

# GENERAL APPENDIX.

## I.

### THE "STATE SERVICES."

UNTIL the year 1859 modern editions of the Book of Common Prayer contained four services for special days of the year, which were commonly called "State Services," because they commemorated certain public events connected with the political history of the country, and because the use of them was enjoined by the State alone rather than by the Church and State together. These formed no part of the book put forth by authority of Crown, Convocation, and the Houses of Lords and Commons in 1661, and therefore no part of the book alone sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity.<sup>1</sup> The authority for the three which have been discontinued was of a mixed character, partly civil and partly ecclesiastical; the authority for that which is still enjoined by the State is to this day solely that of the State, and of one branch of the State alone. In giving a short summary of the history and obligation of the several Forms, it will be convenient to mention the particulars of each case separately.

#### § *The Form of Prayer for the Fifth of November.*

The Act of Parliament 3 Jac. I. c. 1, provided for the annual observance of this day in commemoration of the discovery of the Powder Plot, and ordered that all ministers in every Cathedral and Parish Church should say Morning Prayer, and "give thanks to Almighty God for this most happy deliverance," and that all "persons inhabiting within this realm of England and dominions of the same" should resort to some Church and be present during such service. No particular form, however, was prescribed, and none was prepared by Convocation; but a form drawn up by the Bishops was issued by royal authority in 1606. In April 1662 this form was revised by Bishop Cosin, and adopted by Convocation on the 26th of that month, together with those for January 30, and May 29, and was attached to the Prayer Book by virtue of a Royal Proclamation, enjoining the use of all the three, of May 2, 1662. The form remained unaltered until the accession of William III., when, as he happened to have landed in England upon that day, and was regarded as the means of a similar deliverance to that then commemorated, various interpolations relating to his accession, as well as some alterations (e.g. the substitution of Luke ix. 51-57 as the Gospel, instead of Matt. xxvii. 1-10, the account of Judas's betrayal of his Master, "which for some good reasons, I suppose, says Wheatley, significantly, "was then thought proper to be discontinued") were made by Bishops Patrick and Sprat without the sanction of either Convocation or Parliament. This service was then re-issued by Proclamation of October 18, 1690, and was the form which continued to be enjoined until its recent removal.

<sup>1</sup> The following is found in manuscript at the end of the MS., and of the corrected folio of 1626, preserved in the House of Lords Library [see page 83], and in the Sealed Books, but it is not found in the MS. of the Prayer Book which is preserved at Dublin:—

"The Formes of Prayer for the V of November the XXX of January, & for the XXIX of May are to be printed at the end of this Book."

It may be safely asserted that the forms themselves were not in existence when this note was written in the place of them, and thus that they did not receive the sanction of Convocation, the Crown, and Parliament when the Prayer Book itself did. They were evidently, however, in course of preparation or revision at this time, and that they came into use at an early date subsequently is shewn by the fact that inquiries respecting the use of them are found in Visitation Articles of 1662.

The history of the State Services themselves is fully given, from the two opposite points of view, in Rev. A. P. Percival's *Original Services for the State Holidays*, Lond. 1838, in which the original and altered forms are exhibited in parallel columns, and in a pamphlet by Rev. T. Lathbury, *The Authority of the Services* . . . . considered, Lond. 1843.

#### § *The Form of Prayer for the Thirtieth of January.*

This day was appointed to be observed "as an anniversary day of fasting and humiliation, to implore the mercy of God," by Act of Parliament, 12 Car. II. c. 30. The form of Prayer was prepared by a Committee of Convocation appointed May 16, 1661, which consisted of Bishops Warner of Rochester, King of Chichester, Morley of Worcester, and Reynolds of Norwich, together with eight representatives of the Lower House; it was approved April 26, 1662, and enjoined, with the preceding service, by Proclamation of May 2, 1662.<sup>2</sup> Upon the accession of James II., however, certain alterations were made by royal authority alone, which were not improvements, intensifying in some degree the tone and language of the earlier service, and especially enlarging the Introductory Hymn by the addition of various passages of Holy Scripture prophetic of our Blessed Lord's Sufferings and Death. This form (the order for the use of which was dated December 23, 1685) was not altered during the reign of William III., and was the one which remained in use subsequently.

No public performances in theatres or concert-rooms were permitted on this day until 1808, when a concert was given at the Haymarket without interference from the authorities. An oratorio followed in 1809, and the old custom was then abandoned. [See PARKE'S *Musical Memoirs*, ii. 32, 1830.]

