίκιον* (prelude to dismissal) in the *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ* (Vespers) of the Greek Church. In the West, it is not included in the 6th cent. African list of Verecundus, in the 7th cent. Irish *Antiphonary of Bangor*, or in the Compline office of St. Benedict; this last omission probably means that either the office of Compline did not exist at the beginning of the 6th cent. in the Roman Church, or the canticle was not yet inserted in that office of which it now forms the climax. It is also used in solemn procession in the Roman rite on the feast of the Purification of the BV. Mary.

From its position at Compline, this canticle came into Evensong, where it now forms the conclusion and climax of the act of praise, expressing the personal appropriation of God's mercies set forth in the NT just read in the second lesson, and the peace and rest which they bring.

T. D. Bernard, *Songs of the Holy Nativity*; Cabrol, *DAC*, art. *Cantiques Évangéliques*;  
4. **Bibliography.** Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers*.—Ez. M. LINTON SMITH.

**OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.**—In England the Oath of Allegiance to the Sovereign has to be taken before ordination to the diaconate and the priesthood, and also on consecration to the episcopate; it has also to be taken on institution to a benefice or to a canonry. The reason for the imposition of this obligation is to ensure that a person, who is admitted to a position of influence and importance, shall be pledged not to use his position in any manner inconsistent with the duty which as a citizen he

owes to the Crown. The Oath does not impose any fresh obligation of allegiance upon him, if he already is either a natural born, or a naturalised, subject. He was already bound by natural allegiance: the Oath only converts that into expressed allegiance. The taking of the Oath has no relation to the due performance of spiritual functions, nor does it imply any acknowledgment of authority on the part of the Crown or the Civil Courts in regard thereto. The form of the Oath has varied from time to time; formerly it was long and verbose; as settled by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1867, it is now expressed in the following words: "I, N.M., about to be . . ., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George, his heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God."—*TA*  
E. G. WOOD.

**OATH OF CANONICAL OBEDIENCE.**—This oath is taken before being licensed to a curacy, or being instituted to a benefice, or ecclesiastical dignity. It is also taken before consecration to the Episcopate, and in this case is often called the Oath of Due Obedience. The earliest form of the Oath was the solemn declaration of a bp. after consecration to obey and maintain the "Sacred Canons" of the Ch. It was not a promise of obedience to a person; and, though eventually it took a personal form, the meaning and scope was not thereby changed. The promise is not one of personal, far less of unlimited, obedience, but of obedience to an administrator. The real object of the promise is still the "Sacred Canons," meaning thereby the general discipline of the Ch., as expressed by canons, customs and constitutions, and lawfully and duly administered by the person to whom the promise is made. The obedience promised is therefore limited to what is prescribed by the law and custom of the Ch. This was very clearly stated by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Long v. The Bp. of Capetown* (Brodrick and Fremantle 313): "The Oath of Canonical Obedience does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the Bp. against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the Bishop by law is authorised to impose"; that indeed is what is signified by the qualifying word "Canonical." [This interpretation does not reduce the Bp. to the position of being a mere mouthpiece to echo the explicit requirements of the law, but leaves room for all discretionary jurisdiction assigned to him by law.]

The form of the Oath of Canonical Obedience as taken by a priest or deacon is: "I N. do swear that I will pay true and Canonical obedience to the Lord Bishop of A. and his successors in all things lawful and honest. So help me God."

The oath taken by a bishop is: "In the Name of God, Amen. I N. chosen Bishop of the Church and See of M. do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Archbishop and to the Metropolitan Church of A. and to their successors; So help me God, through Jesus Christ."—*TA*.  
E. G. WOOD.

**OBLATION.**—(a) O. is sometimes used as a name for the service of HC (so from end of 2nd cent.), or for its central act (so Scottish Communion Office and Amer. PB—Rubric indented in Pr. of Consecr.). (b) "Alms and Os."—see CHURCH MILITANT, PRAYER FOR THE, § 3. (c) Offerings made by the people in kind, not in money, are sometimes called Os.—see OFFERTORY (i). (d) Till lately, the King made two Os. at his CORONATION:—one, consisting of a rich PALL (or altar-cloth) and an ingot of gold

weighing a pound, at the beginning, immediately after the *Recognition*—the other, consisting of bread and wine for the HC and a piece (or pieces) of gold, at the Offertory. At the last two Coronations, however, the two were combined, the first O. being merged in the second.—A6.  
J. W. TYRER.

**OCCASIONAL OFFICES.**—The name applied to such offices as Bapt., Confirm., Marriage, VS, Burial, which are only used as *occasion* offers, in contradistinction from the *regular* services of MEP, Lit. and HC.—B1.  
J. W. TYRER.

**OCCASIONAL PRAYERS.**—See PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS.

**OCCURRENCE AND CONCURRENCE.**—When two holy-days fall on the same day they are said to "occur"; when on consecutive days to "concur." No rules are laid down in the PB for either event; but a Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation (1909) has proposed the following Table of Occurrence, which closely follows that in the "Convocation Prayer Book" (1880). The Table is permissive only, but suggests that the days in the left-hand column should take precedence, the Coll. of the corresponding day in the other column being said second, by way of "memorial."

1st S. in Advent.....	St. Andrew
4th S. in Advent.....	St. Thomas
St. Stephen, St. John, Innocents, Circumcision	1st S. aft. Christmas
Epiphany.....	2nd S. aft. Christmas
Conversion of St. Paul....	3rd S. aft. Epiphany
Purification.....	4th S. aft. Epiph., Sept., Sex., Quinqu.
Septuages., Sexagesima....	Conversion of St. Paul
Sexag., Quinqu., Ash-Wed., Sundays in Lent	St. Matthias
Sundays in Lent, days of Holy Week, Easter Day, Easter Mon. and Tu.	Annunciation
Easter Day, Easter Mon. and Tu., 1st S. aft. Easter	St. Mark
1st S. aft. Easter, Ascension Day	St. Philip and St. James
St. Mark, St. Philip and St. James	Other Sundays after Easter
Whitsunday, Whitsun Mon. and Tu., Trin. S.	St. Barnabas
St. Barnabas and Holy-Days till All SS. inclusive	Sundays aft. Trin.

The Convocation PB prefers Annunciation to the 3rd, 4th and 5th Sundays in Lent, and allows the *propria* of the superseded Holy Day to be used at an extra service, except on the Great Festivals. No provision is made for the transference or for the total supersession of the days in the right-hand column, as in the elaborate mediæval rules. And no provision is made for Concurrence. The question in that case arises in connection with the Coll. and (if such should hereafter be provided as suggested by Convocation) the lessons used on the even. The best way would probably be to follow the above Table as nearly as may be. See EVEN.—c5.  
A. J. MACLEAN.

**OCTAVE.**—The custom of observing seven days after a festival is in the main Western. But Easter was, at least from the 4th cent., everywhere thus kept, as the Passover was kept among the Jews

(Ex. 12 15, Lev. 23 6, Num. 28 24; see *Apost. Const.* 8 32; Chrysostom, *Hom. 34 de Res. Chr.*; Augustine, *Ep. 55 32 f. Ben.*). Pentecost has an O. in *Apost. Const.* 5 20. In the *Pilgrimage of "Silvia"* (c. A.D. 385) Easter, Epiphany (i.e., the Nativity, Jan. 6), Dedication, have Os. The custom was extended in the West to many festivals. In Sarum the following days have Os.: Christmas, Epiph., Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, Dedication; SS. Andrew, Stephen, John Evang., Thomas of Canterbury, John Bapt., Peter and Paul, Lawrence, Martin; Innocents, Visitation of BVM, Name of Jesus, Assumption and Nativity of BVM. All Saints' Day had no O. in the Sarum as in the Roman books. The sole relic of Os. in PB is the provision for the use of proper Prefaces for 7 (6) days after the four greatest festivals, and of the Christmas Coll. "unto New Year's Eve." In Sarum the eighth day is called "octava," the intervening days "octavae"; thus we have, e.g., "per octavas Epiphaniae."—c5. A. J. MACLEAN.

**OFFERTORY.**—The Latin *Offertorium*, from which O. is derived, has several meanings. But the Eng. word is used in three senses only, all connected with the Offering at HC: (i) the part of the Service in which the Offering takes place (so 9th Rubric at end of HC); (ii) what is said or sung during the Offering (so Rubric aft. Sermon in HC); (iii) the amount of money, etc., collected at the Offering.

(i) In the first sense the O. consists of three things: (a) the collecting of the Alms, (b) the Presentation of the Alms, (c) the placing of the Elements on the Holy Table. The variations of the ceremonies connected with (a) and (b) in the different PBs are described under ALMS (§ 2). It only remains here to show the antiquity of the people's Offering at HC. One or two witnesses must suffice.

Justin Martyr (c. 155) speaks of it in connection with the Sunday Euch. (*I Apol.* 67). Cyprian (c. 255) tells us further that the elements for HC were taken out of it (*On Work and Alms* 15). This shows us it was not merely a money collection, but in part at any rate consisted of bread and wine. We learn besides its position in the service; it took place bef. the elements were put on the altar, and apparently immediately bef., as Catechumens were not allowed to offer, and therefore the Offering must have been at the beginning of the *MISSA FIDELIUM*, exactly where it occurs now. It would seem that originally everything offered, was placed on the altar; for certain early canons (e.g., *Apost. Can.* 3) forbid this except for bread, wine, corn and grapes. Some other exceptions were, however, occasionally allowed. In later times the people's offering became obsolete, but at Milan Cathedral it is still kept up as a *ceremony* at High Mass (*Rubr. Gen. de Miss. Rit. Ambros.* 36, Milan, 1846). We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Reformers for restoring the people's Offering at HC.<sup>1</sup> (With regard to the law re disposal of money collected at O., see CHURCHWARDEN, § 1.)

(c) The placing of the Elements on the Holy Table was ordered here in the First PB of 1549. In 1552 the order was omitted, but it was reinstated in the Scottish PB of 1637, and from thence passed into the Eng. PB in 1662. Its adoption was in accordance with primitive use, and was a distinct gain. Its position, too,

<sup>1</sup> Offerings in kind are frequently made by the converts in Missionary Churches.

immediately aft. the Presentation of the Alms is significant as replacing the ancient custom of the people offering the bread and wine, and is in strict agreement with the best liturgical usage (e.g., that of Milan). All this is obscured by the slovenly custom, not uncommon last cent., of placing the Elements on the Holy Table bef. the beginning of the service, and by the equally slovenly custom, not uncommon nowadays, of placing them there bef. the Presentation of the Alms. Both are direct violations of the letter and spirit of the PB. (On the question what is meant by "alms and oblations" in the succeeding Pr., see CHURCH MILITANT, PRAYER FOR THE, § 3.)

(ii) The word O. is, as we have seen, also applied, like the Latin *Offertorium*, to what is said or sung during the Offering. In the Pre-Reformation services the *Offertorium* was an Anthem varying with the day. For this in the PB of 1549 certain SENTENCES were substituted, which might be either said or sung. In 1552 the permission to sing them was omitted; nevertheless the custom has not altogether died out. It is perfectly lawful, after one or more of the Sents. have been read, to sing a hymn until the end of the Offering, and such a hymn may well be called "the *Offertory Hymn*."

(iii) The fashion of calling the collection the *Offertory* has no sanction whatever in the PB, or in any other liturgical authority, and is merely a vulgar error of the last half century.—H1.

J. W. TYRER.

**OFFICE, DIVINE.**—The common designation of the entire series of daily offices for the HOURS OF PRAYER. But in England bef. the Reformation this was known as the *Divine Service*.—B2.

A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**OFFICIAL PRINCIPAL.**—The spiritual jurisdiction of Bps. previous to the 12th cent. was, in regard to matters to be judicially determined, exercised personally, either in Synod, or with the assistance of some of the clergy summoned to take part *ad hoc*. The organisation of Ecclesiastical Courts as subsequently developed did not as yet exist. Gradually certain persons were appointed to assist in a more permanent capacity; these, following the usage of the Roman Civil Law, were called *officiales*. Mention of them is found in the proceedings of the Council of Westminster, 1173. The rise of the office of VICAR-GENERAL, to whom was entrusted the exercise of the "voluntary jurisdiction" of the Bp., such as the granting of licences, dispensations, faculties and such like, was followed by the creation of the office of *officialis principalis*, to whom was entrusted the exercise of the coercive jurisdiction of the Bp. The OP. thus became the judge of the Bp.'s Court. He has ordinary jurisdiction and can pronounce a definitive sentence against which there is no appeal to the Bp. The latter is,

<sup>1</sup> It has, however, become so firmly established in the reports of religious societies and on the lips of ch. officers that even those who dislike the innovation must admit that usage has created a fresh connotation for the word.—G. H.]

however, not excluded from his own Court by the appointment of the OP. ; he can, if he chooses, sit with him, and reserve the sentence to himself. The Court is for this reason called the **CONSISTORY COURT**, because the Bp. sits there, or can do so, with his official ; though in practice this seldom occurs. They two form *unum consistorium*, and, therefore, as just said, there is no appeal to the Bp., even if the sentence is pronounced by the official alone, for he exercises the plenitude of the Bp.'s coercive jurisdiction as his deputy and representative. He is called OP. to distinguish him from inferior officials, who were called *Officiales foranei*, because they did not reside, as the OP. was supposed to do, in the episcopal city, but in other places of the diocese, and had only limited powers, both with respect to the matters concerning which they could adjudicate, and the parts of the diocese in which they could act. Archdeacons also have their officials who exercise their coercive jurisdiction in their Courts ; though still appointed, their office is now hardly more than a formality, or at best they are legal advisers to the archdeacon. The archdeacon's official is properly an OP., though it is not customary now to call him so. The OP. is required by the Canon Law to be an ecclesiastic, though Minor Orders will suffice for his qualification ; at present he is usually a barrister and layman. The OP. can, as well as the Vicar-General, appoint *Surrogates* whom he can direct to sit in Court, and hear evidence, and perform other judicial acts on his behalf and under his direction. It has become customary in England to appoint the same person to the three distinct offices of Vicar-General, O.P., and CHANCELLOR. For a full discussion of the history and functions of officials, see Fournier, *Les Officialites au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1880.—A5. E. G. WOOD.

[Abps. as well as Bps. have official principals ; the Dean of the Arches being the OP. of the prov. court of Canterbury, with original jurisdiction under the *Public Worship Regulation Act*, 1874, and an appellate jurisdiction from each of the diocesan and archidiaconal courts in the province. The Chancellor of the Chancery Court of York has similar powers in the northern province.]

R. J. WHITWELL.

**OFFICIATING MINISTER.**—This designation is usually employed in describing the clergyman who performs some eccles. duty, if he be not the incumbent or licensed curate to whom the right or responsibility of performing it properly belongs. Thus, in registering either a baptism or burial taken by a stranger, it is very usual to describe him, or for him to describe himself, as "A.B. Officiating Minister." It would seem, however, that it would be more correct if the officiant were to be described by his proper eccles. title ; such as A.B. Rector of X, or C.D. assistant Curate of Y. The addition of the words "Officiating Minister" is superfluous, as the signature comes in a column of the register headed, "By whom the ceremony was performed" or such like. The designation is not properly a technical one, and its use cannot be advised. It does not serve to identify the person who performed the duty, and is therefore useless. Its convenience consists principally in furnishing a comprehensive title by which

the person who will perform a clerical duty may be addressed beforehand in cases of doubt.—Ta.

E. G. WOOD.

**OILS, HOLY.**—(1) Oil of Catechumens, (2) CHRISM, (3) Oil of the Sick. Since the seventh cent. the holy oils, formerly consecrated at any time, have been blessed by the Roman bishops in the Mass on Maundy Thursday. See Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dict.*, art. *Oils, Holy*.—R2. V. STALEY.

**OLD CATHOLICS.**—This title is adopted by those congregations in Germany, Holland, Switzerland and elsewhere which have rejected the Vatican dogma of Papal infallibility, and have organised themselves independently. A short statement of the Constitution adopted by them is inserted here, inasmuch as their policy was avowedly dictated by a desire, which the Church of England also professes, to restore primitive practice so far as may be. It was also animated by characteristically German faithfulness to the model they had in view, and thoroughness in following out the theories upon which they were acting. An official account of this Constitution is given by von Schultze in his *Altkatholismus* (Giessen, 1887), pp. 577 ff.

He states the position thus : "At the head of the Church stands the Bishop, and at his side the Synodalpräsidentanz." This is a sort of Standing Committee composed of four clergy and six laymen. It in no way controls the power of the Bp. over his proper episcopal functions, e.g., matters sacramental, matters of teaching, jurisdiction and visitation, or matters affecting his *jus liturgicum* (subject to the ecclesiastical law). It is intended as a support for, rather than a control over, him. This Committee controls the Church Property, calls special meetings of the Synod, settles the agenda for Synod meetings, and maintains discipline over the clergy, with the Bp. as President. For all ordinary business of the Church the Synod is responsible. It consists (under the Presidency of the Bp.) of all the clergy and of lay representatives from each parish. Its duties are : making Church laws ; giving sentence in serious cases of clerical discipline ; giving decision upon complaints against the Bp. or the Standing Committee ; election of a Bp. and of various other officers. Each parish is under the leadership of the parish priest, who is responsible under the Bp. for the cure of souls. For matters not clearly pastoral there exists a Church Council, for seeing to the ordinary expenses, for the appointment of officials, the care of the poor, the proper arrangement for the services (not including the manner of conducting them), etc. There is also a Meeting of Parishioners when called to elect a priest to the cure, or representatives to the Synod, or for financial matters of importance. For this Constitution Dr. von Schultze claims that it is true to the primitive ideal, and when put to practical proof it properly preserves spiritual authority, while putting no hindrance in the way of true corporate parochial life.—A1. T. SYDNEY LEA.

**OMISSION** has two special references in regard to the PB. (1) It describes the dropping of some part of one ed. of the PB from one of the subsequent revisions, and the question arises whether the O. has the effect of prohibition. For this see *RITUAL LAW*, § 3, 4. (2) It describes the O. by a minister of the whole or part of some prescribed rite or ceremony.—A4. G. HARFORD.

**ORATORY.**—An O., being a place for private pr., must be distinguished from a domestic chapel. The private Os. at Blois and Holyrood are good examples, and the wayside chapels on the bridges

at Lucerne and Wakefield were probably intended for use as Os. rather than as chapels for public or corporate use.—R6. CHARLES A. NICHOLSON.

### ORDER.<sup>1</sup>

#### I. ORDER AS A PRACTICAL PRINCIPLE.

The essential idea of O. is the shaping of action to realise ends. Each act of will (see

MAN, § 20) is an attempt to *order* the situation in which a man finds himself, in *order* (our common

idiom illustrates the point) to further some *personal* end. But we more commonly use O. to describe a predetermined plan to fit a series of similar recurrent situations. Effective action would be impossible if every situation were new, and the expedient act had to be thought out independently. So, even within the region in which his liberty of action is most complete, the individual is obliged to make out a kind of programme of expedient behaviour to fit the occasions that resemble one another. Partly he invents an O. of life unconsciously: as similar occasions recur, he disposes of them each time more promptly and with closer conformity to a type, till an O. is insensibly created. Partly he deliberately plans out this or that section of his life, fixing some points, and leaving others elastic. And success in life largely depends upon the wisdom shown in the *ordering* of it. It is important to notice, however, that this fixing beforehand of a prescribed O. is only wise on the assumption that *on the average* it will answer better to keep it than to break it. Small inconveniences and losses arising from adherence to the rule will be properly disregarded in view of the promptitude, quickness and efficiency which conformity to rule produces on other occasions. The saving of mental and nervous strain, and the release of the mind to occupy itself with wider and more distant issues, are other patent advantages of O. in the life of the individual.

The application of this principle to personal RELIGION is obvious. On the one hand, a sound

#### 2. O. in Personal Religion.

rule of life must provide opportunities for private devotion and public worship, sufficiently numerous and frequent, and so planned out as to develop harmoniously the spiritual life. On the other hand, the hours of sleep, work and leisure must be also ordered so as most adequately under the individual circumstances to realise the ideal of "a godly, righteous, and sober life."

But the *practical* nature of O. must never be forgotten. A rule may be badly framed at first, and, if experience shows it does not work, no supposed principle of self-consistency must prevent its being modified. Again, no two recurrent situations are identical, and a rule

#### 3. O. a Practical Principle.

<sup>1</sup> The word often occurs in the PB: (1) for the full form for any service (*i.e.*, both the *Office* or words, and the regulating *Rubrics*), 17 times in contents and headings; (2) for the Ch. system of ritual; (3) for either grade of the threefold ministry; (4) as verb = *ordain*; (5) for the fundamental idea, on which other uses rest. This receives full treatment in the text.

may become inexpedient from change of circumstances. Again, the person who made the rule is ever changing and developing. A rule which helped him yesterday may cramp his growth or obstruct his progress to-morrow. A rule of life is really just a piece of advice given to and accepted by a man. Of necessity it is based on a fallible estimate of a changing future. He who is always making new rules or finding reasons for exceptions to old ones will be weak and ineffective. And he who is a slave to the advice he gave himself ten years ago will never be a counsellor or a leader.

Although O. of this private or personal kind is not the subject of this art., so much has been said for the purpose of bringing

#### 4. Public or Common O.

out the fundamental principle of all O., that it is essentially practical, and has constant reference to future situations, which can only be provisionally imagined from the experience of the past. In the case of public or common O. it is still less possible to make sure that the arrangement ordered beforehand shall suit all the emergencies that may arise. The element of compromise bulks larger where the O. has to fit many persons and places in differing circumstances. And the test of a wise O. will be that it settles firmly those matters which are much the same for all everywhere, allows alternatives for the exceptional cases that can be clearly foreseen, and in minor points gives discretion to persons in authority. Public O., then, is concerned with (1) rules for persons to obey or enforce, (2) the appointment of persons to enforce O. or use discretion, and (3) institutions, *i.e.*, groups of persons and things regulated by rules.

Under MAN, § 25, it is shown that the most satisfactory divisions of human activity follow the groupings of the four distinctive modes of his being. O. is, we have seen, related primarily to the will, and the machinery of Ch. government as an engine of the corporate will (to use a convenient though inexact expression) is the principal matter to be considered. But it will be well first to see the function of O. in relation to those activities in which the will is grouped with the imagination, the reason, and the heart.

#### II. ORDER IN RITUAL, DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE.

RITUAL, as is shown under that art. (§ 2), is concerned with the *expression* of religion. It will then be the function of O. to

5. **Ritual O.** settle what, all things considered, will be the most *useful* expression of truth and duty which can be devised to suit the needs and capacities of the people at the particular juncture when the O. is made, and throughout the region over which the ordaining authority has jurisdiction.

See further, RITUAL, §§ 5-13, and RITUAL LAW. In illustration of the general principle it may be pointed out that the modern study of the OT has brought out in a most interesting and impressive way the fact that Hebrew ritual was the product of a long and continuous development. It underwent, not only constant modification in details, but

repeated and drastic revisions, to make it correspond to the altered ideas and habits of the worshippers. The establishment of the Christian Ch. might have merely led to a revision of the OT ritual. But the failure of the Jews generally to accept Jesus as Messiah, and the consequent cleavage between Jews and Christians, together with the successful Gentile Mission of St. Paul, led in the providence of God to the springing up of a new and independent Christian ritual. The essential fitness of this change is expressed in the sentence, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law" (Heb. 7 12). The action of Augustine of Cant. in adapting forms to the conditions and needs of his people, on the express advice of Pope Gregory, marks this plan of local liberty of development as a Catholic method. And the various existing PBs authorised within the Ang. Communion are each the outcome of a long process of practical adjustment. (See HISTORY OF PB REVISION.)

DOCTRINE, in its more specific sense, is a department of Ch. O., which cannot and does not settle what is true, but what—being accepted as true—may *usefully* be embraced as fundamentally needful, formulated in such and such terms, recited, subscribed, or learnt by heart. It is a matter of O. to permit or enjoin that the Bible be translated, printed, read—by the clergy, by a select few, or by all. Authority, which is the voice of O., can by selection and publication *make* such convenient distinctions as those between religious and secular, fundamental and minor, simple and elaborated, truths. The *mind* cannot *find* any real dividing line between these, but the *will* draws its lines where it seems most convenient. Religious education, and the organisation of study, research and instruction, are matters that fall within the province of O., though they may be dealt with by voluntary associations, as well as by eccles. authority proper.

DISCIPLINE, the third department of religious life with which O. has to do, taken in a wide sense, includes the entire working system of the Ch. as directly aimed at the formation of character, the progressive renewal of the *heart*, the realisation of the promise and potency of regeneration—in a word, the perfecting of redeemed humanity. It covers the whole range of Pastoral Care. Authority must lay down the functions and limits of Orders of ministers, with the offices they serve, and the spheres of their several jurisdictions. (See the relevant arts. grouped under App. τ.) The task of formulating a *code* of morals is one that has in the past been undertaken by various portions of the Church. It is, however, one of extreme difficulty in its relation to the general law of a civilised country, and in the Ang. Communion is hardly any longer attempted with regard to the laity. The marriage laws (App. ma) form a partial and perplexing exception. An elementary formulation is, however, contained in the Cat., which needs very slight change to make it a convenient expression for present use of admitted principles (cp. CATECHISM, REVISION OF). Beyond this

guidance, teachers and taught are left to apply as best they may the precepts of SCRIPTURE and the incidental provisions of the PB (cp. also CHRISTIAN RELIGION, §§ 10 f.).

The "O. of this Ch. and Realm" is perhaps at its weakest in the *administration* of the pastoral charge of the people. Beyond good advice, or, at most, admonitions to which a deaf ear may with impunity be turned, the rulers of the Ch. can do little to secure more than a bare minimum of efficiency from the benefited clergy (cp. DIOCESAN BP., § 4). PREACHING, VISITING (see VISITATION), work in the SCHOOLS, the reconciliation and direction of penitents (see REPENTANCE), and the warning of offenders, are all left in the main dependent on the zeal and discretion of the incumbent and his colleagues. Organisation should not be so rigid as to cramp or distort healthy life in the Body of Christ, but it ought not to be so loosely and slightly framed that the very ends for which the Body has been constituted should be imperilled in parish after parish. In the pastoral methods of the Roman Ch., of Nonconformist bodies, of the Salvation Army, and of other Ang. Chs. and missionary jurisdictions, along with salutary warnings not a little valuable suggestion may be found against the day when the Ch. of Eng. shall rouse herself to claim and exercise a worthier share of the spirit of Order.

### III. CHURCH POLITY—ITS GENESIS AND POWERS.

The aim of Ch. organisation is, therefore, that the Ch. may be ordered and equipped to discharge its threefold function of stimulating, maintaining and directing the Worship, Faith, and Obedience of its members.

Thorndike, the Ang. writer who, after Hooker, has perhaps most thoroughly explored this field, makes worship the determining factor.

"The society of the Ch. standing upon the right and power of assembling for the common service of God . . . the whole extent of eccles. power must needs consist in determining the persons, the times, the places, the forms, the ceremonies, the rules and solemnities, by which, on which, at which, and according to which, the offices of Divine service . . . are to be performed, so far as by God's law they are not determined; so that the chief power in every Ch. must needs be that without which these things are not determinable."

But, while worship is thus shown to be a sufficient reason for the organisation of Ch. authority, it will be readily perceived, from what has gone before, that the departments of Doctrine and Discipline no less urgently demand an established system behind them. We have now to inquire what that system is to be.

The analysis of the nature of MAN, as well as the analogy of social life in general, would lead us to expect that in the endeavour to give effect to that yearning of the heart for fellowship with persons, the highest manifestation of which is RELIGION, the method of *association* would be peculiarly

#### 8. Pastoral Care.

#### 9. Aim of Ch. Polity.

#### 10. Primitive Religion Social.



prominent. The history of religions shows us that this has in actual fact been the case. Early religion is an affair of the whole community. Worship is the essential mark of explicit religion, and "we may safely say that there can be no worship unless there is a community worshipping and a being to be worshipped" (Jevons, *The Idea of God in Early Religions*, 1911, p. 62). It was in religion that the social tie was most keenly felt, and, in a wide sense, the Ch. has constantly been the precursor or consolidator of the State.

But "worship is, of course, a habit: if it is not a habit, it ceases to be at all, in any effective sense.

#### 11. Separate Organisation of Religion.

And it is a habit of the community, of the common consciousness, which is continuous through the ages, even though it slowly changes; and which, as continuous, is conservative and tenacious" (Jevons, *ib.*, p. 61); and in this fact lies a first cause of cleavage between the worshipping community and the nation. If the enlightenment of an educated class proceed faster than the guardians of religion can keep pace with, and the "Ch." becomes identified with outgrown beliefs and a lower level of morality (cp. AUTHORITY, § 7), then the union of Ch. and State becomes formal and nominal, or breaks down alto-gether. If, however, the sudden wave of enlighten-ment comes within the circle of worshippers, and an inward transformation works a revolution in the forms of worship, then there is also a cause for cleav-age, but of an opposite kind: the Ch. distinguishes itself from, and is perhaps rejected by, the World; and, again, the impulse to separate organisation is irresistible. So also, where the Ch. exists only as a missionary body, planted in the midst of an in-different or friendly or hostile non-Christian popu-lation, the relative independence of Ch. O. is obviously necessary.

In modern Christendom, however closely in certain cases Ch. and State may be linked together, there is no longer any

#### 12. Ch. and World.

*fusion* between the two. The eccles. and civil spheres are universally recognised as distinct, though the border line may not always be clear, or be variously placed in individual cases. A grave cause of complica-tion has arisen from the confusion between the Ch. and the World, which first became acutely felt at and after the time of Constantine (see CHURCH, § 16). And the subject of Ch. O. cannot be rightly judged unless the nature of this distinction be clearly understood. That it is a necessary distinction may be at once ad-mitted; but is the necessity theoretical or only practical, essential or merely convenient?

Those whose thinking is largely dominated by the idea of the Ch. have tended to speak as if

#### 13. Ch. O. and Salvation.

the administration of Sacraments by duly authorised ministers created a distinct O. of the regenerate, the baptised being, in an essential and not merely a rhetorical sense, a "new creation," a "new people."<sup>1</sup> The watchword of this tendency is the famous formula *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. But that this formula will not hold as more than rhetorically true is shown by the exceptions to

which it is subject. Unbaptised martyrs in the ancient Ch. and the Quakers in modern times are stubborn proofs that very real "salvation" is experienced "outside the Church." On this view, *i.e.*, the word *salus* has to be qualified as meaning "guaranteed or authorised salvation." It follows that eternal salvation is not finally determined by conformity to Ch. O.,<sup>1</sup> which has only to do with the visible Church. On the other hand, those who think rather in terms of the individual Christian can adopt the same formula, using *salus* in the full sense, but meaning by *ecclesiam* what is called "the invis-ible Ch.," *i.e.*, the aggregate of persons inside and outside the visible Ch. who are actually in en-joyment of salvation. But this sense, as having no longer any application to Ch. O., lies outside our subject.

The difficulty of definition is not met by the sug-gestion to use "Ch." for the visible society, and

#### 14. Closer Definitions of Ch. and World.

"Kingdom of God" for the wider but less tangible circle. For (1) the King-dom has the double sense in the Gospels, and (2) the question is not merely one of terminology. Perhaps light will come from a brief examination of first principles. According to the Cat., "all mankind" has been "redeemed." Then, strictly and logically, the World of men is potentially the Church. Conversely, the invisible Ch. (the limits of which are known only to God) is the World of mankind so far as its members (within and without the visible Ch.) realise their redemption (*i.e.*, the *inwardly* elect people of God), and the visible Ch. is the aggregate of those who comply with the requirements for admission which are properly laid down by Ch. O. (*i.e.*, the *outwardly* elect people of God). It follows that the antithesis, the Ch. and the World, is only accurate when "Ch." is the invisible ag-gregate of the saved, and "World" is, not the real World of mankind, but the narrower World of the unsaved, which also is invisible in the same sense in that human judgment cannot discern its limits. It follows also that the visible "Ch." and the invisible "World" are different cross-divisions of mankind. This (evil) World has always been represented among the members of the visible Ch.: there was a traitor among the Twelve, and even in the apostolic Ch tares and wheat were mingled together.

The very important practical question of the relation of the Ch. to the World, as it is discussed under CHURCH, § 16, is a question of Ch. O. and policy: how strictly shall access to the Ch. be fenced, so as to exclude the unworthy, without unduly excluding those who, through being taken in, may become worthy? Some line must be drawn, and drawn by fallible Ch. authority.

Under Ch. O. the three functions of govern-ment, *i.e.*, legislation, administration, and jurisdiction, fall naturally to be considered in this order. But it is to be observed that at first they flowed forth as a single stream from the fountain of apostolic authority. The mystical Body of

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion* (2), 1908, p. 244 n., and the whole chapter, with the quotation from Tertullian on p. 269. "We are of a different nature, I suppose!" repelling a charge of inhumanity. "Nay, a Christian too is a man, he is whatever you are" (*Apol.* 8).

<sup>1</sup> Thorndike (*Works* 2 347) reckons this as a commonplace: "It is notorious to all that understand but a little in Christian-ity, that it is not sin, but the notoriousness of sin, that renders a man liable to be excommunicate: even as it is not Christian-ity, but the profession of it, that qualifies a man to be of the Church."

Christ was only *born* into the world on the day of Pentecost. The Jewish Ch. had long been bearing within itself this child of promise, which at its birth possessed a certain definite though undeveloped structure, the effect of the call and training of the Master. Three strata or circles at least can be recognised: Peter with the rest of the Twelve, an intermediate ring of out-and-out Disciples (those who had literally left all to follow Christ), and the main body of adherents who pursued their ordinary callings. This community had no historic consciousness of any time in which it did not abide in the fourfold Apostolic O., which embraced Doctrine, Discipline (implied in fellowship), and Ritual ("the breaking of bread and the prayers").

Harnack, in his *Constitution and Law of the Ch.*, 1910 (esp. App. I), over against Sohm's elaborately argued verdict that "the rise of eccles. law and the constitution of the Ch. is an apostasy from the conditions intended by Jesus Himself and originally realised," has produced a robust and individual reconstruction of the Ch. in the Apostolic and Primitive periods, as taking of necessity and by intention the form of an external organisation. But his conclusion, after noting the revolution wrought by the Lutheran Reformation, that "the nations of W. Europe still live as Catholics or as Protestants," and "are still waiting for a third kind of Ch. as the foundation of their higher life," needs to be supplemented by what may be called the Anglican golden mean. According to the unreformed Catholic view, as held in the East, Ch. O. is a complete and unalterable system of Divine appointment, while in the Roman Ch. it is rather a huge developing organism, all the main accretions or modifications of which become permanently possessed of the sacredness and Divine authority attaching to the earliest and most fundamental elements. According to the Continental Protestant and general English Separatist view, Ch. O. is the unfettered construction of a voluntary association of Christian believers linked in such numbers and groupings and with such constitutions and laws as appears convenient<sup>1</sup> to the members of such groups or associations, any of whom may at their discretion join other societies or form new ones without forfeiting Ch. status or Christian privileges.

According to the view of the Ang. formularies (upon a moderate interpretation of their terms)

17. **Anglican View.** Ch. O. is the eccles. system freely accepted in the living present by the local Ch., rooted in the past yet reaching out to the future, flexible to its own internal needs, yet loyally sensitive to the duty of intercommunion actual or prospective. Such a view may find itself reflected in the NT, where we find the community from the first as a living society of concrete individuals at work

<sup>1</sup> The Puritan idea of an inflexible Scriptural prescription of details of Ch. O. is now almost universally abandoned.

in time and space, and endowed with inherent authority through persons and groups to settle matters of all kinds as they arose. New members were baptised in *water*, though the outward element is not mentioned in the Gospel record of the institution of Bapt., and John had contrasted his water-bapt. with the Messianic Bapt. in Holy Spirit and in fire. The Washing of the Feet was dispensed with while the Breaking of the Bread was retained. More remarkable still, the new Society shed off, in due course, the whole ritual and ceremonial system of the Mosaic law, including Sabbath observance, without any command of the Master to this effect being recorded. Not even the form of the Lord's Pr. or the Decalogue was fixed by authority.

The Words of the Messiah echoed in the ears of His disciples as clarion calls to spiritual freedom; and were left to be put on paper by anonymous editors—so clearly were they, not shackles upon the soul, nor even labour-saving moulds for turning out lives on one pattern, but liberative forces. The Ch., in a word, started without any prescribed system of O., or any rules but those imperishable Laws of spiritual O. which were first written from the beginning in man's nature, next discerned and kept by the Son of Man, and then revealed freely and fully to others in His Life, His Words, His Death, and His Resurrection. All rules of Discipline about right and wrong were henceforth to be applications of the Law of love, before which the most venerable sanctions of conduct must eventually bend and break if at variance with it. All Doctrines of men must be subject to the law of the progressive guidance of Christians by the Spirit into all truth. All Ritual, aiming at the due expression of the regenerate soul, must obey the Law of clear vision ("what I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light"), by which a strange tongue and dark ceremonies are excluded. And, finally, all eccles. rules and canons must conform to the Law of the practical end ("The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath"), so that the worth of institutions, offices, customs and laws may and should be ever and anon estimated afresh according to their effect upon life and character.

It has, however, been usual, and indeed is still, to except certain fundamental customs and rules from the revising authority of the living local Ch., as being fixed by a prior and superior authority. Such institutions as the ministry with its grades, infant bapt., Sunday, Confirm., and so forth, are regarded as belonging to a different category from (say) the PB formula for announcing the Gospel. Any other idea has been supposed to leave all institutions in a state of flux. But (1) the assumption underlying this view is that the superior authority settled these matters in the best way, and that this way is still best; (2) if this way is still the best, it may be trusted to approve itself

18. **"Christ's Gospel not a Ceremonial Law."**

19. **Limits of Ch. Authority.**

as such, having all the prestige of authority and experience to cast into the balance in addition to its intrinsic merit; (3) it is impossible to find any valid dividing line between things settled and things left discretionary, for the one class shades off into the other; (4) in common life we need no authority to bid us eat food or wear clothes, and the scale of value of the practices enjoined by Ch. O. may be safely left to Christian experience to settle.

But (5) such theoretically unlimited authority can only safely be claimed by or ascribed to eccles. bodies which (a) allow due weight to history as the stored experience of an older and wider past than the lifetime of a generation, and (b) consider, with adequate knowledge for judgment, the effects of any fundamental change upon the future of universal Christendom. To reserve all sorts of questions to a General Council is to allow the stationary or reactionary parts of Christendom to cancel by their *non possumus* attitude the Christian liberty of the rest. All that can reasonably be stipulated for is that the independently deliberating part shall, with conscientious and enlightened care, act as a *constituent part of a world-wide whole*. The need for such a stipulation is written large in the story of the wanton sacrifice by the sects of one portion after another of the Catholic Christian heritage. Such abuse of authority is not best prevented by fencing off reserved areas, but by providing for its wise exercise.

It is not, of course, intended to deny that there are institutions which the Ch. may properly pronounce to be necessary for its *esse* or *bene esse*. But it is suggested that these need not be regarded as restrictions upon its freedom, but as Divinely indicated forms, within which, with a free discernment of their intrinsic value, the Spirit-guided Ch. moves, in the exercise of its liberty. Thus the Anglican Bps., who affirmed in 1888, and reaffirmed in 1897, the four articles of the "Lambeth Quadrilateral," equally exercised the faculty of authoritative but unfettered judgment when they set their seal upon the four fundamentals, and when they virtually expressed themselves ready to dispense with other things, once regarded as also fundamental, e.g., Ritual Uniformity, even as the primitive Ch. dispensed with the Agape. What is fixed, and binds the Ch. with the constraint of a Divine obligation, is the principle of Utility, or practical efficiency, in the realm of Ch. O., with a view to Edification.

#### IV. "THE ORDER OF THIS CHURCH AND REALM."

Ch. O. is equivalent to Ch. Authority in action, and its functions are legislation, administration, and jurisdiction. All these, however, presuppose a basis in some external organisation, which has—whether formally or informally—already come into being. The Eng. Ch., in that resettlement of her position which took place at the Reformation and after, in theory only threw off the usurped authority of the Papal Curia, and fell back upon the diocesan, provincial, and national organisation which had been overshadowed by it. In form, the

Reformation was, as concerned polity, a return from Papacy to EPISCOPACY. In fact, it was the substitution, for the occasional interference and continual exactions of a distant Pope, of frequent interventions and more ruthless exactions under colour of a Royal SUPREMACY on the spot. The old areas, the old ministers and officers for the most part, the old Convs., the old Courts were left in being. But the Submission of the Clergy, the new eccles. legislation of PARLIAMENT, the reduction of the old CANON LAW to a condition that might be called suspended animation, the dissolution of the monasteries, the issue of Royal INJUNCTIONS, and the far-reaching exercise of the visitatorial power claimed to be inherent in the Crown, combined to alter radically the balance and mutual relations of the various parts of the machinery of government.

It can hardly be said that Ch. government has ever settled down into any very satisfactory system since the Reformation. A lay member of the American Ch., Dr. Usher, in his *Reconstruction of the Eng. Ch.*, 1910, 14 ff., says: "When the breach with the Papacy had been finally consummated, the chief concern of Henry and his advisers was the preservation of the doctrinal unity with the Ch. of the past, and the demonstration . . . that the Eng. Ch. was not a new Ch., but the old institution strengthened through the resumption, by king and nation, of those powers in whose usurpation by the popes they had so long acquiesced. *No structural changes were considered necessary*. The Ch. was now what it had been, and, if anything had been altered, it was for the better. . . . Under Edward VI the struggle for unity of doctrinal belief in the Ch. became the crucial issue. . . . If the disputes over doctrine could only be ended, the Edwardian prelates felt sure that the administration of the Ch., which they now found so difficult, would become very easy. *The existence of any structural defect in the Ch. itself was not suspected*. . . . Like her father, but from different reasons, Elizabeth regarded the eccles. settlement as a temporary expedient. Henry VIII took no more action, because he believed no more to be necessary; Elizabeth, because she was convinced that no more was possible. To her, the firm establishment of political Protestantism was the paramount issue. . . . She could not believe that *fundamental faults existed in the frame of the institution* which prevented the most conscientious of bps., or most skillful administrators, from making it work well. . . . Her settlement, like that of her father, was in the main negative and destructive; the truest and best constructive work, *the real construction of the Eng. Ch.* [in its new phase], was left to the Jacobean leaders. . . . Reconstruction was not an attempt to elucidate the problem of the spiritual relation of the individual, but an effort to solve the difficulties of ordinary eccles. life." Not every one will agree with Dr. Usher in his estimate of Bancroft's work. But the CANONS of 1604 marked an epoch.

The subject is discussed further under ESTABLISHED CHURCH. The crux lies in the co-ordination of Parliament with some adequate Ch. conciliar system. The other Anglican Chs. have all developed a series of COUNCILS, parochial, diocesan, and often also provincial and general (see ANGLICAN COMMUNION). The principle of EPISCOPACY is uniformly safeguarded

#### 21. Need for Conciliar System.

20. Ch. O. since the Reformation.

by the Bishop's veto, and large powers are accorded to the laity. In England the recently formed REPRESENTATIVE CH. COUNCIL may in the future become an important factor in an effective revival of Ch. government, if by the parallel creation of a system of PAROCHIAL CH. COUNCILS the lay element can be made genuinely representative of the worshipping laity, and if the Lower Houses of Conv. can be reformed by an enlarged and proportional representation of the clergy.

At the same time the *irregularity* of procedure in the 16th cent., as compared with previous eccles. precedents, does not carry

**22. Procedure**  
Valid but  
Irregular.

with it the *invalidity* of the several stages of settlement, if the view of Ch. O. be accepted which has been already expressed, *i.e.*, that it must "conform to the law of the practical end" (§ 18 end).

Thorndike has an apposite saying, that "The holding of Councils is of Divine right, so far as it is manifest to common sense that it is a readier way to despatch matters determinable" (*Works* 1 537), where he explicitly identifies "Divine right" in matters of eccles. procedure with the "readier way." In another passage the same writer puts admirably the true ground of acquiescence in much law and custom which lacks or has lacked express synodical sanction. He says: "I conceive the Ch. was from the beginning, by virtue of the perpetual intelligence and correspondence settled and used between the parts of it, a *standing synod*, even when there was no assembly of persons authorised to consent in behalf of their respective [local or diocesan] Churches" (*Works* 2 423).

The very going on of a Ch. under a particular system, while it does not bind that Ch. never afterwards to vary the system, may be held—at least within its own borders—to validate the system independently of the methods of its introduction. The admission of its validity by other Chs. will also in the long run be properly independent of questions of procedure, and will turn on the intrinsic nature of the changes made.

The term *legislation* is commonly used of the making of those laws which have widest authority and highest coercive power in any community, and is therefore in England usually understood to refer to the Statutes of the Realm. But the word may also be used in a wider sense for all that process of making plans in advance which only finds in the Statute Book its exemplary product. Early law is indistinguishable from custom, and still the law of the past is being irresistibly modified and the law of the future as surely prepared for by the custom of the present. Another source of law has been recurrent administrative direction, which eventually is extended and formulated as a permanent rule. Other laws are deliberate introductions of a novel order. But all share the provisional and contingent character which has been explained in §§ 1-4. All are relative to the eternal Laws or Principles of Beauty (or fitness of expression), Truth, Utility (or good O.), and Duty (Love to

God and man), as was indicated in § 18. They are jointly based on a rational judgment of past events, and on an imaginative construction of future contingencies in accordance with this judgment, but, in becoming laws, they have acquired a new and constitutive element, the determinative action of the will (cp. AUTHORITY, §§ 4-6). It follows that it is of the essence of human enactments that their terms are by due authority properly variable. The rule as to the desuetude of Canon Law is an obvious confirmation of this principle. If it be urged that the legislative authority of the Ch. is by Art. 20 (cp. Art. 34) declared insufficient "to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written," then the action of the Ch. in regard to the 4th Commandment (cp. SUNDAY), in accordance with the teaching of our Lord, and also of St. Paul, shows that the limitation in the Art. is practically equivalent to the exceptions noted above and in § 18.

The Ch. of Eng., which expressly emphasises the variableness of ritual laws (see RITUAL, § 6),

with equal clearness insists that the current laws ought to be obeyed (*ib.*, § 12). The same principle is well set out by Thorndike (*Works* 1 234), who backs up his own judgment by illustrative quotations from Melancthon and Calvin.