#### § *The Form of Prayer for the Twenty-ninth of May.*

The Act 12 Car. II. c. 14, appointed May 29 to be observed with public thanksgivings for a double reason, as being the birthday of Charles II. as well as the day of his Restoration. The service was prepared, as in the preceding case, by a committee of Convocation, consisting of Bishops Wren of Ely, Skinner of Oxford, Laney of Peterborough, and Henchman of Sarum, together with eight members of the Lower House; its approval by the two Houses and issue under the authority of the Crown were simultaneous with those of the form for January 30. Since, however, various portions herein referred to the birth of Charles II., the use of which after his death would have been out of place, the form was revised upon the accession of James, who upon its republication issued an order for its observance, dated April 29, 1685, which mentioned the reason for its alteration, and stated that it was "now, by our special command to the Bishops, altered and settled to our satisfaction." From this time the form continued without any further change.

<sup>2</sup> It has not, we believe, been previously distinctly noticed that two editions and versions of a form were issued "by His Majesty's direction," before that which was prepared by Convocation. One of these appeared in 1661, in which the Introductory Hymn was longer than that in the subsequent service, some of the proper Psalms different, and a very long prayer, full of the strongest expressions, occupied the place of the first Collect, which, together with some portions of the other Prayers, was taken from *Private forms of prayer, fitted for the late sad times; particularly a form of prayer for the thirtieth of January*, a book in which Bishop Brian Duppa had a share, printed at London in 1660. By a singular oversight, the Collect for the Royal Family was copied without alteration from a Prayer Book of the reign of Charles I.; and consequently petitions were offered in it for "Queen Mary, Prince Charles, and the rest of the royal progeny," when that Prince had become the reigning monarch. A second edition, corrected in this respect, appeared, with a proclamation for its use, dated January 7, 1662; it was somewhat curtailed, but was still longer than the form finally adopted by Convocation. Burnet says that Sancroft drew for the three days "some Offices of a very high strain. Yet others of a more moderate strain were preferred to them. But he, coming to be advanced to the See of Canterbury, got his Offices to be published by the King's authority." [Own Times, i. 333.] Probably these were the alterations introduced on James's accession.

§ *The Form of Prayer for the Accession of the Sovereign.*

This is the only one for which there was never any degree of parliamentary authority, formerly or at present. The other services, although not specially prescribed, were recognized by the enactments which ordered that their several days should be observed with particular thanksgivings; but even this modified authority is wanting to the service for the Accession. In principle, however, it is the oldest of all the State Services. The first form was issued in 1578, to be used on November 17, the day of the accession of Queen Elizabeth;<sup>1</sup> but during the reign of James I. the observance of the day appears to have been laid aside, his reign being sufficiently marked by the form for November 5, and that for August 5, the day of his escape from the conspiracy of the Gowries. A form, however, was issued in 1626 for the accession of Charles I., the history of the preparation of which is not known, but which appeared only under the King's authority. Among the Canons passed by Convocation in 1640 was one which recognized this form and enjoined the observance of the day; but an Act passed in 1661 (13 Car. II. c. 12), expressly forbade the enforcement of these Canons as lacking the authority of Parliament, and the day and form alike remained unenacted, and were then disused, the King's accession being more fitly commemorated on May 29. But on the accession of James II. both were revived; a new form was prepared, which retained but one of the prayers in the previous form (that which commences, "O Lord our God, Who upholdest and governest"). It appeared with a proclamation for its use dated December 23, 1685, which sets out with stating, "Whereas not only the pious Christian emperors in ancient times, but also of late our own most religious predecessors, kings of this realm, did cause the days on which they began their several reigns to be publicly celebrated every year (so long as they reigned) by all their subjects with solemn prayers and thanksgiving to Almighty God; this pious custom received lately a long and doleful interruption upon occasion of the barbarous murder of our most dear Father of blessed memory, which changed the day on which our late most dear brother succeeded to the Crown into a day of sorrow and fasting. But now we thinking fit to revive the former laudable and religious practice, and having caused a form of prayer and thanksgiving to be composed by our Bishops for that purpose, our will and pleasure is," etc. During the reign of William III. the day and form were not observed, his accession being added to the service for November 5; but with Anne they returned into use, King James's service being revised and altered, and re-issued under the authority of a Proclamation of February 7, 1703-4.<sup>2</sup> This remains the form still enjoined for use on June 20, the anniversary of the accession of Her present Majesty, except that during the reign of George I.