"If the laws of the Ch., strengthened by the secular arm, bind not a man in conscience by virtue of that law of God, that enforceth obedience to their authors . . . then must all men be at their freedom to dissolve or preserve O. in the service of God as they please. . . . When there is law to constrain us, we may perhaps have reason to think that the authors of laws might have done better in ordering matters otherwise, and yet be bound ourselves to follow the course which they prescribe. They are to answer for the things they enjoin: we for our performance; when was any human law made that could not be faulted? If our obedience be delayed till it find such laws as no fault can be found with, the world must end in confusion before we practice that virtue. It is never lawful to do anything that is evil; but it is not evil, but necessary, in the sphere of things indifferent, to follow the law that standeth, though a better might stand instead of it."

The cogency of this, in regard to laws which have been recently enacted, or upheld by an efficient legislative authority, is

**25. Recurrent**  
Need for  
Legislation.

clear. But, if the machinery for revising laws is so cumbrous and inefficient that the hope of useful amendment seems to practical men insufficient to justify the toil and cost of attempting it, the natural consequence must inevitably be that, under the "intolerable strain" of an ancient unrevised law, relaxations of all kinds are quietly assumed, and winked at by those in authority (cp. RITUAL LAW, end). The *impasse* is likely to grow worse in England, unless the Ch. succeeds in regaining some degree of legislative autonomy, or—with the bettering of her internal representative system—acquires such an added momentum as shall ensure the reasonable co-operation of Parliament.

The need for constant revision of eccles. laws has never been better stated than by Bacon in *Certain Considerations touching the better pacification and edification of the Ch. of Eng.*; "I would only ask why the civil state should be purged and restored by good and wholesome laws, made every 3rd or 4th year in parl. assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth them, and contrariwise the eccles. state should still continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration now for these five and forty years and more."

Much informal "legislation," in the form of customs, diocesan regulations, and by-laws of Ch. Societies, has furthered the ends of Ch. O.; but the need for such a development of the legislative function as contributes to the relatively higher efficiency (in relation to opportunity) of the sister Ang. Chs. is far more urgent than in Bacon's day.—A4, R.

The need is further exemplified in connection with *administration*, which is the central function of Ch. O., being occupied with the actual working of the Ch. system with a view to its great ends. The

**26. Administration.** appointment, powers and functions of the persons and bodies upon whom the burden of administrations falls (the ARCHBISHOP, DIOCESAN BISHOP, ARCHDEACON, RURAL DEAN, and CURATE, and the CATHEDRAL chapter and other grades of Ch. COUNCILS) all rest upon legislation, and their efficiency is gravely affected by defects in the law. Hitherto, moreover, there has been no system of FINANCE either for the Ch. at large or for its several dioceses. Old endowments have been allowed to paralysse, where they should have stimulated, Christian liberality. A system, or want of system, which was tolerable when most parishes were in large measure self-contained, is equally demoralising to both extremes (of rich and poor parishes), which social changes have produced. The bewildering multiplication of Ch. Societies, while it has called forth an enormous amount of Christian zeal and effort, has led to a grave over-production of religious machinery. There is not too much organisation, as is sometimes said, but too little of the best sort. All the resources of Christian statesmanship are needed to co-ordinate the competitive agencies which distract the Ch. by the restless and almost indecent rivalry of their appeals for help.

The function of *jurisdiction* is similarly dependent upon legislation. An altogether false importance has become attached to

**27. Jurisdiction.** questions as to the decisions and constitution of COURTS, just because a judgment has usually to be based on laws which expressed the mind of the Ch. two or three hundred years ago, while it has not been found practicable to introduce amendments even where it is deemed that the old laws no longer express the mind of the Ch. A system of jurisdiction, by which deliberate violations of law on the part of those charged to administer it may be effectively checked, is a condition of healthy Ch. life, which within the Ang. Communion is alone wanting to the mother Ch.

(Cp. RITUAL LAW, end of, § 35, and see further App. A5.)

For books see list under COURTS; cp. also Hooker's *EP*; Overall's *Convocation Book*; Field on *The Church*; Jackson on the Creed; Thorndike's *Works*; F. Myers, *Catholic Thoughts*, bks. 1, 2; and B. Croce, *Filosofia della Pratica*, iii. *Le Leggi*, 1909.—A, TA. G HARFORD.

**ORDERS, HOLY.**—The Preface to the Ordinal of the Ch. of Eng. recognises "these Orders of

1. Ministers in Christ's Church;  
Introductory, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." We have in this art. to consider, not the history or specific character of these offices, but the question what it is that constitutes a proper and regular ministry.

From a very early period in the history of the Ch. it was the custom to recognise other officials as being within the body of the ministers of the Ch., e.g., READERS, SUB-DEACONS, etc., and in the Middle Ages in the Western Ch. it was generally held that there were seven Orders. The formularies of the Ch. of Eng., however, only recognise three, and it is therefore with these only that we are here concerned (see further, MINOR ORDERS).

We will consider the subject under the following heads: (1) What is the nature of ministry? (2) By what authority is any person admitted to the ministry? (3) What is the relation of the minister to the laity?

(1) *What is the nature of Ministry?* The formularies of the Ch. of Eng. do not themselves furnish us with any very complete statements with regard to this

**2. Twofold Qualification.** question, but they set out two principles as fundamental. (a) The ordination services make it clear that no man should be admitted to any form of ministry unless he sincerely believes that he has been called by God to this work. The first question that is asked of those who are candidates for ordination as deacons is this: "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?" A similar question is asked in Ord.<sup>2, 3</sup>. (b) The principle is clearly set out that for the discharge of the regular ministry in the Ch. a man requires not only the call of God, but some public appointment or authority. The words of Art. 23 are as follows: "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This statement is obviously very cautious and restrained in its tone, but this much is clear, that the minister acts not merely in virtue of his personal qualifications, but in virtue of an authority which is committed to him.

We have thus clearly set out in the formularies

of the Ch. of Eng. the conception that there are two elements which go to make up the proper qualification for the office of Minister of the Church, the call of God, and some public authority. In order to consider the significance of these conceptions we must go back to the early history of the Christian Ch., and we shall then find that both these elements are represented in the history of the Ministry in the apostolic and primitive Ch. We must at the same time be prepared to find that the conception of ministry presented to us by the apostolic and sub-apostolic Ch. is not at all clearly defined, and that it was very slowly that this took definite and complete shape. Still it may be said with reasonable confidence that from a very early date we can recognise the two elements—spiritual endowment and vocation, and public authority—as each having an important place in the Ministry of the Christian Church.

The Epistles of St. Paul present us with a very living picture of the importance of the spiritual or charismatic element in the ministry. The most detailed

#### 4. Ministry Universal.

account of this is to be found in I Cor. 12, and we must stop for a moment to observe his conception of the character of the Christian society. It presents itself to him as the one Body of Christ, of which the individual Christians are members, but members not only in the sense that each draws his life from the one body, but that each renders to the one body his particular and appropriate service.

St. Paul conceives of each Christian as having his own endowment of the Holy Spirit: "To one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; to another faith, in the same Spirit; and to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues" (I Cor. 12 8-10—cp. Rom. 12 4-8). [See further, BODY, §§ 11 f.]

It is with this conception of the universal ministry of all Christian people that we must start if we are to understand St. Paul's conception of the order of the Ch., and we must be careful to observe that the universal ministry of Christian people does not merely mean that every one has his own vocation, and that every vocation can be dedicated to God's service; it is clear from I Cor. 14 that St. Paul is thinking also, perhaps especially, of ministration in the meetings of the Christian community. St. Paul also makes it plain that certain gifts seem to him to have a higher value than others, notably the gift of prophecy.

We can now understand the meaning of those two passages in which St. Paul sets out perhaps a little more formally the nature of the ministrations which God has given to the Church.

#### 5. Graded Ministries.

"God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers

kinds of tongues" (I Cor. 12 28); and again, "And he (Christ) gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4 11).

All these offices or ministrations are related to some special gift of the Holy Spirit which makes men competent for the services which they are to render to the Christian community, and we may be confident that we must include among them such more strictly official functions as already existed in the Churches. It is true that St. Paul does not refer directly and by name to those functions which are related to the titles *ἐπισκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, διάκονοι*<sup>1</sup>; but it cannot be doubted that they are included in his reference.

In the address of St. Paul to the elders of the Church in Ephesus, he bids them "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops to feed the Ch. of God, which he purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20 28); and in the account which is given of the appointment of the Seven whose special duty it was to carry out the charitable work of the Ch. it is stated that they were to be men *πλήρεις πνεύματος, ἰ.ε., "full of (the) Spirit"* (Acts 6 3).

We need not here enter into all the complex questions of the relation of what is sometimes called the "charismatic" ministry

#### 6. All Ministry Charismatic.

to the more strictly official ministry; it is enough for us here to observe that in a very real sense every ministry, official as well as unofficial, is looked upon as "charismatic." And it is this principle which is expressed in the ordination services, when the candidate is asked whether he thinks that he is moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon himself a given office. Such a spiritual vocation is the proper and necessary antecedent to admission to any ministerial office.

When we now turn from the conception of the spiritual call to the conception of some public authorisation as a qualification for

#### 7. Prophets Uncommissioned.

ministry, we are compelled to recognise that the statement of the 23rd Art., that no man may take upon himself the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation without public authority, does not wholly correspond with the conditions of the apostolic and primitive Ch. It is clear from the passages to which we have already referred (I Cor. 12 and 14) that among the most important forms of ministration in the early Ch. was that of prophecy, and it cannot be maintained that the prophet required any public authority to discharge his office. The Christian community, as we may judge from I Cor. 12 3 and I John 4 1, had both the right and the duty to try or test the prophet; and the same general principle is with some differences drawn out in the *Didache* (11 and 12). But there is no trace to be found in early Christian literature of a notion that the community could in any sense be said to appoint him. There can be no doubt then, that in the apostolic and primitive Ch. there was

<sup>1</sup> "Bishops (or overseers), presbyters (or elders), deacons (or ministers)."

a very important form of ministry which did not derive its authority from any person or persons in the Ch.; and it would seem from the reference in the *Didache* (10 7) to be probable that this was a ministry not only of the Word but of the Sacraments.

On the other hand, it is also clear that in the Apostolic and primitive Ch. there were forms of ministry which required public authority. Reference is made in § 9 to the account given in Acts 6 of the appointment of the Seven, and it is clear from the narrative that those officers were appointed by the Twelve Apostles with the co-operation of the Ch. in Jerusalem to discharge their functions. Our conclusion is confirmed by such notices as we have in the NT with regard to the appointment of the presbyters (Act 14 23 and Titus 1 5), and by the references to the same subject in the sub-apostolic writings (e.g., the presbyter-bishops of Clement Rom. 42, 44, *Didache* 15). Indeed there can be no doubt that in the apostolic and primitive Ch. the presbyters or bishops derived their commission from public authority, while it remains true that this office also represented a spiritual gift and a spiritual vocation.

(2) *By what authority is any person admitted to the Ministry?* We can now examine the question of the nature of that public authority by which the official ministers of the Ch. are appointed, and of the mode in which they are invested with this ministry. In the orders of the Ch. of Eng. there are two elements, the one represented by the appointment to a cure of souls, with licence or institution, the other represented by ordination or consecration. We must first consider the nature of appointment. No one (if we omit certain apparent exceptions such as fellows of colleges) can be ordained unless he is also appointed to a cure of souls. This principle was definitely laid down by the Council of Chalcedon, in its 6th canon, and was only abrogated in the Latin Ch. by a decretal of Innocent III (*Dec.* iii. 5 16).

In order to understand this principle we must again turn back to the apostolic and primitive Ch. The appointment of ministers is described in relation to the Seven in Acts 6, in relation to the Presbyters of the Lycaonian or Galatian Ch. in Acts 14 23, in relation to the Presbyters in Crete in Titus 1 5. In the first passage we read that the Twelve Apostles, finding the work of administering the charity of the Ch. to interfere with their primary duty of preaching the gospel, bid the members of the Ch. in Jerusalem select from their number (*ἐπιπέψασθε*) certain persons, whom they would then appoint (*ὄντας καταστήσομεν*) to discharge this function. They then chose (*ἐξελέξαντο*) Stephen and his colleagues, and presented them to the Apostles, who prayed over them and laid their hands upon them. In the second passage St. Paul and St. Barnabas are represented as appointing (*χειροτονήσαντες*) presbyters in each city. In the last passage St. Paul says that he has left Titus in Crete to "set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city"

(*ὡς . . . καταστήσης κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*). We may put beside these references two passages in the sub-apostolic writings. Clement describes the Apostles as having established some of their first fruits (*καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν*) as bishops and deacons (*εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*) in the various places where they preached (Clement 42), and as having provided that others should (when needful) be appointed by certain *ἐλλόγμοι ἄνδρες* (*approved men*) with the consent of the whole church (*συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης*—Clement 44). In the *Didache* (15 1), the Christian community is bidden to appoint for itself bishops and deacons (*χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*).

What conclusion are we to draw from these references? At first sight it might seem as

#### 10. Powers of the Community.

though in most of these passages the appointment of the ministers of the Ch. were carried out by the Apostles or their delegates, or by those who had been first appointed. But the statements in Acts 6 and in Clement 44 seem to indicate clearly that the community as a whole had its share in the appointment, while the *Didache* simply speaks of the community as appointing. It may therefore, I think, be fairly said upon these passages that while in some cases the Apostolic preachers, in setting in order new churches, may themselves have appointed the first ministers, the Christian communities themselves, including the Apostolic preachers, are normally the appointing body.

We may come to the decision with the more confidence inasmuch as there can be practically no doubt that the custom of the Ch. for many centuries was clear, that the clergy, especially the bps., but also the presbyters, were appointed to their offices not merely by some one officer or group of officers, but also by the consent of the whole body of the people. Two illustrations of this will suffice. Cyprian, in one of his letters, maintains that the people have in a very high measure the power of choosing worthy priests, and refusing those who are unworthy (Cyprian, *Ep.* 67 3). The 22nd canon of the *Sacrosanctae Synodus Antiqua* requires a bp. in ordaining presbyters to have the counsel of his presbyters (or clergy) and the testimony and agreement of the people.

We are not here concerned with the history of the gradual transference of these powers to the superior clergy, or in later times

#### 11. Powers Obscured not Destroyed.

to patrons, a transference which was a grave abuse on any strict ecclesiastical view. There can be little doubt that the appointment of a minister in the apostolic or primitive Ch. was connected with the authority of the community to which he was to minister, and that his ministrations were conceived of as related to their consent. As late as the 12th cent. Gratian, in discussing the position of a monk who has been admitted to the priesthood, lays down explicitly as the general principle of Ch. order, that, although such a person has received the power to celebrate the sacrament and to administer it, yet he may not exercise this power, unless he has been

elected by the people and appointed (or instituted) by the bp., with the consent of his Abbot (Gratian, *Decretum*, c. xvi. q. 1, *Dicta Gratiani* ante c. 20).

If this is true of the presbyters, it is still more clear with regard to the bp. Such phrases as *Nullis inivit detur episcopus* (Pope Celestin I, *Ep.* 2 s) and *qui praeffectus est omnibus, ab omnibus deligatur* (Leo I, *Ep.* 89) represent the normal principle of the relation of the bp. to the people of his diocese; it cannot be doubted that the consent or concurrence of the people in the election was a necessary part of the appointment.

It is clear, then, that the minister is admitted to his office by, and discharges his office in virtue of the authority of, the Christian community, including that of the particular community in which he is to minister. He is the officer of the community and represents their authority, and the Ch. of Eng. recognises, however imperfectly, this principle in its normal rule, that no one can be ordained unless he is appointed to a cure of souls.

We can now consider what is the significance of ordination or consecration. The formularies of the Ch. of Eng. contain very

#### 12. Meaning of Ordination.

little by way of direct statement upon this matter. It seems reasonable to say that the statement in the 23rd Art. refers to this, or at least that the statement includes this. But the terms of the Art. are vague and do not indicate any precise conception of the matter. The Ordination and Consecr. services do not throw much more light upon the subject; they are, quite naturally, occupied rather with the great responsibilities and obligations of the ministry than with any discussions of a technical kind. The Preface to the Ordinal does indeed state that no man is to be accounted a "lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Ch. of Eng." unless he is "called, tried, examined, and admitted" according to the form printed in it, or has formerly had "Episcopal Consecr. or Ordination." But this is a statement of the law or rule of the Ch. of Eng., not an explanation of the nature of ordination.

We must again turn back to the NT and the primitive Ch., and consider what may be the light in which they regard the rite of ordination.

There are four passages in the NT which have been understood to refer to this. (1) The account of the appointment of the Seven in Acts 6. We are told that the disciples at Jerusalem chose seven men to administer the charity of the Ch., and presented them to the Twelve Apostles, who prayed and laid their hands upon them (*προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας*).—(2) 1 Tim. 4 14, where Timothy is bidden not to neglect "the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (*μη ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χάρισματος, ὃ ἐδόθη σοὶ διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτηρίου*).—(3) 1 Tim. 5 22, where St. Paul warns Timothy, "Lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins" (*χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, μηδὲ κούνην ἁμαρτίας ἄλλοτρίας*).—(4) 2 Tim. 1 6: "For the which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which

is in thee through the laying on of my hands" (*ἀνακαυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃ ἐστὶ ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*).

In (1) the imposition of hands is clearly connected with the appointment of certain persons for work in the Ch. Professor Hort in his *Christian Ecclesia* (pp. 214 ff.) has pointed out that (3) is more naturally related to the exercise of some disciplinary authority than to anything of the nature of ordination; and that (2) and (4) probably refer—as the context in both cases suggests—to the original dedication of Timothy as companion and assistant to St. Paul in his work of *preaching* the gospel (Acts 16 1-3).

When we examine the references to the imposition of hands in the NT we find that this is related to many solemn actions.

In Acts 8 17 it is connected with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the Samaritans; in Acts 9 12, 17, Ananias imposes his hands upon Saul that he may receive his sight; in Acts 13 3 the prophets and teachers at Antioch lay their hands on St. Paul and St. Barnabas in dedication of them to the work of their first missionary journey; in Acts 19 5, 6, we read that St. Paul finding some who had previously been baptised with the baptism of John, and after due instruction having had them baptised in the name of Jesus, laid his hands upon them, and they received the gifts of the Holy Spirit; in Acts 28 8 we read that St. Paul laid his hands upon a sick man that he might be healed. [Cp. LAYING ON OF HANDS.]

It is clear that the ceremony had no exclusive relation to any one religious function, but rather that it was customarily used in the Ch. in relation to any solemn action or dedication; and it seems clear that this was according to Jewish usage (Hort., *Chr. Ecclesia*, p. 216, n. 1; Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 131, n. 46).

(3) *What is the Relation of the Minister to the Laity?* The principle of the Ch. of Eng. is clearly expressed in that sentence of Art. 23, to which we have so often referred, namely, that "it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same." Public preaching and the ministration of the Sacraments belong to the ministers of the Church.

These phrases are distinct and clear in form, but behind this clearness there lie certain ambiguities. What is public preaching, and in what sense is the ministration of the Sacraments forbidden to the laity? It is clear that as a matter of public order these functions are reserved to the ministers of the Ch. Does this also mean that they have no reality if performed by the laity? We must distinguish between the ministry of the Word and that of the Sacraments, if we are to consider the question. Unlicensed public preaching may be an irregular and disorderly thing, to be controlled by the Church; but it would have no meaning to call it invalid. What are we to understand of the Sacraments? Are they ineffective and unreal if administered by a layman? And first as to baptism. The formularies of the Ch. of Eng. do not contain any distinct statement as to the

#### 14. Lay Ministry Irregular.



validity or invalidity of LAY BAPTISM; but the law of the Ch. of Eng., as administered by the courts, seems clearly to recognise lay baptism as valid.<sup>1</sup> What are we to say as to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?

We must again return to the custom of the primitive Ch. if we are to form any judgment upon this question.

**15. Primitive Usage.** The writings of the NT contain no clear evidence as to the mode of administration of the Lord's Supper.

The earliest detailed account of this is contained in the *Didache*,<sup>2</sup> in which we have what is generally considered to be a form of words to be used in the celebration of the Sacrament when there is no prophet in the community.<sup>3</sup> It is noteworthy that the prophet is conceived of as the chief minister of the Ch., and he is to celebrate the Euch. with any form of words which he chooses (*τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσι, Did. 10 7*). It is in his absence that the prescribed form is to be used, but there is no clear indication of the person by whom in such a case the service is to be conducted. It is possible that the sentence "ὄμνι γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ (ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι) τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων," *Did. 15 1*, may mean that in the absence of a prophet these officers are to administer the Euch., but this is not clear.

The next reference we have is contained in the Ignatian letters. Ignatius lays great stress upon the unity of the Christian communities under the direction of the bp., and in one important passage discusses this in relation to the Eucharist.

*Ad Smyrn. 8*: "Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Ch. apart from the bp. Let that be held a valid Euch. which is under the bp. or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bp. shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Ch. It is not lawful apart from the bp. either to baptise or to hold a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is well-pleasing also to God; that every thing which ye do may be sure and valid."

Ignatius clearly means that the Euch. was not to be celebrated without the sanction of the bp. in their churches, but it is not clear from his words who actually celebrated it.

Justin Martyr in his *First Apology* gives us a full description of the Eucharistic service, and he describes the president (*προεστράς*) as conducting the service; it is no doubt most probable that by this phrase he means the *ἐπίσκοπος* or *προεσβύτερος* if one were present.

It is fairly clear that by the middle or end of the 2nd cent. it was the rule of the Christian Churches that in normal cases the celebration of the Euch. belonged to the regular minister of the Ch. But it is also clear that Tertullian a little later held that in the absence of a regular

<sup>1</sup> See Phillimore, *Eccles. Law of the Ch. of Eng.*, ed. 1895, pp. 491-495.

<sup>2</sup> The ecclesiastical rules of the *Didache* probably represent usages and ideals current in some region of Syria, if not of Palestine, about the last quarter of the first century (so *ε.ε.*, Lightfoot). The mainly rural conditions contemplated account for their conservative nature at a date when the *charismatic* element was, in other regions known to us, already subordinate to the regular local ministry of presbyter-bishops.

<sup>3</sup> But see EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION, § 8.

minister the layman could celebrate the Sacraments. Bp. Lightfoot, in his essay on *The Christian Ministry*, has cited some of the most significant passages from his writings. The most important is the following:

"We should be foolish to suppose that a latitude is allowed to laymen which is denied to priests. Are not we laymen also priests? It is written, 'He hath also made us a kingdom and priests to God and His Father.' It is the authority of the Church which makes a difference between the order (the clergy) and the people—this authority and the consecration of their rank by the assignment of special benches to the clergy. Thus, where there is no bench of clergy, you present the eucharistic offerings and baptise and are your own sole priest. For where three are gathered together, there is a Ch., even though they be laymen. Therefore, if you exercise the rights of a priest in cases of necessity, it is your duty also to observe the discipline enjoined on a priest, where of necessity you exercise the rights of a priest" (*De Exh. Castillatis* 7).

It has been suggested that the force of these phrases is destroyed by the fact that when Tertullian wrote them he was a Montanist; but, as Dr. Lightfoot has pointed out, this contention has little force, as these treatises are addressed to his opponents and *assume these principles as recognised by them*.

It seems to be clear that we can trace in the early Ch. the gradual development of that system of Ch. order which eventually restricted the discharge of the public ministry of the Ch. to its regular and official ministers. And for this gradual process there were no doubt many good reasons. But it is impossible to found upon this the conclusion that the validity of the Sacraments is dependent upon their administration by the minister. The true conclusion cannot be better expressed than in some closing words of Bishop Lightfoot in the same treatise: "It may be a general rule, it may be under ordinary circumstances a practically universal law, that the highest acts of congregational worship shall be performed through the principal officers of the congregation. But an emergency may arise when the spirit and not the letter must decide. The Christian ideal will then interpose and interpret our duty. The higher ordinance of the universal priesthood will overrule all special limitations. The layman will assume functions which are otherwise restricted to the ordained minister" (*Phil.*, p. 268).

F. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry* (in *Comm.* on Philipians); Hatch, Bampton Lect. on *The Organisation of the Chr. Chs.*, also arts. in *DCA*;

**17. Bibliography.** T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the early centuries* [a full and fair recent discussion by a Presbyterian]; J. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace* [candid and learned]; Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood* [luminous as to functions, but historically uncritical]; C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry and Orders and Unity* [the latter supplements the former: both argue for a sharper and more uniform distinction between laymen and ministers in the early Ch. than is taken above. For further

treatment of the subject, see APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION, EPISCOPACY, ORDINAL, § 13.]—TD.

A. J. CARLYLE.

ORDERS, HOLY (IN LAW).—See DIOCESAN BISHOP, PRIEST, DEACON.

**ORDERS IN COUNCIL.**—In eccles. legislation (as in some branches of civil legislation) procedure by Order in C. to be made upon Schemes or Representations framed by the appropriate authorities is very commonly directed, e.g., for the formation of New Districts and Parishes under the Church Building and New Parishes Acts, for the Union or Disunion of Parishes and re-arrangement of boundaries of parishes under the Pluralities Acts, for the constitution of certain new bishoprics under the Bishoprics Act, 1878, and for a multitude of matters that may be effected under the provisions of numerous statutes relating to the Eccles. Commissioners. The schemes so ratified must be made in pursuance of the powers given by the several statutes and be within those powers; and schemes so duly made and ratified commonly have the same force as if they had been included in and enacted by Acts of Parliament. In effect the Order in C. (deriving its validity from a general Act relating to the whole class of similar cases) takes the place of a Special Act which would otherwise be required to deal with the particular case. In some matters (as in the formation of new eccles. districts) the Order in C. made in those cases upon the Scheme or Representation of the Eccles. Commissioners with the requisite consents is sufficient without any future reference to Parliament. In other cases there is such future reference, for instance in the case of a Union of Benefices in the Metropolis the Scheme of the Eccles. Commissioners has to lie for a fixed period upon the Tables of both Houses of Parliament before ratification by Order, and will not be ratified if either House objects; in other matters the Order in C. may be made, but its operation is suspended until it has lain upon the Tables of the two Houses for a fixed time without objection being made by either House. A Bill is at the present time before Parliament for enabling new bishoprics to be formed by the procedure of Orders in C. with such a suspensory provision as above described.—A7.

R. W. FOWELL.

## ORDINAL.

- § 1. ORIGIN AND EDITIONS OF THE ENGLISH ORDINAL.
- § 2. ITS SOURCES.
- § 3. THE ANCIENT ROMAN RITE.
- § 4. THE GALLICAN RITE.
- § 5. SARUM ORDINATION OF DEACONS.
- § 6. SARUM ORDINATION OF PRIESTS.
- § 7. SARUM CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS.
- § 8. ORDINATION OF DEACONS IN ORDINAL OF 1550.
- § 9. ORDINATION OF PRIESTS IN ORDINAL OF 1550.
- § 10. CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS IN ORDINAL OF 1550.
- § 11. CHANGES MADE IN 1552 AND 1559.
- § 12. CHANGES MADE IN 1662.
- § 13. SUMMARY.
- § 14. COMPARATIVE TABLE.
- § 15. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

On Jan. 31st, 1550, ten months after the publication of the First PB of Edward VI,

the King, by Act of Parliament (3 and 4 Ed. VI, c. 12), appointed twelve persons, six of whom were prelates, to draw up a new O. to contain "A Form and Manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and other ministers of the Church," and enacted that it should "be set forth under the great Seal of England before the first day of April," and after that date it should "be lawfully exercised and used and none other." The book was published by Grafton and appeared at the beginning of March, and bears the date 1549<sup>1</sup> (= 1550). In 1552 after further revision the *second* edition of the O. made its appearance. It was, however, not issued as a separate volume but annexed to the Second PB. The *third* Edition, which except for one alteration followed that of 1552, appeared under Elizabeth in 1559. On this occasion it again appeared as a separate book. Finally, certain important alterations having been made in it, it appeared in its present form in the PB of 1662.

The intention of the compilers of the Ordinal of 1550 is clearly set forth in its Preface, where it is stated that "it is evident unto all men. . . that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders . . . in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . And, therefore, to the intent that these orders may be *continued* and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man, not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon, shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." With this purpose in view, the compilers made use of the existing PONTIFICALS, especially that of Sarum, making such omission, addition and alteration as seemed suitable for their purpose. It should be observed that no mention is made of the sub-diaconate and other MINOR ORDERS (acolyte, exorcist, reader, door-keeper) in the Pref. to the O., and that no form of ordination was prescribed for these Orders, in spite of the fact that the Act had provided for a Form and Manner of making other Ministers of the Church, as well as Absps., Bps., Priests, and Deacons.

The Service contained in the Pontificals presented no small difficulty, owing to the fact that it consisted of a fusion of the ancient *Roman* and *Gallican* Rites of Ordination. The ancient *Roman* Rite in its earliest shape was characterised by great simplicity, and may be found in the *Leonian* and *Gregorian Sacramentaries* and in the *Ordines Romani*. No form of Ordination is provided for the Minor Orders, including those of Acolyte and Sub-deacon. The two latter, however, appear to have received a form of Benediction at an ordinary Mass, when the candidates presented themselves to the Bp.; the acolyte receiving as a symbol of his office a linen bag in which to carry to the priest the oblates or consecrated hosts, and the sub-deacon

1 For explanation of this, see BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PB. § 3.

3. The Ancient Roman Rite.

an empty chalice. They then prostrated themselves and were blessed by the Bp. But even this formula of blessing appears not to have been very early.

In the case of Sacred Orders, we find a very simple rite of Ordination, but one which was celebrated with great publicity and at stated times, these being the Saturdays of the Ember weeks, preferably in the Advent season. The candidates had been previously presented to the faithful on the Wednesday and Friday of the Ember week, and opportunity given to those present to bring forward any objection to their suitability. The actual ceremony took place during the Mass on the Saturday, shortly before the Gospel, when the candidates were presented to the Bp., who in a set formula invited the prs. of the congregation for those who were to be ordained deacons. After this all knelt, and the Lit., containing special petitions for the ordinands, was recited. Then the Bp. arose and, laying his hands on each of the candidates, recited a Coll. (or collective Pr.), summing up the petitions of the Lit., and a long Consecratory or Eucharistic Prayer. The newly ordained deacons then received the Kiss of Peace from the Bp. and took their place among the other deacons.

The ordination of Priests was conducted in a similar manner. The prs. of the congregation were invited and the Lit. recited, followed by two Prs. (a Coll. and a Eucharistic Pr. said by the Bp. and accompanied by the imposition of hands). The Mass was then continued.

The Consecration of Bps. followed the same lines. No special time in the year was assigned for this, but it always took place on a Sunday. The Bp. elect having been presented to the Pope, the prs. of the congregation were invited and the Lit. was sung, the Coll. and Consecratory Pr. following.

In the *Gallican Rite*<sup>1</sup> we find forms for Ordination to the Minor Orders. The candidates for each Order were instructed as to the nature of their

#### 4. The Gallican Rite.

duties. They then received from the Bp. the symbol of their office—the *Door-Keepers* a Key; the *Readers* a book; the *Exorcists* a book of Exorcisms; the *Acolytes* a candlestick containing a candle; the *Sub-deacons* a paten and chalice together with the basin, ewer and napkin. After delivery of the instruments the Bp. recited a Pr. and a Benediction, which contained in each case a reference to the special office conferred on the candidates.

The Ember seasons being unknown in Gallican countries, the candidates for Sacred Orders were presented to the congregation on the day of Ordination itself. After an address by the Bp., the congregation, if satisfied of their fitness, responded, *Dignus est (He is worthy)*. (At Rome the silence of the congregation was considered a sufficient indication of their assent.) The Bp. then invited the people to pray for those that were to be ordained to the Diaconate, and pronounced a blessing, during which he laid his hands on the candidates.

The Ordination to the Priesthood followed the same lines. At the close of the Benediction, however, came an anointing of the hands accompanied by prayer. (It would appear that in some cases Deacons also received this anointing.)

The method of Consecrating Bishops was very similar. The Bp. elect was presented to the people and their prs. were invited. During the recital of the consecratory Pr. two Bps. held over his head the open book of the Gospels. After the Consecration his hands were anointed and a suitable Pr. was

recited. At the Consecration of Bps. at Rome, the imposition of hands was performed by the Pope alone: in the Gallican rite all the Bps. present laid their hands on the candidate's head.

The mediæval Pontificals exhibit, as we have said, a fusion of the Gallican and Roman rites. Since the ancient Roman rite contained no forms of Ordination to the Minor Orders, these followed the Gallican use. As the Minor Orders, however, are omitted in the Edwardine O., they do not concern us here. And we at once proceed to give a brief description of the *Celebratio Ordinum* as contained in the *Sarum Pontifical*—this being the chief source employed by the compilers of the English Ordinal. The Minor Orders having been conferred immediately before the Epistle, those who were to be ordained to the Diaconate and Priesthood were presented to the Bp. after the reading of the Epistle and Tract, and prostrated themselves before him. Then followed the Lit., with special petitions for the ordinands. Next, the Bp. instructed the candidates for the Diaconate in the duties of their office, after which he laid his hand on the head of each of them in silence.<sup>1</sup> Then he invited the congregation to pray on their behalf, and after a period of silence a brief Coll. was recited. This was followed by a long Consecratory or Eucharistic Pr., introduced in the usual way by the *Sursum Corda*; after which the Bp. vested the candidates with the STOLE and handed to each of them the book of the Gospels saying, "In the Name of the Holy Trinity receive authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God as well for the living as for the dead. In the name of the Lord. Amen." Another invitation to pr. followed and then a Benediction. Finally, the newly-ordained deacons were vested with the DALMATIC.

After the reading of the Gospel, those who were to be ordained to the Priesthood were presented to the Bp., who instructed them in their duties. Then, together with all priests who were present, he laid his hands over them in silence. Next, the prs. of the congregation were invited, and after an interval the Bp. recited a Coll. and a long Eucharistic Pr., introduced by the *Sursum Corda*. The candidates were then vested by the Bp. with stole and CHASUBLE, and appropriate formulae were said. After this there was another invitation and another Consecratory Pr. Then, all kneeling, the Bp. began the hymn VENI CREATOR, which being sung he consecrated the hands of the candidates and presented to each one of them a paten with an unconsecrated host, and a chalice containing wine, with these words, "Receive authority to offer Sacrifice to God and to celebrate Masses both for the Quick and the Dead, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ." The Mass was then continued as far as the Communion. Before the Post-Communion the Bp. laid his hand on the head of each candidate, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou forgivest they are forgiven; whose sins thou retainest they are retained." Then followed the final Benediction and Exhortation.

In the Consecration of a Bp., he was first presented by two Bps. of the Province to the Metropolitan, and examined by him in the presence of the congregation. In the course of the Examination the oath of canonical obedience was administered. Then the Mass was begun and continued as far as the Collect. Meanwhile the Bp. elect was vested, and afterwards the Metropolitan gave him a brief

#### 5. Sarum Ordination of Deacons.

#### 6. Sarum Ordination of Priests.

#### 7. Sarum Consecration of Bishops.

<sup>1</sup> In later times the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* were ordered to be said by the Bp. secretly.

instruction. The prs. of the congregation were then invited for him, and the Lit. sung by two Bishops. At the close of the Lit. two Bps. placed the book of the Gospels on the neck of the Bp. elect, and all Bps. present laid their hands on his head. According to some rites this ceremony was performed in silence: according to others the words "*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*" were used; or the *Veni Creator*. A Coll. followed and a long Eucharistic Pr. of Consecration. Then came a second and third Consecratory Pr. with a Blessing; after this the unction of the head and hands, the putting on of the gloves, the giving of the PASTORAL STAFF, the blessing and bestowal of the RING and MITRE, and finally the delivery of the book of the Gospels.

We now come to the First Edwardine Ordinal.<sup>1</sup> In its Ordination is to take place on a Sunday or Holy-day, and to begin with an Exhortation "declaring the duty and office of such as come to be admitted Ministers" etc. . . . .

8. Ordination of Deacons in Ordinal of 1550.

After the Exh. the candidates for the Diaconate are presented by the Archdeacon to the Bp., and then by the Bp. to the people, opportunity being given for any objection against their suitability. The Lit., with a special petition for the ordinands, follows, ending with the Coll., "Almighty God, which by Thy Divine Providence hast appointed divers orders, etc." The Communion of the day is then begun with a special Ep. (1 Tim. 3 8-16 or Acts 6 2-7). After the Ep. the Bp. administers the "Oath of the King's Supremacy and against the usurped power and authority of the Bishop of Rome." He next examines the candidates, and, at the close of the Examination, lays his hands severally upon the head of everyone of them, saying, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen." He then delivers to everyone of them the NT, saying, "Take thou authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same, if thou be thereunto ordinarily commanded." Then one of them, appointed by the Bp., putting on a tunic, reads the Gospel for that day. The Communion service is now continued, and all those who have been ordained receive the HC with the Bishop. At the close a special Coll. is said before the Benediction.

It would appear that the following changes have been made from the older Ordinals. (a) The Presentation of the candidates to the Bp. by the Archdeacon, and to the people by the Bp., and the recitation of the Lit., take place before the beginning of the Communion Service. (b) The Oath of the King's Supremacy and the Examination of the candidates are inserted immediately after the Epistle. (c) The instruction of the candidates is expanded and placed in the course of their Examination, which occurs at this point of the service. (d) The laying on of hands is not performed, as heretofore, silently, but with the words, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon,

etc." (e) The Bidding Pr., Consecratory Pr. and vesting with stole are omitted.

The Ordering of Priests takes place in the course of the Communion Service aft. the reading of the Gospel, a special Introit, Epistle and Gospel being provided. Next, a paraphrase of the *Veni Creator* is sung; the candidates are presented by the

9. Ordination of Priests in Ordinal of 1550.

Archdeacon to the Bp., and by him to the people; the Lit. is said, ending with a special Collect; the oath of the King's Supremacy is administered; and a long Exh. made by the Bishop. Then follows the Examination, and at its close a short Pr., after which the prs. of the congregation are asked, and silence kept. Next, the Bp. recites a long Coll., and then, together with the priests present, he lays his hands on the head of each of the candidates, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." This done, he delivers to each the Bible in one hand and the chalice with the bread in the other, and says, "Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in this congregation." The Communion Service is then continued, all the newly-ordained receiving with the Bp., and immediately bef. the Benediction a special Coll. is inserted.

The following changes have been made in the Ordination of Priests from the older Ordinals. (a) The *Veni Creator*, which in the old Pontifical occurs aft. the second Consecratory Pr., is now placed bef. the presentation of the candidates, and the latter takes place not as formerly at the beginning of the service, but aft. the Gospel. (b) The short Instruction of the old Pontifical is expanded very considerably, and is followed by an Examination, a brief form of which, although not in the Sarum, is found here in certain rites of date about the 11th cent. (c) The Imposition of hands, which in the older rite took place at this point in silence, is postponed till after the prs. of the congregation have been invited and the Bp. has recited a Coll. at their conclusion. (d) The long Eucharistic Pr. is omitted (though the last-mentioned Coll. is obviously intended to represent it), as is also the vesting with the stole and chasuble. (e) The Second Bidding and Consecratory Prs. are omitted, together with the Blessing and Consecration of the hands. (f) As we have seen, the Imposition of Hands is accompanied by the formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost, etc.," taken from the second Imposition of Hands, which occurs in the Latin Rite aft. the Communion:—"Accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseris peccata, remittuntur eis: et quorum retinueris, retenta erunt." And to it is added, "And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments."

<sup>1</sup> For a comparative synopsis of all the Eng., as well as the Amer. and Irish, Os., see RITUAL, § 51-53.

(g) The ceremony of delivery (*porrection*) of the INSTRUMENTS now occurs immediately after the laying on of Hands, and it should be noticed that the Bible, as well as the Chalice and Bread, are presented to the candidate, with the words, "Take thou authority to preach the word of God and to minister the Holy Sacraments in this Congregation." With this formula should be compared the one which accompanies the porrection of the Instruments in the Latin Rite:—"Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, Missasque celebrare," etc. . . . (h) The Kiss of Peace, and the Blessing and Exhortation which precede the Post-Communion in the Latin Rite, are omitted.

The Consecration of Bps. is appointed to take place in the Communion (for which a special Ep. and Gospel are provided) after the Creed. The Bp. elect, having upon him a surplice and a cope, is presented by two Bps. to the Abp. or his substitute.

**10. Consecration of Bishops in Ordinal of 1660.**

The King's Mandate having been read, the Oath "Touching the Knowledge of the King's Supremacy" and the Oath of obedience to the Abp. are administered. The prs. of the Congregation are then invited, and the Lit. is recited, containing a special petition for the Bp. elect and concluding with a special Collect. This is followed by the Examination of the candidate. Then, the *Veni Creator* having been sung, the Abp. recites a lengthy Collect. Next follows the Imposition of hands by the Abp. and Bps. present, the Abp. saying, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and of soberness." Then the Abp. lays the Bible on the neck of the newly-consecrated Bp. with the words, "Give heed unto reading, etc.," and places the Pastoral Staff in his hand saying, "Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, etc." This done, the Abp. proceeds to the Communion, and a special Coll. is provided immediately before the final Benediction.

The most important changes which have been made in the Consecration of Bps. are the following. The instruction, the unction, the putting on of gloves, and the delivery of ring and mitre are omitted. The first and third consecratory Prs. are also omitted; the second is, however, represented by the Pr., "Almighty God and most merciful Father," which precedes the Imposition of hands. The Lit., Examination, *Veni Creator* and Imposition of hands have been retained, together with the ceremony of laying the Bible upon the candidate's neck and the delivery of the Pastoral Staff.

The principal changes made in the Ordinal of 1552 consist in the omission of certain ceremonies.

**11. Changes made in 1552 and 1559.**  
In the Ordering of Deacons and Priests the ordinands are no longer commanded to have at their presentation "every one of them. . . upon him a plain albe"; the direction for the deacon who

reads the gospel to "put on him a tunicle" is likewise omitted. So is also the Introit in the Ordering of Priests; and the porrection of the Instruments is confined to the delivery of the Bible, the words, "where thou shalt be so appointed" being added at the end of the formula, "Take thou authority," etc., which accompanies the porrection. The only other important change is in the Oath of the King's Supremacy. In the Ordinal of 1550 it concluded, "So help me God, all saints and the holy evangelist"; in 1552 the words, "So help me God through Jesus Christ," are substituted.

In the Consecration of Bps. the Oath of obedience to the Abp. undergoes a similar change. No mention is now made of the vesture of the Bp. elect or of the Bps. who present him. The laying of the Bible upon the neck of the newly-consecrated Bp. is omitted, as is also the delivery of the Pastoral Staff. The accompanying formulæ are, however, retained and used in connection with the delivery of the Bible, which is now substituted for the two former ceremonies.

The only alteration made in the Ordinal at the Elizabethan revision of 1559 (apart from certain changes in the LITANY incorporated into it) was in the form of the Oath which is now styled "The Oath of the Queen's Sovereignty" instead of "the King's Supremacy." It is no longer directed against "the usurped power and authority of the Bp. of Rome," but against "the power and authority of all foreign Potentates."

In the final Revision of 1662 the following changes, some of them important, should be noticed.

Three alterations have been made in the *Preface*. (a) The canonical age for entering upon the diaconate is raised from twenty-one to twenty-three. (b) Ordination is now to take place normally "at the times appointed in the canon," i.e., at the Ember seasons (see canon 31). (c) The language of the first paragraph is made more explicit, in order to make even clearer than heretofore the difference between the Ministry of the Church and that of non-episcopal bodies.

In the *Ordering of Deacons* we find the following alterations. (a) The Ordination is to take place "after Morning Prayer is ended." (b) In 1552 no reference was made to the vesture of the deacons they are now ordered to be "decently habited." (c) The Lit. ends with the Pr. "We humbly beseech Thee, O Father," and the Coll. which had occurred at the end of the Lit. has become the Coll. of the Communion office; we notice that in this Coll., as in other places, the word "Congregation" has been changed to "Church." (d) At the end of the formula, "Take thou authority to read the Gospel, etc.," the words, "If thou be thereunto ordinarily commanded," have been changed into "If thou be thereunto licensed by the Bishop himself." (e) A special Gospel (Luke 12 35-38) is provided. (f) Aft. the Pr. "Almighty God, Giver of all good things" the Coll. "Prevent us, O Lord," has been inserted. (g) A clause has been added to the final rubric connecting this service with that of the Ordering of Priests which immediately follows.

(a) Alterations in the opening Rubrics of the *Ordering of Priests* have been made similar to those made in the Ordering of Deacons. (b) Some changes have been made in the arrangement of the Service; the Presentation of the candidates and the Lit. now occur, as in the Ordering of Deacons, bef. the Communion Office, and not aft. the Gospel, and the special Coll. has been removed from the end of the Lit. and made the Coll. of the Communion Office, the words "profit of the congregation" having

been changed into "the edification of thy Church." (c) A new Epistle (Eph. 4 7-13) is appointed and Matt. 9 36-38 has been substituted for Matt. 28 18-20, but the alternative Gospel (John 10 1-16) has been retained. (d) The *Veni Creator* has been placed later in the service, so that it may immediately precede the Pr. "Almighty God, and heavenly Father"; an alternative version of this hymn, derived from Bp. Cosin's *Private Devotions*, has been added, and the older version revised. (e) In the Instruction and Examination of Priests a number of small verbal alterations have been made, and the conclusion of the brief Pr. at the end of the Examination is altered. (f) In the rubric immediately preceding the Imposition of hands, the words, "Everyone that receiveth orders," have been changed into "Everyone that receiveth the Order of Priesthood." (g) The most important alteration is in the formula which accompanies the Imposition of hands. In 1550 and 1552 it began, "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, etc." It now runs "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands: Whose Sins thou dost forgive, etc." (h) At the delivery of the Bible the words "in this congregation where thou shalt be so appointed" have been changed into "in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto." (i) The Coll., "Most Merciful Father," at the close of the service has been slightly altered, and "Prevent us, O Lord," has been inserted bef. the Benediction. (k) The wording of the final rubric, which provides for the case of the Ordination of Deacons and Priests on the same day, has been modified in accordance with the alterations made in the services.

In the *Consecration of Bishops*, (a) a special rubric has been supplied at the beginning of the Communion Service, and a special Coll. provided. (b) An alternative Epistle (Acts 20 17-35) has been added, and two alternative Gospels<sup>1</sup> (John 20 19-23, Matt. 28 18-20). (c) In the rubric aft. the Gospel it is ordered that the Bp. elect shall be vested in his ROCHER. (d) The wording of the rubric bef. the Lit. has been expanded and made more explicit, and in the Coll. aft. the Lit. the words "profit of thy Congregation" have been changed into "edifying and well governing of thy Church." (e) In the Examination a few slight verbal alterations have been made, and the question, "Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others?" has been added. (f) Bef. the *Veni Creator*, it is ordered that the Bishop elect shall put on the rest of the Episcopal habit; and, as in the Ordering of Priests, Bishop Cosin's version of the hymn has been added. (g) In the Pr. "Almighty God and most merciful Father" a few verbal changes have been made, and the word "congregation" changed into "church." (h) Again the most important alteration is that in the formula accompanying the laying on of hands. In 1550 and 1552 it had been, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up, etc.": it now runs, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up, etc." (i) Some slight verbal changes have been made in the words used at the delivery of the Bible and in the Coll. "Most Merciful Father." (k) As in the Ordering of Deacons and Priests, the Coll. "Prevent us, O Lord," has been added before the Benediction.

<sup>1</sup> In most copies of the PB of 1552 the Gospel is misprinted, as from John 4, instead of John 21.

The main objects of the Reformers in preparing an O. which should "continue" the valid succession of the threefold order of the ministry was to simplify the Latin rite, and to bring into greater prominence the essentials of Ordination as set forth in the NT<sup>1</sup> and in the early Church,<sup>2</sup> namely, *Prayer* and *Imposition of hands*. This had been obscured in the Latin service owing to the fusion of the Gallican and Roman rites. In the mediæval books the LAYING ON OF HANDS no longer took place in connection with a great central pr., but was performed in silence at an earlier point in the service, while in the case of the Ordering of Priests a second Imposition of hands, with the words "*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*," had been added towards the close. The revisers restored it to its proper position as the central feature of the service, where it is accompanied by the solemn charge authorising the candidate to execute the functions of the Order which he is receiving. It is to be noted that they retained the words of John 20 22, 23 (used in the Latin Service at the second Imposition of hands) and added to them a second clause based on Acts 6 4 (cp. also Luke 12 42 and 1 Cor. 4 1), the verse in Acts being probably chosen in order to make clear the distinction between the Diaconate and the Priesthood. Similarly, in the Ordination of Bishops, the words are taken from 2 Tim. 1 6, 7, this passage being understood to refer to the work of a Bishop. It is to be regretted, however, that the ancient Consecratory Prs., which originally were the chief feature of early rites, and which were introduced by the *Sursum Corda*, should have been omitted. While removing a number of ceremonies of late date, such as the anointing, vesting, etc., the revisers of 1550 were careful to retain in a somewhat modified form the porrection of the INSTRUMENTS, which was regarded by the later mediæval authorities as essential to the validity of the rite. Further, they thought it necessary to expand certain features which had been making their appearance in the mediæval books, especially the Instruction and Examination of the candidates. In order to do this, they considered it needful to supplement the somewhat meagre formulæ of the Pontificals with matter derived from a draft of Ordination services which had been drawn up by Martin Bucer especially for their benefit. The Examination is regularly found in the older rites for the Consecration of Bps. and occasionally in the Ordination of Priests, while the Instructions

<sup>1</sup> See Acts 6 6, 13 3, 14 23, 1 Tim. 4 14, 5 22, 2 Tim. 1 6.

<sup>2</sup> See: (a) the early Church Orders, e.g., *Didascalia*, c. 4; *Canons of Hippolytus* 2 7, 5 42; Sarapion's *Pontifical* 12-14; *Apost. Const.* 8 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, etc.; (b) canons of early Councils, e.g., canon 9 of Neocæsarea (c. 315), 9 of Nice (325), 10 and 17 of Antioch (341); (c) early writers, e.g., Origen, *Hom. in Num.* 22 4; Cornelius, *Ep. to Fabius*, apud Euseb., *HE* vi. 43 9, 17; Cyprian, *Ep.* 49 1, 67 5; Eusebius, *HE* vi. 84, 23 4, vii. 32 21; Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus* (Migne, *PG* 46 909); Jerome, *Comm. in Is.*, bk. 16 (on c. 58); *De Aëtaribus* 3; *Ep. Clement to James* 19; *Clementine Hom.* 3 63, 72.

had always been extremely brief. In the Edwardine O. these features assumed large proportions, and, though the revisers appear to have rejected, in the main, Bucer's draft, they followed it very closely in these particulars. Thus, the Exh. to the candidates for the Priesthood and the Examination which follows are, in the main, a reproduction of Bucer's text. The Prs. of the O. are for the most part derived in a modified form from the Latin; but the long Pr., "Almighty God and heavenly Father," which occurs immediately before the Imposition of hands at the Ordination of Priests, is taken, with certain modifications, from Bucer's draft. Of the alterations made since 1550 the most important is the addition of the words specifying the office, which have been added, in the case of Bps. and Priests, to the solemn charge accompanying the Imposition of hands. For the

significance of this and of other changes made in 1550 or 1662, in so far as they affect the question of validity of our Orders, the reader is referred to the art. ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The following Table will enable the reader to form some idea of the relation of the O. of 1662 to the Pre-Reformation services and to the Edwardine O. of 1550. The first column contains an outline of the Latin O. closely following the use of Sarum. Items marked with an *asterisk* represent the ancient Roman and Gallican elements. Those enclosed in *brackets* are late additions, occurring in some mediæval rites and not in others. *Italics* indicate items which are not proper to the Ordination service. The details are numbered in the first column; the numbers in the other columns point out parallels.

14.  
Comparative  
Table.

## ORDERING OF DEACONS AND PRIESTS.

## PONTIFICAL.

## ORDINAL OF 1550.

## PB OF 1662.

1. *Mass begins.*
2. Presentation of Candidates for all Orders to Bp. and \*final inquiry as to their suitability.
3. Admission to Minor Orders.
4. \*Litany, with special clauses.

- ORDERING OF DEACONS.
2. Presentation of Candidates for diaconate only, and final inquiry as to their suitability.

2. Presentation of deacons and priests separately, and final inquiry.

4. Litany, with special clauses and special Coll.
1. *HC, as far as Epistle.*

4. Litany, with special clauses.
1. *HC, as far as Epistle,* with special Coll. for each Order.

## ORDINATION OF DEACONS.

## ORDERING OF DEACONS.

5. Instruction.
6. \* Imposition of hands in silence ("Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," secretly).
7. \* Bidding Pr. and \* Coll.
8. \* Consecratory Pr.
9. Vesting with Stole.
10. Tradition of Gospel Book, with formula, "In nomine. . . accipe potestatem legendi evangelium. . . ."
11. \* Second Bidding Pr.<sup>1</sup>
12. \* Second Consecratory Pr.
13. Vesting in Dalmatic.
14. *The Gospel.*

- Oath of King's Supremacy.
5. Examination and Instruction.
  6. Imposition of hands, with words, "Take thou authority. . . ."

- Oath of King's Supremacy.<sup>1</sup>
5. Examination and Instruction.
  6. Imposition of hands with words, "Take thou authority. . . ."

10. Tradition of NT, with formula, "Take thou authority to read the Gospel. . . ."

10. Tradition of NT, with formula "Take thou authority to read the Gospel. . . ."

## ORDINATION OF PRIESTS.

14. *The Gospel.*

## ORDERING OF PRIESTS.

14. *The Gospel.*

## ORDERING OF PRIESTS.

22. Veni Creator.
2. Presentation of Candidates for Priesthood, and final inquiry.
4. Litany, with special clauses and special Coll.

## Oath of King's Supremacy.

Oath of King's Supremacy.<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Omitted in Sarum.<sup>1</sup> Omitted in 1865.

## PONTIFICAL.

15. Instruction.
16. \* Imposition of hands by Bp. and priests, in silence.
17. \* Bidding Pr. and \*Coll.
18. \* Consecratory Pr.
19. Vesting with Stole and Chasuble.
20. \* Second Bidding Pr.<sup>1</sup>
21. \* Second Consecratory Pr.
22. Veni Creator.
23. (Blessing and) \* Consecration of hands.
24. Tradition of Paten with host and Chalice with wine, with words, "Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium. . . ."
25. *Continuation of Mass to the Communion.*
26. Second Imposition of hands, with words, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum. . . ."
27. Kiss of Peace.
28. Final Benediction.
29. Exhortation.
30. *Post-Communion, etc.*

## PONTIFICAL.

1. Examination of Bp. elect.
2. Oath of canonical obedience.
3. *Mass up to Collect.*
4. Instruction.
5. \* Bidding.
6. \* Litany, with special clause.
7. \* Imposition of hands of Bps. and of \*Gospel Book, in silence ("Accipe Spiritum Sanctum").
8. (Veni Creator.)
9. \* Collect.
10. \* First Consecratory Pr.
11. Unction of head.
12. \* Second Consecratory Pr.
13. (Third Consecratory Pr., with Abp.'s right hand extended.)

<sup>1</sup> Omitted in Sarum.

## ORDINAL OF 1550.

15. Instruction and Examination.
17. Bidding.
18. Prayer, "Almighty God and heavenly Father . . . ."
- 16, 26. Imposition of hands by Bp. and priests, with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost. . . ."
24. Tradition of Bible and of Chalice with bread, with formula, "Take thou authority. . . ."
25. *Continuation of Communion Office to last Coll.*
30. Two Collects :—(a) "Almighty God, giver of all good things. . . ." (for Deacons). (b) "Most merciful Father, we beseech thee. . . ." (for Priests).
28. *Final Blessing.*

## CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS.

## ORDINAL OF 1550.

3. *HC as far as Creed*, with special Introit, Epistle and Gospel.
- Presentation to Abp.
- Oath of King's Supremacy.
2. Oath of canonical obedience.
5. Bidding.
6. Litany, with special clause and concluding Pr.

## 1. Examination.

## 8. Veni Creator.

12. Pr. "Almighty God and most merciful Father. . . ."

7. Imposition of Hands of Bps., with formula, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up. . . ."

## PB OF 1662.

15. Instruction and Examination.
17. Bidding.
22. Veni Creator.
18. Prayer, "Almighty God and heavenly Father. . . ."
- 16, 26. Imposition of hands by Bp. and priests, with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a priest. . . ."
24. Tradition of Bible, with formula, "Take thou authority. . . ."
25. *Continuation of Communion Office to last Coll.*
30. Three Collects :—(a) "Almighty God, giver of all good things. . . ." (for Deacons). (b) Most merciful Father, we beseech thee. . . ." (for Priests). (c) "Prevent us, O Lord. . . ."
28. *Final Blessing.*

## PB OF 1662.

3. *HC as far as Creed*, with special Coll., Epistle and Gospel.
- Presentation to Abp.
- Oath of King's Supremacy.<sup>1</sup>
2. Oath of canonical obedience.
5. Bidding.
6. Litany, with special clause and concluding Pr.

## 1. Examination.

## 8. Veni Creator.

12. Pr. "Almighty God and most merciful Father . . . ."

7. Imposition of Hands of Bps., with formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop. . . . And remember. . . ."

<sup>1</sup> Omitted in 1865.



PONTIFICAL.

ORDINAL OF 1550.

PB OF 1662.

- 14. (Sevenfold Blessing.)
- 15. Unction of head and \* hands.
- 16. Putting on of Gloves.
- 17. Benediction and delivery of Pastoral Staff.
- 18. Benediction and delivery of Ring.
- 19. Benediction and delivery of Mitre.
- 20. Tradition of Gospel Book, with words, "Accipe evangelium, et vade, prædica populo tibi commisso. . . ."
- 21. Mass continued to end.

- 7. 20. Imposition of Bible, with words, "Give heed unto reading. . . ."
- 17. Delivery of Pastoral Staff, with formula, "Be to the flock of Christ. . . ."

- 20. Delivery of Bible:—"Give heed unto reading. . . ." "Be to the flock of Christ. . . ."

21. Communion office continued to last Coll.

21. Communion office continued to last Coll.

Pr. "Most merciful Father . . . ."

Pr. "Most merciful Father . . . ."

Coll. "Prevent us, O Lord. . . ."

Final Blessing.

Final Blessing.

(A) Documents containing the ancient Roman and Gallican Ordination Rites:—*Leonian Sacramentary* (ed. Feltoe, Camb., 1896);

**15. Bibliography.** *Gelasian Sacramentary* (ed. Wilson, Oxf., 1894); *Gregorian Sacramentary* (in Muratori, *Liturgia Romana Vetus*, 2 vols., Venice, 1748); *Ordines Romani* (in Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, vol. 2, Paris, 1689—also in Migne, *PL* 78); *Statuta Ecclesie Antiqua* (in H. T. Bruns, *Canones Apostolorum et Conciliorum*, 1839). (B) For English Medieval Ordinals see:—Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesie Anglicane* (Oxf., 1882), vol. 3; Frere, *Use of Sarum* (2 vols., Camb., 1898, 1902); a list of English Pontificals is given by Frere in his *Pontifical Services* (Alcuin Club 3). (C) *Lutheran* forms of Ordination will be found in Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, vol. 2, pp. 517 ff. (D) *The English Reformed* Ordinals may be conveniently consulted in two publications of the Parker Society:—*Liturgies of King Edward VI*, and *Liturgical Services under Queen Elizabeth*; Bucer's *Draft* will be found in his *Scripta Anglicana*, pp. 238-259—the parts which influenced the PB Ordinal are reprinted in *CQR*, Apr. 1897, pp. 132 ff. (E) On the subject generally see:—Procter and Frere, *New History of the BCP* (London, 1907); Blunt, *Annotated PB*.—T.D.

H. LEONARD PARS.

**ORDINARY.**—Spiritual jurisdiction, that is, the authority to exercise within a definite area or over certain persons the spiritual power conferred by Holy

**1. Nature of Jurisdiction.**

Order, is of two kinds, ordinary and delegated. Ordinary jurisdiction is that which attaches to an office, the tenure of which is permanent, and of which the incumbent cannot be deprived except by process of law, on account of malfeasance, crime or incapacity. Ordinary jurisdiction once bestowed cannot be withdrawn at the mere will and pleasure of the superior who has conferred it. Delegated jurisdiction can be so withdrawn. Ordinary jurisdiction arises out of the office conferred by the superior; delegated depends upon the continued good pleasure of the superior.

An ecclesiastic having ordinary jurisdiction is called an "Ordinary." He may have other

**2. Grades of Ordinaries.**

Ordinaries subject to him, and again others who exercise their ordinary jurisdiction over him. The superior O. of a diocese is the Bp. An Archdeacon is the O. for certain purposes within the area of his Archdeaconry, but subject to his superior O. the Bp. Every incumbent of a parochial benefice is an O., that is, he is the O. of his ch. and parish, wherein he possesses, by conference by the Bp., ordinary jurisdiction, but subject to his superior Ordinaries, viz., the Bp. in all spiritual matters, the Archdeacon as regards certain matters, the Rural Dean as concerns certain other matters.

The O. referred to in rubrics of the PB means generally the Bp., but also sometimes the

Archdeacon, or either the Arch-

**3. PB Rubrics.** deacon or the Bp. in cases where they may have concurrent jurisdiction; as for instance in the rubric as to signifying to the O. the name of a person repelled from Communion, in order that the O. may "proceed against (him) according to the Canon." Such person might be proceeded against either in the Bp.'s Court or in the Court of the Archdeacon, and therefore the signifying might be to either Ordinary (see ARCHDEACON).

Every O. can delegate jurisdiction within the limits of his own jurisdiction to another duly-qualified

**4. Delegated Jurisdiction.**

person, but subject to inhibition by the superior Ordinary. Thus a parochial incumbent can give leave to another priest to administer the Word and Sacraments and to officiate in his parish, but always subject to inhibition by the Bp., or to any regulations which the Bp. may lawfully make. At certain times or occasions the superior Ordinary may suspend the jurisdiction of the inferior. Thus during the period of his diocesan visitation the Bp. usually inhibits the Archdeacon from visiting.—A4. E. G. Wood.

**OREMUS** ("Let us pray").—We find occasionally in the PB an Invitation (Bidding) prefacing a pr. and setting forth its special object (*e.g.*, in HC, "Let us pray for the whole state . . ."; "Ye that do truly . . ."; in Bapt., "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as . . ."; "Seeing now, dearly beloved . . ."). In early days such Invitations commonly preceded all prs., and "Let us pray" is a relic of them. It is found in the PB in two situations:—(a) at the beginning of the prayer-part of services; (b) to mark the change from Versicles and Responses to prs. of the Collect-type. And in all cases it serves as a call to devout attention.—**BI.** J. W. TYRER.

**ORGAN.**—The O. is the instrument most closely connected with Church music, and its origin must be sought in the most remote periods of history.

### 1. Introductory.

There can be no doubt that in its earliest forms the O. was recognised as particularly suitable to the needs of worshippers in religious ceremonies, as much for the dignity of its tone as for the support it provided for the voices. The many stages of development through which it has passed to its present size and complexity are interesting in their connection with the history of music. The O. is an instrument playable by a single performer, and is capable of supporting unlimited voices in musical expressions of joy and sorrow alike. It still preserves its nobility of tone, and a dignity, when it is properly used, which gives it a pre-eminent position. From the nature of the case the O. has had a very important influence upon music, and organists have, had, and to some considerable extent still have, upon their shoulders the musical well-being of a large number of people who have to depend upon church-going for their music.

It is not proposed to trace at any length the development of the O. through the many centuries of its existence, but to deal with a few of the difficulties which modern conditions impose both with regard to the organ and the organist. It will, however, be advisable to show in as short a way as possible a few of the phases through which the instrument went, and their connection with Ch. music.

The earliest organs, owing to the great size of the keys which controlled the pipes, were used in single notes to support the PLAINSONG. These

### 2. Early Instruments.

keys required great pressure to put them down, and involved the whole hand in the process, so that, at the best of times, two notes only could be played together. It is obvious that a long process of development was necessary before it was possible to use the keyboard in a manner at all approaching the modern method. But as improvements were made, and it became possible to play notes in more rapid succession and in greater combination, a kind of organ music began to be written on the lines of choral music. The composers of this early kind of instrumental music were all of them organists; and they soon began to experiment in order that they might find a style more suited to the nature of the instrument than to voices. The greater the demands on the technical resources of the performers and the mechanical devices of the instrument, the greater was the stimulus organ builders received to meet them, and invent the means to satisfy them.

From this period (1550) the organ began its

career more or less in the form in which we know it. The organs were, of course, very small, and must have been rather

### 3 Influence on Music.

exhausting to play on, but it is surprising to find how soon composers began to write passages for the O. which demanded a very considerable amount of dexterity. The compositions of Merulo, Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli—all of them organists of St. Mark's at Venice—abound in such passages. These organ compositions are the first definite attempt to create a style of composition suited to the instrument.

It is interesting to find that the men who were, first and foremost, organists were the founders of modern instrumental music. In these days we hear much of the influence (for ill) of the O. loft upon composers. But it was not always so. In the 2nd half of the 16th century the O. was the more advanced and matured among available instruments, and therefore offered the greater inducements to composers. The O. had a good start in the development of instrumental style, and kept its lead until the time of Bach's death in 1750.

It may be well to give some idea of the kind of O. those early composers had to write for.

### 4. Organ Building.

An O. of 12 stops was considered a large one. It contained, as a rule, no reed stops. Pedals which had been invented in the previous century (1470) were beginning to take their place, but were cumbersome and incapable of rapid performance. Reed stops, although they had been introduced into German organs in the 15th cent., were little used, owing to difficulties of keeping them in tune, and their slowness of speech. This is borne out in Antignati's account of his organ at Brescia (1608). The organ built for York Minster in 1632 by Robert Dallam contained but 14 stops, 2 manuals and no reeds or mixtures.

O. building seems to have developed more rapidly in Germany than elsewhere, judging by the instrument built at Lübeck during the 16th century (1518). This organ, of 2 manuals, contained the earliest 32 ft. pedal stop. A third manual was added in 1561, and by the end of the 17th cent. there were 57 speaking stops. This is the instrument over which Buxtehude presided, and upon which he performed when Bach came to Lübeck to hear him, having tramped all the way from Arnstade. Pedals seem to have become general in England at a much later date than abroad.

It is difficult to say to what extent in those early days the organ was used in this country.

### 5. Organs in England.

But that it had definite functions is obvious from the fact that as early as 1570 organs were looked upon with disfavour by the Puritans, and in 1586 Parliament was asked to put down cath. chs. in which "the service of God is abused by piping with organs," etc.

However, things did not come to a head until 1644, and, judging by the vehemence of the following clause in the Ordinance passed by Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament on May 9th of that year, that "All organs and the frames and the cases wherein they stand in all chs. and chapels aforesaid shall be taken away and utterly defaced, and none

other hereafter set up in their places," it is fairly plain that organ and organ-playing had assumed very definite proportions in the chs. at that time. Many organs were destroyed, but not all. Some found their way into private houses with this important result, that O. playing was cultivated on more secular lines, and instrumental music gained thereby.

During the Interregnum English O. builders had, to a large extent, disappeared; so that, at the Restoration when O. building became an urgent necessity, there were too few builders for the work, and it was then that Bernhard Schmidt (Father Smith) and his two nephews came from Germany, and established a great reputation in England. Thomas Harris and his son Renuus returned from Paris. These men brought with them all the newest things in O. construction, and gave to O. building in this country an impetus which has resulted in the pre-eminence of English organs to-day.

With the Restoration of Charles II a great change came over church music. In any case after the silence and restraint of the 16 years previous to the Restoration, a change was bound to come. But a still greater reason for a change was supplied by Charles himself, who expressed a desire for a lighter kind of music, such as he had heard at the French Court under the influence of Lulli. The introduction of a more secular idiom into church music was the result; and the increase in importance of the instrumental accompaniments gave still further stimulus to organists and O. builders.

Among the composers of this period, who were also organists, Humphreys, Blow and Purcell had the greatest influence. During the 18th century O. building developed but slowly. We do not find instruments of any great size. Any considerable increase under the old tracker system was to some extent limited by the weight of the touch which the finger could cope with. Couplers for connecting the manuals were little used for the same reason. An organ of two manuals and pedals, with 20 to 30 stops, was considered a large instrument.

The invention and introduction of the many fancy stops with which modern organs abound are developments of the 19th

**7. Later Developments.** century. The organs of the 18th and early 19th centuries are chiefly notable for the beauty of the diapason tone, a quality which is rarely produced in modern organs. On the other hand, the superiority of the reed stops in our modern instruments is unquestioned. The most important achievement, however, in the development of organ building was the invention of the pneumatic action. It has resulted in the entire reorganisation of the interior of the organ, and has made it possible to play with the utmost rapidity passages hitherto impracticable. It has made the use of couplers general, and has thereby placed an infinite number of combinations at the disposal of the performer. The adoption of mechanical blowing has made a steady wind supply possible, and has been the means of producing some of the wonderful reed stops of modern organs.

The importance of the O. in churches was never greater than it is to-day. It has to supply music at every turn and of every kind. Congregational singing is largely dependent on it. Choir accompaniments of every variety are provided

by it. It has to fill up many chinks and crevices, and to cover up all sorts of movements of the clergy and the choir. It plays the congregation in and out. It preludes the sermon and ekes out the collection. Its influence for good, if well handled, is immense. It adapts itself most readily to all kinds of experimental effects, and is, therefore, a dangerous instrument in the hands of the unskilful. It is the only instrument, playable by one person, which can provide infinite variety of tone-colour to the many parts of the service it has to perform. And, lastly, it provides the only opportunity many people have of hearing instrumental music of all kinds played either as voluntaries or at recitals.

One question arises which deserves very careful consideration. The position in which

**9. Its Position.** an organ is placed in a church has the most important bearing upon its utility. In many chs.

organs are placed in unsatisfactory positions, not infrequently in chambers totally inadequate for the purpose. In the Ch. service the congregation is surely the most important consideration, and organs, if they are to stimulate the singing, must be so placed that they can accomplish this. Organs tucked away in chancel niches are wasted, so far as the purpose for which they were built is concerned. The old west gallery, with the organ in it, was a far better arrangement, and gave far more support to the congregation. To have the choir in this gallery would be an additional advantage, and would also make it possible for women to sing in those choirs which find it difficult to secure adequate boys' voices. Many chancels, especially in small churches, have the effect of deadening the voices of the choir and obscuring the tone of the organ. In all concert rooms great care is taken so to place the chorus, orchestra and organ that they may be heard to the greatest advantage. Would that similar thought and care were bestowed upon these very important points in many chs. ! When the value of music in the service is so generally acknowledged, it is surely only reasonable to expect that everything should be done to give the music its greatest effect, by placing the instrument and singers in the position where they can be heard best.

With the wonderful developments in modern construction, and the endless contrivances for stop control, the conditions under

**10. Organ Playing.** which an organist works are very much better than in former years; but a very much higher standard of attainment is expected of him. O. technique, especially in the direction of registration, has advanced enormously. A new style of O. playing may be said to have arisen; a style in which the charm of the old solid O. tone has given place to a highly sensitive appreciation for tone-colour. But the organist should not forget that the most modern O. is still capable of playing those most perfect examples of O. music yet available, the works of J. S. Bach. The fascination of

orchestral arrangements is reasonable, but the better the organist the wider are his sympathies.  
—Q3. H. P. ALLEN.

**ORIENTATION OF CHURCHES.**—See EAST, TURNING TO.

**ORIGINAL SIN.**—Certain passages of Holy Scripture, principally from the writings of St. Paul, have been generally understood to imply that man is by birth under the "wrath of God,"

**1. Scriptural Teaching.** that he is in a state of alienation from God which can be traced back to that beginning of human sin described in Gen. 3, that he brings into the world a nature which is inclined to sin, and that only by regeneration, by a total change or new birth from above granted by God's free grace, can he be delivered. Cp. Ps. 51, and the teaching of Christ in <sup>1</sup>John 3, and of St. Paul, especially in Rom. 5-7, 1 Cor. 15, Eph. 2.

The early Church undoubtedly held the same doctrine, though without formal definition and expressed in various ways by the early Fathers. The doctrine was impugned indirectly by the Gnostic sects of the 2nd and 3rd cents., and directly challenged early in the 5th cent. by Pelagius and Coelestius, who appear to have taught that new-born infants are in the same condition as unfallen man. Pelagianism was refuted in Britain, the country which gave it birth, by SS. Germanus, Lupus and David, and elsewhere by St. Augustine and others. It was finally condemned at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. The subject continued to be discussed by the Schoolmen, and was one of the burning questions of the Reformation period. It formed one of the subjects of controversy between the rival schools of Calvinism and Arminianism.

**2. History of Doctrine.** The teaching of the PB on the subject of OS. is to be gathered chiefly from Art. 9 and the Bapt. Offices. Art. 9 is somewhat reserved in its language; while condemning Pelagianism, it does not, at any rate in its English wording, appear to go as far as Calvin in teaching the total depravity of fallen man. Man is only "very far gone from original righteousness" (the Latin however has *quam longissime*). Nor does it deal with the "imputation" of Adam's guilt to his posterity. On the other hand, it is more emphatic than the Council of Trent in teaching the sinful nature of "concupiscence." That Council (Sess. v, held in 1546) simply laid down that concupiscence is "of sin and inclines to sin."

**3. Article 9.** <sup>1</sup> It has, however, been argued that John 3, while clearly implying the necessity of passing by a new birth from a lower and earthly state to a higher and heavenly, involves no precise doctrine of original sin, and is satisfied by supposing universal imperfection. It has also been urged that the ecclcs. doctrine of the Fall has no real support in the OT, and cannot even be securely deduced from St. Paul. See Tennant's *Hulsean Lectures*, and Sanday-Headlam on Rom. 5. Cp. MAN. G. H.]

The practical exposition of the doctrine in the Bapt. Offices is clearer and more satisfactory than in the Arts. It stands outside controversy and is confined to a simple Scriptural statement which may be analysed under the two following heads. (1) The natural condition of fallen man is that of sin and separation from God; and only by the regeneration of which Bapt. is the outward means can he be delivered from this condition and brought into living union with God in His Kingdom. (2) This natural sinfulness of man is not merely a forensic statement. He is not merely overshadowed by the original guilt of Adam. There is in every man an ingrained tendency to commit actual sin (see opening Exh. of Bapt. <sup>3</sup>). That this tendency to sin remains after Bapt. (as stated in Art. 9) is implied in the fervent prs. for victory over sin and the final perseverance of the newly baptised. They are stated to be regenerate and to have received the remission of sins, and a rubric affirms that baptised children, "dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." But the gift of the Holy Spirit is prayed for not only before but after the actual Bapt.—a gift which will not only confer the new birth from the state of nature to that of grace, but act as the Divine remedy, by the co-operation of the human will, for all the perils of natural *concupiscence*. The baptised are delivered from the condition of sin; they are also given a new spiritual endowment which will enable them to avoid actual sin and attain to actual righteousness.

Much past controversy on OS., as well as much loose language to-day, might have been spared, if the clear principles on which the Bapt. Offices are based had been grasped. The teaching of the Church stands on a different plane from, and is really untouched by, modern theories as to the evolution of man or the transmission of character by heredity. Evolution is clearly going beyond her own sphere in suggesting that the Fall of man was really a rise in his moral development, or that the sense of sin is due only to man's inheritance of tendencies from his brute and savage ancestry, out of which he is endeavouring in the process of evolution to rise. Evolution as a doctrine of natural science is concerned only with processes, and from its own standpoint cannot deal with man's spiritual endowment. Theorising on these subjects without taking account of revealed data is an invasion of the sphere of theology, even as theology would be going out of her province in dogmatising from Bible texts on the origin of species. Those who have received the Christian Faith are justified in meeting such intrusion on the ground of Divine revelation. The doctrine of OS. (as distinguished from original guilt) in the PB formulation of it rests upon the truth, revealed in Scripture and confirmed by experience, that each member of the race is from birth onwards constitutionally liable to sin and exposed to the influences of an evil world. It is revealed also that no self-caused development can set right what has gone astray from the Divine plan. This can only be effected by an inward spiritual renewal from God, by an exercise of that Almighty grace and power which transcends natural processes. [See further, MAN.]

#### 4. The Baptismal Offices.

#### 5. Original Sin and Evolution.

Similarly, the theories of heredity connected especially with the name of Weismann do not really touch the teaching of the Church.

**6. Original Sin and Heredity.** It is asserted that, while natural characters are transmitted, acquired ones are not; and that, while the tendency to fall below the ideal is heritable, this cannot be due to the effect of any wrong volition on the part of ancestors. Leaving out of question the doubtfulness from a scientific point of view of such conclusions, the Church may not only entrench herself in her consciousness of a Divine revelation, she may point also to the facts of human life, conscience and history. Whether we consider the malignity and the persistence of sin, or the mysterious power of recovery which the Christian Faith and Sacraments have brought into the world, or the indubitable phenomena of conversion and spiritual experience, we can find no explanation so full and satisfactory as that of Holy Scripture and the Church's teaching. Revelation and the facts of life are really at one.<sup>1</sup> (For Literature, see SIN.)—*ib.* A. R. WHITHAM.

**ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.—See RITUAL, vii.**

**ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER.—**In this connection the term "Ornaments" signifies what is necessary as well as what is decorative in character, or what is used by the clergy in the way of liturgical vesture in the services

**1. Early Evidence as to Vesture.** of the Church. In the early *Church Orders* or directories of worship of the 3rd and 4th cents. of the Christian era little is said on the subject of the vestures of the clergy—so little, in fact, as to make it doubtful whether any distinctive liturgical dress was common, or at least universal, up to the close of the 4th cent. In *The Testament of our Lord*, c. A.D. 350, there is no reference to vestments of the ministers during Service; but the chief deacon in charge of "the guest-house which is in the church" is to be "clothed in white garments, a stole (Gr., *Orarion*) only on his shoulder" (134). This is probably the first mention of a stole; it is named as a badge of office, and it was not worn during Service, at least exclusively, if at all. It is interesting to observe that here the chief deacon wears his stole on one shoulder only, as is usual in our own day (see Maclean, *Recent Discoveries illustrating Early Christian Worship*, S.P.C.K., 3 § 7). At the Council of Laodicea, held c. A.D. 380, we find the mention of stoles, forbidden indeed to subdeacons, readers and other members of the Minor Orders, but worn as a mark of office in the case of deacons and perhaps also of the higher orders of clergy (*ib.*). The *Canons of Hippolytus* (37 201), probably of 4th cent. date, refer to certain Eucharistic vestments. We read that the presbyters and deacons assembled for the Eucharistic Service with the bishop, "robed in white vestures, more beautiful than those of all the people, specially splendid . . . even the readers are to have festal garments." It seems that at this date special vestments were regarded as badges of office.

<sup>1</sup> [See further MAN.]

Amongst the latest discoveries in the field of ancient Church usages are *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, recently translated by Dom Connolly (*Texts and Studies*, viii, Cam. Univ. Press, 1909). In describing the celebration of the Eucharist in the East Syrian Church in the 5th cent., Narsai, apparently a bishop, draws for us a picture of the altar surrounded by a crowd of richly dressed ministers; he says: "The priests now come in procession into the midst of the sanctuary and stand there in great splendour and in beauteous adornment" (*Hom.* xvii A., p. 4). Lights, incense, waving of fans, genuflections and bowings before the Consecration only, are named. The ceremonial and liturgical development revealed in Narsai is very great, and far in advance of that in the West before the close of the 5th cent. In fact the *Homilies of Narsai* breathe a markedly different liturgical atmosphere from that of earlier documents.

It seems clear, however, that in the first four centuries the liturgical costume of the clergy was identical with that worn in daily life by the laity or official persons of the State. In the

**2. Western Use.** 5th cent. the outdoor costume worn at Rome by State officials consisted essentially of two garments—an under-tunic with or without sleeves, and a *paenula* or ample cloak, which was sleeveless and without any opening down the front. The head was passed through an aperture made in the centre of this latter garment, and it was lifted in folds over the arms when the wearer wished to use his hands. This is the cloke (*phelonion*) referred to by St. Paul in 2 Tim. 4 13. From these two vestures the liturgical dress of the clergy in the West has been mainly evolved. When in full-dress the lower officials of State wore the *paenula* over the tunic, the latter garment being confined at the waist by a girdle; in addition, they wore conspicuously a brightly coloured scarf, the *pallium*, as a badge of office. With the exception of this latter vesture the dress of the Roman clergy was absolutely identical with that of the Roman civilian of position of the time. (See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, S.P.C.K., pp. 379 ff.)

That this is the case is conclusively proved from a letter of Pope Celestine I (A.D. 423-432), addressed to the bishops of Provence (Labbe and Cossart and Mansi, *Sacr. Concil.*, 1762, 4 431), in which he condemns the use of any specially or exclusively ecclesiastical costume. In Gaul, however, there was a tendency to distinguish the clerical garb from that of the civilian or lay dress, which Celestine strongly disapproved, as his letter shows. "The documents, liturgical or otherwise, dealing with the Roman use, take for granted that all ecclesiastics, from the Pope down to an acolyte, wore the *planet* or *paenula* with the tunic under it. . . . This costume was still used in the 6th cent. by laymen of distinction" (Duchesne, p. 380). A contemporary picture exists (reproduced in Atchley's *Ordo Romanus Primus*, Delamore Press, 1905, p. 29), which exhibits Pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-604) and his father, Gordianus the senator, dressed similarly, each wearing a *planet* or *paenula* over the tunic or dalmatic; the bishop is only distinguished from the senator by the *pallium* or scarf thrown round his shoulders and the book of the Gospels in his hand. In the Church of St. Vitalis, Ravenna, is a mosaic of the 6th cent. (the church was consecrated A.D. 547),

showing a bishop and two clergymen: all three ecclesiastics wear a long white garment reaching down to the feet, with full and wide sleeves; a narrow band or stole passes over both shoulders, reaching to the bottom edge of the garment, which is a linen tunic or dalmatic, an early form of the alb, surplice or rochet. The bishop also wears a dark olive-green *paenula* (*planeta* or chasuble) and over it the *pallium*, an episcopal scarf, white, fringed at the ends, and marked with a cross (reproduced *ib.*, p. 1). The evidence against the use of any distinctive liturgical habit in the West at this period is conclusive.

From the Roman tunic and *paenula* the alb and chasuble are derived, the clergy retaining, with modifications, the ancient dress of civilians of position, whilst the latter adopted various changes of attire as time went on. The rochet and surplice are, as said above, modified forms of the ancient tunic. Duchesne traces the stole and similar scarf-like vestures (the *oravion*, the *epitrachelion* and the *pallium*) alike to a common origin, as first introduced into liturgical use during the 4th cent., and he regards them as scarves of office similar to the civil insignia of Roman life (Duchesne, pp. 393-4). We must, therefore, on historical grounds, dismiss from our minds any idea that the liturgical vestures of the Christian Church in the West are derived from those of the Jewish priesthood—the former were undoubtedly, in their earlier forms, merely the ordinary garments of daily use, which by degrees became restricted to the clergy alone, and were as time went on invested with a sacred and symbolic character.<sup>1</sup>

The authoritative direction for the liturgical vesture of the clergy of the English Church is found [according to the view here taken] in the Ornaments Rubric, which requires the retention and the use of such ornaments of the ministers at all times of their ministrations as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the Second Year of the reign of King Edward VI. It is now generally admitted that this direction, worded loosely enough, is intended to refer to the legalised usages in regard to the ornaments of church and minister which prevailed under the First PB of Edward VI. There is undisputed evidence that the Ornaments Rubric was revised and deliberately re-enacted at the last revision of the PB in 1662. It takes no account [but see ORNAMENTS RUBRIC for another view] of any intermediate legislation enforcing a minimum of liturgical vesture in the face of prevailing gross neglect, such, e.g., as the Advertisements of A.D. 1566 or the canons of A.D. 1604; it refers back to the legalised usage under the PB of 1549 for guidance in the matter of the ornaments of the minister.

"The Rubric seems to me to imply with some clearness that, in the long interval between Edw. VI and the 14th year of Car. II, there had been many changes; but it does not stay to specify them, or distinguish between what was mere evasion, and

what was lawful. It quietly passes them all by, and goes back to the legalised usage of the First PB of Edward VI. What had prevailed since, whether by an archbishop's gloss, by commissioners, or even statutes, whether, in short, legal or illegal, it makes quite immaterial."—Letter to Dr. Liddon from the Right Hon. J. T. Coleridge, 1871, quoted in *Ritual Conformity*, p. 10.

It will suffice here to quote the directions as to liturgical costume given in the First PB of Edward VI, enumerating the various vestures of the minister which were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, and which the present PB orders to be retained and to be in use by the ministers of the church at all times of their ministrations.

(a) *Holy Communion*. "Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a *white albe plain*, with a *vestment* or *cope*. And where there be many priests or deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration, as shall be requisite; and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, *albes*, with *tunicles*."

"And whensoever the bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, beside his *rochette*, a *surplice* or *albe*, and a *cope* or *vestment*,<sup>1</sup> and also his *pastoral staff* in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain."

(b) *Ante-Communion, or Table Prayers*. "Though there be none to communicate with the priest . . . he shall put upon him a *plain albe* or *surplice*, with a *cope*, and say all things at the altar (appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord's Supper) until after the offertory. . . ."

(c) *Choir Offices, etc.* "In the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, baptising and burying, the minister, in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a *surplice*. And in all cathedral churches and colleges, the archdeacons, deans, provosts, masters, prebendaries and fellows, being graduates, may use in the quire, beside their *surplices*, such *hoods* as pertaineth to their several degrees, which they have taken in any university within this realm. But in all other places, every minister shall be at liberty to use any *surplice* or no. It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, should use such *hoods* as pertaineth to their several degrees."

Thus, the legal vestures of the English clergy at the present time, as enjoined by the PB<sup>2</sup> and specified above, are these: (i) *For the Holy Communion*: Bishops—ROCHET, SURPLICE or alb, COPE or vestment (with the use of the PASTORAL STAFF); Priests—Alb, vestment or cope; with albs and TUNICLES for assisting priests or deacons. (ii) *For Matins, Evensong, and other Offices*: Bishops—as above; Priests—surplice, and HOOD in preaching.

The simultaneous use of hood and TIPPET (scarf) in service-time rests on no enactment of any rubric or canon of the English Church, but merely on custom. For a popular yet

<sup>1</sup> For the mediæval symbolic meanings attached to the various vestments of the ministers of the Church see the *Rationale of Ceremonial*, c. 1540-1543, Ed. C. S. Cobb, 1910, pp. 16 ff.; cp. OCM, pp. 33-37, and Staley, *Ceremonial of the Eng. Ch.*, pp. 159-167.

<sup>1</sup> The term "Vestment" was frequently used to describe a complete set of Eucharistic vestments—CHASUBLE, STOLE, GRIBLE, MANIPLE, ALB, and AMICE (see Scudamore, *Notit. Eucharistica*, and *id.*, p. 72).

<sup>2</sup> [But see for another view ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.]

accurate account of the vestures of the ministers, with illustrations, see Dearmer, *The Ornaments of the Ministers* (Mowbrays): for a fuller account see Report of Sub-Committee, Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury, No. 416, SPCK, 1908, entitled *The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers*. [Cp. Brightman on *Vestments*, in *DECH*, 1912.] For explanations concerning the various vestures named above, see other articles in this work under the respective headings.—R3.

V. STALEY.

**ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.**—The vexed question of the validity and meaning of the OR. has become urgent from the "Letters of Business" addressed by the Crown to the Convocations in 1906 to consider whether it was desirable to "prepare a new rubric." It is obvious that the proper construction of the existing rules as to O. must have an important bearing on any discussion of proposed modifications of those rules. What may be called the *primâ facie* view has been stated in the previous art. It assumes that the OR., taken by itself, defines the law of O. in the Ch. of Eng., and that its meaning is that at least the O. lawful under the First PB are still legally required. In 1908 a sub-committee of the Upper House of Cant. Conv.<sup>1</sup> made the same assumption as to the governing force of the OR., and reported, though not very decidedly or explicitly, in favour of the legality of vestments.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, an opposite interpretation has been twice endorsed, after lengthy discussion

**2. Legal and Historical View.** of the historical and legal points involved, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.<sup>3</sup> It has

been argued at length under RITUAL LAW, <sup>1</sup> The members were Bps. J. Wordsworth, G. F. Browne, Robertson, Gibson, and Chase, and their Report is cited as *OCM* (The Ornaments of the Ch. and its Ministers).

<sup>2</sup> *OCM*, p. 90: "We feel bound to state that our own study of the facts leads us to the conclusion that the Ornaments Rubric cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding the use of all vestments for the clergy other than the surplice in Parish Churches and, in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the surplice, hood, and cope." It will be noted that those who think that scarf, hood, and preacher's gown are lawful in parish churches could subscribe to this conclusion, even if they judged the Euch. vestments illegal. But the construction placed upon it in the text has been explicitly or implicitly sanctioned by the authors elsewhere.

<sup>3</sup> See Table II at end of RITUAL LAW, under 1871 H.P. and 1877 R.C., for the names of the great judges concerned. It is proper to add here that the famous Westerton Judgment (1857 L.W. in Table II at end of RITUAL LAW) had created the impression that the "dresses" of the First PB "may still be used." And so secure did those feel who introduced the vestments that this impression was correct, that the opposite decisions were received with consternation and indignation. The terms of the Judgment were these. Speaking of the printed rubrics of 1559, 1604, and 1662, their Lordships said that "they all obviously treat the same thing; that the same dresses, and the same utensils or articles ["Ornaments of the Ch. and of the Ministers thereof"] which were used under the First PB of Ed. 6, may still be used. None of them, therefore, can have any reference to articles not used in the services, but set up in ch. as ornaments in the sense of decorations." But (1) the whole point of this paragraph was to lay stress on the limitation contained in the words "the Min. shall use" (1559 and 1604), and "be in use" (1662), which excluded decorations; (2) this sentence was a mere *obiter dictum* in regard to "dresses," for, as the Purchas Judgment notes, "this question of the Vestments was not before the Court"; (3) the Judges were right in 1857 in ignoring the proviso, because no one pretends that

§§ 8-29, that in regard to the Elizabethan period later research has greatly strengthened the general position taken by the Court as to vestments,<sup>1</sup> both by showing evidence of an independent legal prohibition of them earlier than the Advts. on which the Judges relied, and by thus interpreting a body of data hard to explain if vestments were first made illegal in 1566. On this view, s. 25 of Eliz.'s Act of Unif.<sup>2</sup> is the governing rule, and carries with it the orders made, not in abrogation of it (as is suggested, *OCM*, p. 89, l. 4), but in fulfilment of its provision for retention and use only "until other order." The OR. is on this view a mere note, any doubt as to the construction of which must be settled by reference to the governing rule.<sup>3</sup>

This interpretation would maintain that the *primâ facie* view requires the OR. to be taken apart from its historical origin and its legal connections, and misinterprets one part of the rubric because it ignores the qualifications contained in the rest; whereas a review of the evidence would show that both the *terms* of the OR., when properly read, and the *law* of which it is the subordinate expression, exclude the use of vestments.

The OR. is a patchwork of old phrases, and its meaning cannot be judged without taking into account the purpose of its authors and the situation with which it dealt. Accordingly, we must begin with a survey of the law and practice in regard to ministerial vestures in the past. The crucial dates are 1549, 1552, 1559, 1566, and 1662. As a good deal turns on the sequence of events, the facts will be given in a chronological series.

1547, Jan. 28. Edw. 6 succeeded his father H. 8, the mediæval vestments being still in continuous use.

1548. An English supplement to the Mass provided for the communion of the people in both kinds, but no change of vesture was made.

1549, Jan. 21. Before the end of Edw. 6's 2nd year it was ordered in the First PB by the authority of Parliament that "a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope<sup>4</sup>" should be worn at HC by the principal any "other order" was taken about "Ornaments of the Ch." (which alone were in question in that case), and, as the Ridsdale Judgment pointed out, "Judges weigh their words with reference to the questions, which they have to consider, and not with reference to questions which are not before them." (*CAT* 110 39 f.).

<sup>1</sup> This term will be used summarily for alb and chasuble or tunic.

<sup>2</sup> For full text see RITUAL, § 16 (25), and note inclusion of the Act in the PB as No. 1 of the contents (*ib.*, § 15).

<sup>3</sup> With the language of the Ridsdale Judgment (*CAT* 110 24-26) cp. Frere (*Lit. Ref.*, p. 105): "Rubric is in its essence a note, inserted in a Service-Book as a reminder to the user concerning some point of law or custom which is material to the business in hand. It is not in itself, properly speaking, directive, but suggestive. It never is complete, and may be incomplete in very various degrees."

<sup>4</sup> The suggestion that the cope was only intended for use when the Ante-Communion alone was to be used (*Hier. Ang.* 1 136 n., 273-5) is negatived by the fact that Abp. Cranmer, who presumably knew better than anyone else the meaning of words he with others had drafted, officiated at the HC with other bps., "clothed (say the words of the *Register*) in linen surplices and copes" (Strype, *Cranmer*, 1 363 l., q. *Hier. Ang.* 1 137), the option as to episcopal dress being similarly worded (RITUAL, § 24, d<sup>4</sup>).

minister, as "the vesture appointed for that ministration" (see RITUAL, § 36, H<sup>4</sup>, n. 1); and "Certain Notes" at the end of the book required that for matins, evensong, baptising, and burying, the minister in parish churches, and chapels annexed to the same, should use a surplice. A momentous change was thus made in reducing the chasuble ("vestem sacerdotalem") to the rank of a permissible alternative at HC, and also in dispensing with various accessories previously ordered.

The assumption, so frequently made,<sup>1</sup> that the term "vestment" includes a chasuble with the mediæval appurtenances (amice, stole, and maniple), is not borne out by the evidence. Sometimes, as in Bonner's arts. (see RITUAL, §103 (b)), it is used so comprehensively as to include at least the alb and girdle, or even the frontal. But more often it clearly denotes the chasuble, as in the inventory of St. Paul's Cath. (*Hier. Ang.* 1 142), where "Allbis with stoles fannels and parours" are numbered separately. And in the rubric, where "vestment" appears as distinct from the alb and alternative to the cope (cp. the prohibition in the 1552 rubric), the comprehensive sense "cannot be the use" (*OCM*, p. 109). Sir R. Phillimore in the Purchas case in 1870 condemned the stole and maniple, while allowing alb and chasuble. (Cp. also the quotation from Becon under 1554 below.)

1552. The 2nd Act of Unif. (which only came into force<sup>2</sup> Nov. 1), by a rubric in the revised PB, ordered that the minister "at the

**4. From 1552 to 1557.** time of the Communion and at all other times of his ministration (shall) use neither alb, vestment, nor cope, but . . . being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

1553. Immediately after Mary's accession the Acts of Unif. were repealed, and the religion of the "last year" of her father was restored, including of course the mediæval vestments which Henry had left untouched.

1554. The usage of this time may be illustrated from the contemporary description given by Becon in his *Displaying of the Popish Mass* (PS 3 529). "As though your own apparel, or else a fair white surplice, were not seemly enough for the due ministration of the sacrament, ye first put on upon your head an head-piece, called an amice. . . . Then put ye on also an alb . . . and that alb ye gird unto you. . . . After this ye cast a stole about your neck. . . . Again upon your left arm ye put on a fannel [*ib.* p. 361, fannon,<sup>3</sup> *i.e.*, maniple]. . . . Last of all come on your . . . coat which is called a vestment. . . ."

1558, Nov. 17. Elizabeth succeeded Mary. 1559, May 8. The 3rd Act of Unif. was passed, which has the distinction that it was formally subscribed by the Convs. on Dec. 28, 1661, as No. 1 in the contents of the PB, and was re-enacted by Parl. in 1662 (see for full text any large Desk PB or other complete ed.,

**5. The Act of 1559.**

<sup>1</sup> E. Geldart in *The Case for Incense*, p. 125, who in the text thinks it cannot be reasonably argued that the "vestment did not include its full suit of stole and maniple, just as the alb would naturally include the amice, and, especially, the girdle," yet in a n. admits that "this is, however, not to be absolutely taken for granted"; and Braun, author of the exhaustive work *Die Liturgische Gewandung*, 1907, in his review of *OCM* (in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, 1910) adopts the limited sense, confirming it by parallels from contemporary Lutheran usage.

<sup>2</sup> Evidence as to ornaments in 1552 has often been cited as if showing usage under the Second PB, when it really referred to the 1549 rule. Cp. RITUAL LAW, § 11 and nn.

<sup>3</sup> "An humeral or ephod" is the first item (= amice) in this alternative list, from *A Comparison between the Popish Mass and the Lord's Supper*.

or cp. RITUAL, § 16, for main contents verbatim). By s. 3 the PB of 1552 was re-enacted under severe penalties (see above), but a proviso in s. 25 is usually interpreted as suspending the operation of the OR. of 1552 (which prohibited the ministerial use of alb, vestment or cope), until other order should be taken. As there is no evidence of the ritual use of these vestures, as prescribed in 1549, anywhere after the re-establishment of the PB, it is natural to ask whether such use really was sanctioned by the new law. The result of this inquiry has been often prejudged in reliance on the *expositio temporanea* contained in the rubric which the editors—whenever they were, and acting under whatever authority—substituted for the statutory rubric (see RITUAL, § 24, D<sup>1</sup> n. 3, D<sup>3</sup> n. 1). No well-informed writer now maintains that this printed rubric had statutory authority. It is urged, therefore, that its terms should not prejudice the interpretation of the Act; some ground of policy may be found to explain the difference.<sup>1</sup> A somewhat minute analysis will be necessary in order to do justice to the complex ambiguities lurking under the terms of the proviso.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Provided always and be it enacted*] It has not always been recollected that the sole statutory authority that could be claimed for vestments from 1559 to 1662, and (it may be added, if the view described in § 2 be correct) from 1662 to now, is a temporary suspensory proviso, and not an independent enacting clause. From that it would follow that no one could be punished for disregarding it, for no penalties are attached, as is pointed out in the *Short Dialogue*, 1605 (Tomlinson, *CMV*, 1908, p. 61 f.).<sup>3</sup>

**6. Analysis of s. 25.** <sup>2</sup> *that such Ornaments*] According to two concurrent judgments of the Privy Council,<sup>4</sup> "the term 'ornaments' in the rubric means those articles, the use of which in the services and ministrations of the Ch. is prescribed by that [*i.e.*, the First] PB," and "is confined to these articles," for "though there may be articles not expressly mentioned in the rubric, the use of which would not be restrained, they must be articles which are consistent with, and subsidiary to, the services: as an organ for the singing, a credence table from which to take the sacramental bread and wine, cushions, hassocks, etc."

<sup>3</sup> *of the Church*] It is generally admitted that the reference is to the structure, and not to the society. <sup>4</sup> *and of the Ministers thereof*] In *OCM*, p. 93, it is held that the term 'Ministers' in the OR. includes bps. and abps., because these are clearly sometimes termed Ministers. On the other hand,

<sup>1</sup> The state policy of the Q. would easily provide a motive (see further below § 8). Cp. Creighton (*Q. Eliz.*, pp. 60 f.; cp. p. 55). "So Eliz. set to work to play a game which bewildered every one"—the apparently serious consideration of Philip's proposal of marriage. The Spanish ambassador wrote, "This woman is possessed with a hundred thousand devils."

<sup>2</sup> The historical survey is resumed in § 9.

<sup>3</sup> Dealing with a similar attempt to overpress a proviso (in the case *Rex v. Dibdin, ex parte Thompson*), Lord Justice Fletcher Moulton said, "The proposed method of interpretation . . . sins against the fundamental rule of construction that a proviso must be considered with relation to the principal matter to which it stands as a proviso. It treats it as if it were an independent enacting clause instead of being dependent on the main enactment. The courts have frequently pointed out this fallacy, and have refused to be led astray by arguments . . . which depend solely on taking words absolutely in their strict literal sense, disregarding the fundamental consideration that they appear in a proviso" (*Times*, Dec. 13, 1910). According to this ruling s. 25 of 1 Eliz., c. 2, could not repeal s. 3 (requiring the surplice only) or replace it: it merely qualified its action for a time.

<sup>4</sup> See Table II at end of RITUAL LAW, 1857 L.W., and 1868 M.M. The quotations in the text are the statements in the latter of points they regarded as established in the former.



the Privy Council ruled on the appeal from the Lincoln judgment, that the Bp. of Lincoln was not responsible for the use of lights, which were under the control of the incumbent.<sup>1</sup> This view, as taking account of the qualifying "thereof," seems to be the better founded. In that case the OR. only prescribes for incumbents and their deputies; and bps. and abps., unless benefited or taking temporary charge, are outside its scope.

5° It should be noted, as bearing on the meaning of the proviso, that whereas in the 1552 and 1559 (printed) rubrics the words "at the time of the Communion, and [at] all other times of his ministrations" occur, and in 1662 the variant "at all times of their ministrations," the Act does not mention ministrations, or its times.

6° *shall be retained*] These words imply that the Ornaments (to be further specified) were at the time lawful possessions of the parish churches under the Marian régime, and at least require that they shall not be parted with contrary to the subsequent terms of the proviso.

7° *and be in use*] (a) The *prima facie* interpretation of these words is that they refer to "use" in the sense of ceremonial employment. (b) But it has been urged by Tomlinson (*PBAH* 102 f., and more fully *R. Com. on Eccles. Disc.* 1 212-214, 222, as well as in his pamphlets) that 'use' has here a meaning practically obsolete now, but then accepted both in ordinary speech and in legal terminology, viz., "trust."<sup>2</sup> (c) He has also given instances of "use" in connection with Ch. property as meaning employment in a very wide sense, covering any sort of beneficial disposal<sup>3</sup> (cp. *RITUAL LAW*, § 11, n.). Similarly the Judges in the Purchas case (see Table II at end of *RITUAL LAW*, 1871 H.P.) pointed out that "the Statute of Eliz. did not direct such use [i.e., in ministrations], nor refer to any special times of ministrations, but it ordered simply the retaining of the ornaments, till further order made by the Queen" (cp. 5° above). All three interpretations, (a) to be used by the minister in the services, (b) to be in trust, or (c) to be in non-ceremonial employment, are thus legitimate according to contemporary usage, and the historical context must settle which is correct.

8° *as was in the Ch. of Eng.*] Not "as were in use" (the wording of the printed rubric of 1559). The word "was" in the extant MS. original of the Act as signed by the Queen was clearly written over an erasure and is therefore deliberate. It is not, therefore, "such ornaments as were in use then," but "such as was the regulation then."

9° *by authority of Parl.*] Dibdin (*Case against Incense*, p. 6) states that this is a phrase which "appears at the beginning of every statute . . .

<sup>1</sup> See Table II at end of *RITUAL LAW*, 1892 R.L.

<sup>2</sup> In the Statute of Uses (27 H. 8, c. 10) one clause, e.g., refers to "such like estates as they had or shall have in use, trust, or confidence of or in the same." Cp. Shakespeare in the *Merchant of Venice*, "I am content, so he will let me have the other half in use—to render it Upon his death, unto the gentleman That lately stole his daughter." (Act iv, sc. 1). (Lewin on *Trusts*, p. 12, endorsed this view.) This sense is connected with *usance* and *usury*, the ordinary sense with *useful* and *usage*. Note that many 19th cent. PBs erroneously printed "be used" for "be in use" in the Act.

<sup>3</sup> The Bodmin inventory of 1566 (*Hier. Ang.* 1 172-4), often quoted to prove the late ritual use of vestments, includes along with a "censer of latten" and "a sacring bell" (forbidden as early as 1547 by R. Injn., cp. Cardwell, *D. A.* 1 15), "3 Jesus coats," "3 tormentors' coats," and "2 devil's coats,"—all "to be used and occupied to the honour of God in the same church." On this Dibdin (*Case against Incense*, p. 72) remarks, "these words 'to be used and occupied' look uncommonly like the formal words of a deed, and I doubt in my mind whether they have any significance at all with reference to actual employment."

'authority' is the technical word for indicating the enacting power of Parl." More than one attempt at legislation had been made earlier in the session, but had failed. And the reference to Parl. may well have been inserted in order to conciliate opponents, who were thus only asked to endorse what an earlier Parl. had approved. Neither Injns. nor Proclamations (the statutory force of which was abolished at the end of the first year of Ed. VI) can be referred to here.

10° *in the 2nd year of K. Ed. VI*] The passing of the 1st Act of Unif. is mentioned in K. Ed.'s Journal among the entries of the 2nd year, and the 1552 Act refers to it as "made in the 2nd year of Ed. VI." It was long contended that the reference was to the usage of 1548,<sup>1</sup> but it is now generally admitted that the First PB is the standard intended. Sir L. T. Dibdin gave before the *R. Comm. on Eccles. Disc.* (v. 1, q. 2468) a long list of the Judges who in various cases have "been unanimous as to the meaning being" as just stated. It should be noted also that the wording is "such as was . . . by authority of Parl. in the 2nd year," not "such . . . as was . . . in the 2nd year by authority of Parl.," and the verbal usage of statutes proves that the date refers to the session of Parl., not to the whole year, so that the interpretation under 8° is confirmed.

11° *until*] This word is not "unless," and, read in its own context,<sup>2</sup> it creates a presumption that some "order" will be "taken" at an early date (cp. the reference in the R. Injns. of 1547 to "ceremonies . . . not as yet abrogated," the abrogation following in the 1st Act of Unif.). Evidence will be offered to show that this presumption was realised.

12° *other order shall be therein taken*] The force of these words has been discussed at length under *RITUAL LAW*, §§ 8-14, where it is argued that, if not the issue of R. Injn. 30, at least its imposition upon the clergy, and its administrative enforcement in the R. Visitation, satisfied all legal requirements involved in the proviso.

13° *by the authority of the Q.'s Maj. with the advice of*] The very general terms in which the R. authority is required should be noted, cp. *RITUAL LAW*, § 8 (b).

14° *the commissioners appointed and authorised under the great Seal of Eng. for causes eccles.*] On June 24, 1559, the day on which the restored PB came into force, and in realisation of the presumption noted under 11° above, a Commission "under the great seal for causes eccles." was issued, the Injns. were "annexed" to the Commission, and were authorised by their "advice" when they made the clergy subscribe them, Injn. 30, as shown under *RITUAL LAW*, § 9 (1), requiring the surplice, to the exclusion of alb, vestment and cope.

15° *or of the metropolitan of this realm.*] Abp. Parker was not consecrated till Dec. 17, or "confirmed" till Dec. 9. So he could not give the "advice" earlier; but, at the time these words were inserted in the Act, the difficulties and delays over his consecration could not have been foreseen.

In the PB, as printed, the statutory rubric of 1552 has been altered, and differs from the proviso, on which it depended for any validity it might possess, in five points. (a) It followed the 1552 rubric in saying, "The Minister shall use," whereas the proviso might equally well refer to the Churchwardens.

#### 7. Rubric as printed in 1559.

<sup>1</sup> See Micklethwaite, *Ornaments of the Rubric*, and Maccoll *R. Comm. and the OR*, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> The tendency to read "until" as "unless" is no doubt due to the terms of the printed rubric of 1559, where, however, though the "until" sentence is omitted, there is an explicit reference to the Act; and the presence of this may account for the curious fact that the rubric was left in the PB, though the overt prescription in it was universally disregarded.

(b) It specified "ministration," and (c) noted the times ("at the time of the Communion, and at all other times"), and (d) the place ("in the Church") of such ministration. (e) The ornaments were noted as such "were in use" at the specified date, ct. 8° above.

Its terms, that is to say, require sense (a) under 7° above, and negative both the other alternative meanings of "use." Even if they were correct that "the Rubric, whatever its origin, is the only *expositio contemporanea* of the proviso" (*OCM*, p. 66), that would not be decisive. But it does not stand alone, and from its unauthoritative character cannot rightly override all other evidence, of which there is no lack.

1° "On Easter Day (March 26) her Maj. appeared in chapel, where Mass was sung in Eng. according to the use of her brother, K. Edward," and the celebrant according to the rubric of the Second PB did not "wear anything but the mere surplice" (*Venetian S.P.*, 757).

2° On April 30, two days after the Act was passed, Sandys (afterwards Abp. of York) wrote to Parker, referring with verbal inexactness to the proviso; but, as he was then in touch with Cecil, and shortly after became a Royal Visitor to enforce the Act, he is not likely to have been wrong about the *purport* of it. His interpretation—his word "gloss" means no more—"is that we [clergy] shall not be forced to use them, but that others [e.g., churchwardens] in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen" (Parker, *Corr.*, p. 65).

3° On June 13 Cecil wrote (*S.P. Eliz.*, Foreign, p. 313) that the Injns. were "already framed for general Visitation" (see further § 6, 14°). A more authoritative *expositio contemporanea* can hardly be imagined. (1) The Injns. had to be subscribed by all the clergy along with the PB, and were regularly enforced by the bps. on pain of deprivation right through Eliz.'s reign. They are grouped (*OCM*, p. 66) with the "Interpretations" of 1561 (p. 68) as being merely "more or less formal documents making a claim to some sort of authority." But the three MS. variants of the latter in the Petyt collection are but unpublished, unauthorised, and anonymous drafts. (2) The reference of Injn. 30 [text in *RITUAL LAW*, § 9 n<sup>1</sup>] to ministerial vesture can scarcely be seriously doubted. But a tradition based on incomplete quotations has favoured a "general view" (*OCM*, p. 67), which is hardly tenable. (a) The words "both in the Ch. and without" are categorical. (b) The definition "such seemly habits, garments, and square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of K. Ed. VI" is unequivocal. "Orderly" implies conformity to the current regulations. The "latter year" (*i.e.*, 1553) was the one year in which the new usage as to ministerial dress ("a surplice only" "at the time of the Communion, etc.") was in sole force. The mention of this year had no special relevance for outdoor dress. That "there is no mention of the surplice by name" (*OCM*, p. 67) is true; but the OR. of 1662 names no vestures, and the argument tells both ways. Further, the form of reference was obviously politic, as conciliating the Marian exiles, just as 1 Mary, stat. 2, c. 2, in an equally politic manner, only required "all such divine service and administration of sacr. as were most commonly used in the realm of Eng. in the last year of the reign of our late sovereign lord, K. H. 8." (c) The words immediately following, "not thereby meaning to

attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments" (*OCM* "garment"), can only be an apology for the surplice, already under Ed. 6 much protested against. (d) The uniform reliance on the Injns. for enforcing the surplice by Elizabethan bps.<sup>1</sup> seems a complete proof.

4° At the R. Visitation, which got to work in Aug., 1559, the rule of the surplice only was administered everywhere, except that in certain "great churches" the "order taken" permitted the retention and use of the cope.

5° Even in the Q.'s chapel the rule of 1549 was never carried out, though there was adopted, no doubt by her orders, in the autumn of 1559, a novel usage, neither prescribed nor allowed by any rubric, viz., the wearing of three copes at HC (cp. end of first par. of § 5 above, and n. there).

6° The preceding rubric about chancels was also modified without statutory authority (for text and variant see *RITUAL*, § 24, D<sup>2</sup>), but the visitation arts. of the Ordinaries, which embody the wording of 1552, prove that this modification also was not regarded as having any force of law.<sup>2</sup>

In any case there is a contradiction to be explained between the printed rubric and the

authoritative action taken by Injn. 30 and the R. Vis., together with the immediate disuse of vestments which is now generally admitted to have taken place. And the only point seriously in doubt, apart from questions of legal validity, is, whether the proviso is, or is not, consentient with the rubric. If it is so, the Act orders what was immediately and unhesitatingly prohibited; if it is not, the anonymous rubric stands as the sole exception in a chain of harmonious data.

Either view can find explanation in considerations of policy. The Q. and the Government had to consider, both the feelings and wishes of the Marian clergy, who had to be conciliated if possible, and the judgment of foreign courts alike on general grounds and with a view to a possible Royal marriage. Some means of masking the suddenness and completeness of the changes made must be found. And it matters little to the argument which of the two alternative solutions be adopted. All that is claimed here is that the conclusion, that the sanction of the ritual use of vestments was not in the proviso but in the printed rubric, fits best the whole of the facts. On this view a period of grace was, by the politic administrative act of modifying the terms of the rubrics in the printed PBs, interposed between enactment and enforcement. The two altered rubrics (1) allowed MEP to be said by the min. facing E. in his "return stall" ("the accustomed place"), and (2) let him at HC go on wearing albe and chasuble, the two principal items in the mediæval Euch. dress.

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Guest of Rochester, quoted *OCM*, p. 68, as if acting upon the *Interpretations* (which required the cope alone at HC), asks on the contrary (June 28, 1565) in art. 13, "whether ye know any priest or minister that useth not in the Ch. and abroad the apparel that is appointed him by the Q. Maj.'s Injns.," and in art. 28 about "the ministration of the HC," "whether they use such decent apparel at the same ministration as they are appointed by the Q.'s Maj.'s Injns." (*Rochester Register*, fol. 98). Nine other vouchers are given in *CAT*, 395 a-c; cp. also Tomlinson, *PBAH*, c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> For refs. see Tomlinson, *Hist. Grounds of the Lambeth Judgment* (6), pp. 23 f.

But, if this view be rejected, as hitherto it has been generally,<sup>1</sup> then it is claimed that the only satisfactory solution of the problem that has yet been offered is that the policy of temporary postponement was the policy of the Act, and that "other order" was taken as soon as it was possible to do so safely and effectively, *i.e.*, by the imposition and enforcement of the Injns. at the R. Vis. of August, 1559 (see this alternative discussed under RITUAL LAW, §§ 8-14). In *either* case the rubric of 1552 was fully operative as to its positive requirement ("The Min. at the time of the Communion . . . shall use . . . a surplice") after the Visitation.

(The historical survey, broken off in § 6, can now be resumed.) 1559, June 24. The PB came into force, with the rubric discussed above; and on the same day the Commission was issued with the

**0. Survey:** Injns. annexed, under which in Aug. 1559-1682. and thereafter vestments were

systematically put away (RITUAL LAW, § 12). 1560. "Some ordinary at his visitation" asked "whether any . . . vestments *not allowed by law* be reserved of any man, or in any place, or no." (Strype, *Ann.* i. 1 245, 2 497). Also Becon's *Catechism* claims that "a magistrate (may) command that the min. in the time of his administration wears a surplice." He would certainly not have defended the allowance of the vestments.

1561.<sup>2</sup> Bp. Parkhurst of Norwich repeated the inquiry noted under 1560, and Abp. Parker (Strype's *Parker* 1 146) asked if "the sacraments (be) ministered in manner and form *prescribed by the Q.'s Maj.'s Injns.*"

1562, Feb. 7. Jewel writes desiring even to get rid of the surplice (*Z.L.* 1 100); Bp. Alley of Exeter reports a Puritan as preaching "against surplices, rochets, tippetts, and caps." Not a word is said of the more obnoxious vestments.

1563, July. The 2nd bk. of Homilies speaks of "this costly and manifold furniture of vestments of late used in the ch.," whereas "the vestures used in the ch. in old time were very plain and single and nothing costly."

1564, Jan. 2. A min. loses his benefice for "refusing to conform to the order of the Ch. service by wearing a surplice at the administration of the Sacr.," though such use was illegal on the *primâ facie* view. (Taylor, *Annals of St. Mary Overy*, pp. 126 f.). Mar. 24. Earl's *Diary* (f. 3a) reports an order for "the surplice at all services." Earl also records that before Parker and Grindal at a Court of the Eccles. Commission the ministers of London were thus admonished: "The Council's pleasure is that strictly ye keep the unity of apparel like to this man here, Mr. Robert Cole, as ye see him. A square cap four-cornered, a scholar's gown priestly, a tippet and in the Ch. the *linen surplice*, and strictly keep the rubric of the book of our common prs. of Eng. and the Q.'s Maj. her Injns." (Note that the 1559 rubric, by its closing words referred to the statute, and so contained the ground for its own modification by the Injns. But "the rubric" is prob. a generic term for the whole body of rubrics, as in Sharp *On the Rubric.*)

<sup>1</sup> The decisive ground of rejection has been that, if no *ritual* use were intended, there was no reason for limiting the ornaments to those of the First PB. A rebutting argument, that Parl. would not brook even temporary exemption from confiscation for ornaments not sanctioned by a Reformation Parl., has not convinced many, but is deserving of consideration.

<sup>2</sup> The *Interpretations*, which contain a clause prescribing the cope (apparently by itself) at HC, are not noted above, because there is no real evidence that they were ever published, enforced or obeyed by anyone.

1565-6. The Queen's letter of Jan. 25, 1565, and the Advts. which gave effect to it on their promulgation, April 4, 1566, are fully discussed under RITUAL LAW, §§ 18-28, where the conclusion is reached that the vestiarial clauses of the Advts. in regard to the surplice satisfy all requirements as a taking of other order under s. 25, while the provisions as to three copes in great churches were—if not *ultra vires* as contravening s. 3—an "ordaining and publishing of further ceremonies" under s. 26. Much fresh evidence, however, confirms the judgment expressed above, that "the surplice" had been legally made the only legitimate ministerial vesture. The abp.'s report to Cecil on "Varieties in the Services" (Feb. 28, 1565) noted no cases of using alb or chasuble at HC, but stated, "some with surplice and *cofes* [*i.e.*, in imitation of the Q.'s chapel and in anticipation of Advts. and Canons], some with surplice alone, some with none" (reprinted in *R. Com. on Eccles. Disc.* 4 49). July 17 Bp. Horn of Durham, a R. Commissioner and Visitor, wrote that "though the rest of the dress [of Popery] had been taken away (*sublata reliqua faece*), the wearing of square caps and surplices was continued to the clergy, though without any superstitious conceit, which was expressly guarded against by the terms of the Act" (*Z.L.* 1 142). The reference is to Injn. 30, which the bp. thus identifies with the Act. So Gualter refers to "the Q.'s Maj.'s ordinance for the wearing of the surplice and priest's cap" (Lansd. MSS. 9, art. 1). See *CAT.* 381 20-22 for 7 other vouchers from this year.

1566, Mar. 26 (a week before promulgation of the Advts.). The London ministers were brought "before the Abp. of Cant. and other of the [Privy] Council, where charge was given them to serve their Churches and wear their apparel according to the Q.'s Injns. or else to do no service" (Gairdner, *Three 15th cent. Chronicles*, p. 135).

1604. Nearly 40 yrs. can now be passed over, not for lack of evidence, but because it adds nothing fresh to the tale. The PB was reissued by Jas. 1, with alterations the validity of which has been usually denied. They did not concern the OR. In the same year the canons endorsed the prescriptions of the Advts. (see RITUAL LAW, § 32), and asserted their harmony with the PB by requiring no variation from the latter.

1627. Bp. Cosin (then only archdeacon) asked, "Doth he [the min.] when any sacr. is to be administered . . . wear the surplice?"

1628. Laud in his Vis. arts. asked: "Whether doth your min. wear the surplice, while he is saying the public prs., and administering the Sacrament"; and again "Whether there be in your parish who are known or suspected to keep hid in their homes any Mass books, Breviaries, or other books of Popery or superstition, or any chalices, copes, vestments, albs, or other ornaments of superstition uncancelled or undefaced, which it is to be conjectured they keep for a day, as they call it" (*Rit. Com.* 2 575).

1641. Bp. Wren of Ely reported to Parl. that "these Injns. are allowed and confirmed by the Q.'s own Advts., cap. 1, art. 3, and those Advts. are authorised by law, 1 Eliz., c. 2, *sect. penult.*" (*Parentalia*, p. 75).

1643. Episcopacy was abolished by the Long Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the "rusticall" terms reported by the Puritan author of *An Answer for the Times* from "the talk of the rude people": "Neighbour, played we not a wise part, when we kept our Mass-clothes and books, for by the Mass, neighbour, we shall have all again one day." Cp. similarly the account in Strype (*Parker*, 1 399) of the destruction or defacement in 1572 of "vestments, albes, tunicles, stoles, maniples, etc.," kept by Dr. Caius, and described as "Popish trumpery which he might think would come in play again."

1645. The PB was suppressed and its use in public or in private made a penal offence.

1660. The bps. and clergy were reinstated, and the PB restored as a matter of course, its illegal suppression not having affected the validity of the Act of Uniformity. The prescription by the canon of the surplice at all services was universally obeyed by conformist clergy.

1661. At the Savoy Conference, among a long list of objections, many of them frivolous, there was a complaint that the printed OR. of 1559 "seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, and other vestments." The bps. in their reply ignore this point as unworthy of notice, declaring that they "think it fit that the rubric continue as it is,"<sup>1</sup> and refer to their full treatment of the main objection that "the surplice" was enforced (pronouncing "no habit more suitable than white linen"), for that had been the main bone of contention in the century-long vestiarian controversy.

1661, Nov. Revision of the PB was formally begun in the Convs., on the basis of a draft prepared by a committee of bps. and divines, whose work is represented by Cosin's *Durham Book*, a copy of a 1619 book, altered in the handwriting of Cosin and Sancroft, as secretaries.

1662. The PB was passed by Parl. as received from the Convs. with the OR. as we now have it (RITUAL, § 24, D<sup>3</sup>).

Our survey may be summed up in the statement that from the time of the R. Vis. in the summer and autumn of 1559 down to 1662, when the present OR. was accepted by Convs. and Parl., no one wore a chasuble, no one ordered vestments to be worn, no bp. or conformist divine, neither Parker, Andrewes, nor Laud, hinted or suggested that they could be legally worn, much less that a white alb plain, with a cope or chasuble, was the only authorised vesture at HC.<sup>2</sup> The explanation suggested above of this state of things is that an unbroken series of authoritative acts had excluded alb and chasuble from the category of legal vestures, and had left the surplice, with the additions sanctioned by the canons, as the sole legitimate vesture of the clergy "at all times of their ministrations."<sup>3</sup> The importance of this conclusion lies here. If the 1662 Act and annexed Book *unmistakably* required the vestments, all previous law and history would become

#### 10. The Position in 1662.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps they did not wish by alteration to give countenance to the allegations of some Puritans (cp. RITUAL LAW § 28, objection 10) that the current practice was not in accord with the rubric. On similar grounds Pope Leo 13 argued recently that Ang. Orders were invalid because the alterations in the 1662 Ord. were a confession that the Edwardian Ord. was insufficient. But the revisers of 1661 *did* alter the rubric after all, see § 12, 1<sup>o</sup> below.

<sup>2</sup> Cosin's notes, on which much stress has been laid by many writers, are no exception, for he never published them, and his official action (see above under 1627) is inconsistent with those notes which seem to accept the legality of vestments. Further, (1) the notes are full of inaccuracies, (2) in a later note he acknowledges himself mistaken on this point, "But the Act of Parl., I see, refers to the canon, and until such time as other order shall be taken" (OCM, p. 88). The notes ascribed to Bp. Overall are not his.

<sup>3</sup> The alternative explanation, that the action of R. Visitors, Bps., Commissioners, and Council, was an illegal modification of the law, is stated and discussed in regard to the first crucial epoch (1559) under RITUAL LAW, § 13 f., and in regard to the second (1566) in §§ 23-28 (cp. § 29 f., and the theory of the surplice as a *minimum*).

practically irrelevant. But if, as will appear, these documents admit, not to say require, a different interpretation, then it may be possible to settle the meaning by noting the intention.

The first fact is the constantly ignored insertion of the Act 1 Eliz., c. 2, as No. 1 of the contents of the PB. The substitution of a new book<sup>1</sup> did not affect the operation of ss. 25 f. This proviso, it was ruled in the Ridsdale Judgment (CAT 110 25), still constituted "the law authoritatively governing the matter," and the new Rubric was, like the old, "a memorandum or note of reference to that law." Apart from the high legal authority of the great judges concerned in this conclusion, the cogency of it is apparent even to non-legal minds, when once the significance is grasped of the re-enactment of Eliz.'s Act, not by mere reference but by incorporating it in *extenso* in the forefront of the PB, and with ratification by Ch. as well as State. Moreover, this ruling is on a point of law, not of doctrine or ritual, and no "new light" can alter the legal question. In the same way the ruling, that the double proviso carries with it the order or orders to which it had looked forward, and to which it gave operative force and statutory validity, is simply common sense. This interpretation is borne out by Pref.<sup>1</sup> which refers to "the laws of the land, and those laws never yet repealed."

Turning next to the rubric, a careful examination will be needed to establish its conformity to previous law and usage. If the Act settles the matter, it must override the rubric. But if the OR., properly interpreted, agrees with the Act, that will be an additional confirmation of the view taken.

1<sup>o</sup> The Revisers did not adopt the attitude of the Savoy conferrers, but altered the rubric. That any alteration would introduce an "occasion of cavil" is excluded by Pref.<sup>1</sup> (RITUAL, § 17, B1<sup>4</sup>), and Lord Clarendon tells us that "the bps. spent the vacation [i.e., the summer of 1661] in making such alterations in the BCP as would make it *more grateful* to the dissenting brethren."<sup>2</sup>

2<sup>o</sup> As if to show that the OR. depended on the 1559 Act, inserted a few pp. earlier, they introduced "the words of the Act itself," as Sancroft noted on the original draft in the *Durham Book*, but (a) having incorporated the Act already, they naturally dispensed with the reference to it in the rubric they were amending, and (b) they "stopped short of the reference to the taking of other order," not, as suggested (OCM, pp. 88 f.), so as "to exclude any reference to the Advts. as authoritative in the future,"

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting, as bearing on the question of interpretation, that on June 25, 1661, the House of Commons ordered "to make search whether the original book of the Liturgy annexed to the Act passed in the 5th and 6th yrs. of K. Ed. 6 be yet extant"; i.e., the intention was to disregard the Elizabethan and Jacobean books altogether, and to go back to the 1552 PB.

<sup>2</sup> There were, of course, changes in an opposite direction (e.g., "sanctify this water"), and it has been claimed (cp. HISTORY OF THE PB, § 20) that the balance of change is on that side; but no change comparable to the legalising of the Euch. vestments can be noted.

#### 11. The 1559 Act Reaffirmed by Ch. and State.

but simply because in 1662 the order was regarded as taken and the law settled.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>3</sup> They replaced the words "at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministrations" which might imply a difference of use, by the phrase "at all times of their ministrations," the meaning of which is settled by their own (the revisers') *Vis. arts.*, Cosin, *e.g.*, asking in 1662, "Have you a large and decent surplice for the minister to wear at all times of his ministrations in the ch.?" This *expositio contemporanea* seems to rule out the otherwise tenable grammatical construction of the phrase in the rubric ("at all times") as equivalent to "at the several times."

<sup>4</sup> Instead of repeating the direction "the Minister shall use" (which might have "seemed to bring back the alb, etc."), they borrowed from the Act the wording "shall be retained and be in use."<sup>2</sup> In the Act of 1559 these words were qualified by the condition "until other order, etc." By the order or orders thereafter taken the alb and chasuble had been put away, and the cope banished from parish churches, and the resulting law<sup>3</sup> was as was most recently expressed in the canons. On the Restoration in 1660 the surplice, the only ornament of the minister prescribed in 1549 and still "retained" by law,<sup>4</sup> was reintroduced as usage in the churches, and with it the Ornaments of the Ch. which the First PB had prescribed. The OR. does no more than order that *these* "ornaments of the Ch., and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use." What was called the "*prima facie*" view (in § 1 above) interprets "retained" as if it were "re-introduced."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> By adopting the words of the Act the Revisers were able to make clear the distinction between "the Ornaments of the Ch." and those of "the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministrations." This had been obscured by the 1559 OR. And this combination of the two sets of ornaments supplies the reason for the continued reference, which has misled so many, to the usage of the First PB. That was still one of the criteria for the legality of ornaments of the Church. Moreover, as noted under 4°, the surplice was an ornament of that book, and the OR. was simply a direction to read "Certain Notes" (RITUAL, § 24, D<sup>3</sup>, n. 3) as controlling the Mins. "at all times of their ministrations," instead of for the specified offices only. Thus also the frequent contemporary allusions to the "Certain Notes" (as if no other direction in the 1549 PB mattered) are both accounted for and justified.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the quotation from Bp. Wren, a leading Reviser and High Churchman, in § 9 under date 1641.

<sup>2</sup> No one doubts that "use" in 1662 meant "ministerial use."

<sup>3</sup> This paragraph, it is proper to note, loses some of its force if the alternative of § 20 n.<sup>8</sup> is adopted.

<sup>4</sup> To a plea on behalf of "those two things that remain" (*i.e.*, the cope in cath. chs. at HC and the surplice everywhere, according to the then recent Advt.), the early Puritan "Answer" replied (*An. Answer for the Time*, p. 103). "It grieveth you to hear the rest of the popish apparel that is abolished rehearsed" [see quotations under RITUAL LAW, § 28 (10) b and n. there] "with that which is retained. But, as God by His magistrates had delivered us from those, so we trust He will deliver His Ch. from these" (*i.e.*, cope and surplice).

The most natural interpretation of "retained" is "retained in use." But it might mean—if the evidence pointed that way—"retained in law," with the right of re-introduction in use. And the double phrase, "retained and be in use," might have been taken in this sense by the Revisers. The decision will then turn on the question whether, in view of the evidence marshalled above and under RITUAL LAW, the appearance of illegality attaching to the vestments from 1559 onwards can be brought under the proverbial rule that "appearances are deceitful." See § 13 (i).

<sup>6</sup> That the Revisers did not make their meaning still plainer is easily explained by the historical situation. They never dreamed that the revival of the discarded vestments would ever become a practical question, and they followed a natural

It has now been shown that the OR. admits, if it does not require, a meaning in harmony with the canons. It must now be pointed out (1) that no evidence has been produced to show that any single Reviser desired to change the law, or expressed the belief that it already legalised vestments. On the other hand, Bp. Wren, chairman of the revision committee, wrote in 1660 in relation to the First PB as enacted by the 1549 Act that "there is somewhat in that Act that now may not be used," and declared that "to preserve those that are still in use, it would be set down in express words" (cp. under 1641 above).<sup>1</sup> (2) Our examination has shown that the alterations in wording, to say the least, do not require us to suppose that they were alterations in the law; and (3) there is no evidence that anyone alive at the time hinted or suggested that such a change had taken place. The changes in the rubric are not named in the list of principal alterations, and they passed Conv. at a session which reviewed so many pages that these could not have excited discussion. In Parl., moreover, on a proposal to dispense from the use of the surplice and the Cross in Bapt., the spokesman of the Commons explained their rejection of it by saying "that he thought it better to impose no ceremonies than to dispense with any, and he thought it incongruous, at the same time when you are settling Uniformity, to establish Schism" (J. H. Parker, *Introd.*, pp. 476, 482).

It so happens that *Vis. arts.* dating from 1662 or a year or two later have been preserved from every diocese except Bangor. Not only do all the ordinaries agree in requiring the surplice at all ministrations, but 25 of them expressly refer to the Canons of 1604 as of full obligation, while the rest by their references to hood and tippet or scarf, imply the same.

It was not till nearly fifty years later that the (at that time) novel interpretation of the

legality of vestments was set forth by John Johnson in a 3rd and revised ed. of his *Clergyman's Vade Mecum* (1709), Nicholl at the same

time printing Cosin's early Notes, without his correction. A long line of legal and liturgical writers took the same line, and a new tradition gradually established itself.<sup>2</sup> And in 1858,

impulse to make as slight changes as possible under pressure of opposition. Hence, instead of drafting a new rubric, they simply made a mosaic of old phrases, full of latent ambiguities unless resolutely taken together and illuminated by history.

<sup>1</sup> Frere gives no authority for his statement that "the more learned of the liturgical scholars seem to have become aware that the rubric [of 1559] authorised the alternative use of the vestment" (*Lit. Ref.*, p. 123). Bp. Wren, called by Lord Clarendon "very learned and particularly versed in the old liturgies of the Greek and Latin Chs.," and one who had suffered imprisonment by the Puritans for his ceremonial usages, was under no such illusion, we have seen, and Cosin had found out his early mistake (§ 10 n.).

<sup>2</sup> Nicholl (*Comm. on BCP*, 1710), Wheatley (*On BCP*, 1710), Bp. Gibson (*Codex*, 1713), and Burn (*Eccles. Law*, 1809) may be named, and, among writers on the Low Ch. side who took the same view, A. J. Stephens (*BCP with Notes*, 1849), Dean Goode (*Aids*, 1851), and Dr. Vogan. On the other hand, what may be called the "Wren" view was maintained by Sharp (*On the Rubric*, 1753), Bp. Madox in 1733 (quoted by Soames, *Eccles. History*, 1839), K. P. Blakeney (*BCP*, 1870), and others, Soames and Wheatley Balme (*The Ch. and the OR.*, 1883) being High Churchmen.

### 13. Other Indications.

acting on a natural mis-reading of an *obiter dictum* in the Westerton Judgment,<sup>1</sup> the systematic revival of vestments began. The movement can be followed in the *Report of the R. Com. on Eccl. Disc.*, pp. 54 ff., *Hist. Survey*.

In view of the long continuance of vestments in many chs., many, especially among the clergy, have favoured the legalising of an alternative use.<sup>2</sup> And in response to the Letters of Business inviting the Convs. to consider the propriety of forming a new Rubric, tentative proposals have been approved, leaving the OR. unaltered, but sanctioning either interpretation in practice, subject to episcopal control or other safeguards. The York Upper House have suggested as a compromise the permission of a white vestment, one of their number preferring that a licence for the use of vestments should be issued to selected churches. See ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER; RITUAL (VII ORNAMENTS); *Reports of Rit. Com.* (1867, etc.), and *R. Com. on Eccl. Disc.* (1906); *Report of a Sub-Committee of the Cant. Upper House of Conv.*, *The Orn. of the Ch. and of the Min.*, 1908 (cited as *OCM*); Tomlinson, *PB, Arts. and Homs.*, 1897 (cited as *PBAH*), and various tracts; Frere, *Religious Ceremonial*; and the reports of cases cited in Table II at end of RITUAL LAW. Cp. also F. Warre Cornish, *Eng. Ch. in the 19th Cent.*, 1910, 2 153; *Enc Brit.*<sup>11</sup> art. Vestments; Frere on OR. in *DECH*, 1912. For refs. to the older literature, see § 14 n. 2.—R3; G. HARFORD.<sup>3 4</sup>

**ORTHODOX.**—This is the title assumed by the Eastern Church, and reflects its somewhat stereotyped adhesion to the dogmatic formulations of the great conciliar age of doctrine. But it is commonly used to describe those who hold the Nicene Creed. It has also a looser sense, which is hardly caricatured by the old epigram: "Orthodoxy is my 'doxy'; heterodoxy is the other man's 'doxy'." Religious circles which keep to themselves are always liable to be afflicted with a nervously narrow conception of orthodoxy.—U.

G. HARFORD.

**PAINTING.**—Before the era of whitewash, our churches were a blaze of colour. Walls,

<sup>1</sup> See above, § 2 n.

<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, some who wear vestments, or accept *con amore* the view of their legality, have argued against the recognition of an alternative use on the ground that this would be a new departure, because, on their view, the Euch. vestments are already *ordered* exclusively. But the cope is not an Euch. vesture, and yet it was an equally lawful alternative under the 1549 PB, unless we adopt the scarcely tenable theory mentioned above in § 3 under 1549, n.

<sup>3</sup> Canon Grensted who, with a wide and accurate knowledge of the literature takes the same general view of the OR. as is argued in this art., has read both this art. and RITUAL LAW in proof, and both are indebted to his suggestions for substantial and verbal improvements. In view, moreover, of the difficulty of avoiding prejudice in this connection, it may be added that the present writer from 1889 to 1899 believed in the legality of vestments, and upon occasion wore them. The discovery and observation of data, unknown or unnoticed by him before, seemed to make it a duty to present these with some fulness to others. G. H.

<sup>4</sup> [We desire to state that we are unable to follow the writer of the previous art. in his construction of the legal and historical problems involved, and in particular we are not satisfied with the view taken as to the validity of the 30th Injn. of 1559. M. S.; J. W. T.]

tombs, stonework, were all painted. There is not a single Pre-Reformation church in England which was not adorned with painted

### 1. The Art in Early and Mediaeval Times.

decorations, and it is a melancholy fact that so much of this art has perished, or been wantonly destroyed. In the whole of the country there are few of the old edifices which contain any traces of the numerous quaint designs and figures painted on the inner surfaces of their walls during the mediæval period. Several means were employed. Sometimes *Fresco* was used, by means of which pictures were produced upon walls covered with plaster, while the plaster was wet. *Wall P.* was employed when the plaster was dry. The distinction between *Fresco* and *Wall P.* is frequently forgotten. Most of the early specimens of this art are monochromes, but subsequently the painters used polychrome, introducing various hues. The vaulted ceilings, timber roof, screens and canopies, monuments with their effigies, as well as the surface of the walls, were often coloured with diaper-work. Colour and gilding were marked features in all mediæval buildings, and even richly carved fonts and sculptured monuments were embellished by this method of decoration. Beneath coats of white-wash many still remain to be uncovered. Some of the Ps. fade rapidly when exposed to the air, but means have been devised for their preservation.<sup>1</sup>

The practice of P. churches is very ancient. St. Wilfrid used it. Figures of saints at St. Mary's,

### 2. Brief Historical Sketch.

Guilford, are probably Saxon work, and traces of early colouring can be found at St. Nicholas', Ipswich, at Britford, and at St. Martin's, Canterbury. There are numerous examples of Norman painting, and sometimes early specimens of the art have been painted over in later Gothic times. At the Church of St. Lawrence, Reading, no less than five distinct series of Ps. were discovered, executed one over another. The cathedral of St. Albans contains some of the best Norman Ps. The favourite subjects were the Agnus Dei, scenes from the life of our Lord, the Apostles, the Last Judgment, St. George, St. Nicholas, St. John writing the Apocalypse, St. Michael weighing souls, and the torments of the lost. Great progress was made in the art in the 13th cent. Travelling monks roamed the country and left behind them in many a village church traces of their skill in P. The murder of St. Thomas of Canterbury became a favourite subject, and also the lives of St. Catharine, St. Nicholas, St. Margaret, St. Edmund, the Seven Acts of Mercy, and the Wheel of Fortune. The early English artists carefully prepared the surface of the walls for their work, a practice neglected by their successors; hence their Ps. have lasted well, whereas those of the 14th cent. have often crumbled away. It would require too long a space to trace the development and decline of the art. We may notice the gradual increase in the number of the Ps. of the Coronation of the Virgin, and of the increased veneration for St. Christopher and St. George. The former is depicted almost life-size, and usually appears opposite the principal

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *List of Buildings having Mural Decorations*, by C. E. Keyser, Science and Art Dept., South Kensington Museum, p. xcii.