<sup>1</sup> In Oxford the anniversary had been, however, previously observed in the reign of Mary as well as in that of Elizabeth. We learn from a sermon by Bishop John Howson in defence of the *Festivities of the Church of England* (4to, Oxf. 1602), that two solemn Masses were appointed in Queen Mary's days to be celebrated in St. Mary's Church on the Queen's birthday, and also on her coronation-day. And in the appendix to a sermon preached at St. Paul's, November 17, 1599, by Dr. Thomas Holland (4to, Oxf. 1601), there are some interesting particulars given as to the form adopted on Queen Elizabeth's accession-day. To the ordinary daily service was added an exposition of Scripture, "such as is fittest to persuade the auditory to due obedience to her Majesty," etc., followed by solemn prayer "made by the ministers, or set forth by publique authority," and, in some cases, "Psalmes song or sacred Antiphons, either by the whole multitude or by the Quier (as it is used in her Maiesties Chappell or in Cathedrall Churches)." And of the beginning of this custom Holland writes thus: "About the 12 years of the reigne of her Excellency was the first practice of the publique solemnization of this day, and (as farre forth as I can heare, or can by any diligent enquiry learne) the first public celebrity of it was instituted in Oxford (by D. Cooper, being then there Vicechancellor, after B. of Lincoln, and by remoue from thence B. of Winchester), from whence this institution flowed by a voluntary current over all this Realme, not without the secret motion of Gods Holy Spirit, I doubt not, and to the great comfort of all true English hearts. The continuall observation of which ceremony sithence hath not bene imposed upon the Church of England by any Ecclesiasticall decree neither prescribed by any Canon of the Church; but hath bin meere voluntarily continued by the religious and dutifull subjects of this Realme," etc.

To the first issue of the Accession Service in 1728 for 11th June, the anniversary of the accession of George I., the following rubric is prefixed:—"This day being the festival of the Apostle St. Barnabas, the proper Office for that day shall be wholly omitted, and this used instead of it; and there shall be notice thereof given publicly in the Church the Sunday before." In a copy of this form preserved in the Bodleian Library (8vo, Rawlinson, 1048) there is the following caustic MS. note by the Non-juror Thomas Hearne: "I have bought and secured this form of Prayer with Thanksgiving, because in after times perhaps it will hardly be believ'd that the office for the day of St. Barnabas the Apostle was publicly prohibited, and that orders were given that no notice should be taken of him, but that instead thereof one much inferior to an Apostle should be mentioned in his room." Hearne adds also in another note that the omission of St. Barnabas was "to the great scandal of good and honest men, who justly think it very shocking."

part of the first lesson appointed in James's book (Josh. i. 1-9) was restored in place of the lesson substituted by Queen Anne (Prov. viii. 13-36).

From this brief summary it is evident that the three earlier forms had in their original condition sufficient authority; the days were appointed by Parliament for special services, such services were prepared by Convocation, and then were ratified by the Crown. The subsequent alterations lacked both parliamentary and ecclesiastical sanction, except in so far as the former was afforded by the recognition of the days and their services through the incorporation of the whole Prayer Book Calendar in the Act for the regulation of the Calendar, 24 Geo. II. c. 23. Considerable difficulty was in consequence felt by many Clergy as to the legality of the forms, the reconcilability of their use with the terms of the Act of Uniformity, and the right of the State to impose them; added to which, the tone of portions of them jarred painfully in their bitterness and vehemence with that of the ordinary devotions of the Church. "Popish treachery," "hellish malice," "blood-thirsty enemies," and the like expressions, which were chiefly found in the form for November 5, were felt by most to be out of place in a service of solemn thanksgiving and intercession. In consequence, the observance of the several days gradually fell into comparative disuse, and was kept of late years only in Cathedrals, College Chapels, and in some (and some only) of the Churches where Daily Prayer was offered. The subject was considered in the Lower House of Convocation in 1857, and a Report from a Committee appointed to examine it (presented July 10), stated that the services as they then stood, with the alterations which had from time to time been made, rested on the sole power of the Crown. The mind of Clergy and Laity was therefore prepared to some extent for the debates in Parliament in June 1858 (in which special reference was made to the Report of Convocation) on the expediency of abolishing the observance of the three days, which resulted, in the first place, in Addresses to the Queen from both Houses, praying for the discontinuance of the Forms of Prayer. Upon these Addresses followed, on January 17, 1859, the issue of the "Warrant" by Her Majesty, which ordered that the use of these forms "be henceforth discontinued," and that they "be not henceforth printed and published with, or annexed to, the Book of Common Prayer." The repeal of the several Acts enjoining the observance of the anniversaries (including also the Act of the Parliament of Ireland, 14 & 15 Car. II. c. 23, for the observance in Ireland of the 23rd October in commemoration of the Rebellion of 1641) was then in the last place enacted by Stat. 22 Vict. c. 2, which received the Royal Assent on March 25, 1859. It is, however, a matter for regret that the history of great national mercies and sins should by this total repeal have altogether lost its public religious aspect, in connection with the teaching of the Church of the land; well would it have been if but one Collect for each day had been left by proper authority to preserve the memory and lessons of events which were of the highest national moment.

But if any doubt rested on the degree of obligation attaching to these three earlier forms, much more must it be a question how far the remaining service, that for the Accession, can still bind the Clergy to its use, when it rests simply and entirely upon the authority of Proclamation alone, without sanction from either Parliament or Convocation. Every true Christian Englishman who has a real sense of the dignity, greatness, and responsibility of the Sovereign set over him by God, and a real interest in the welfare of the nation, must desire that the day which annually commemorates the perpetuity of our Constitution should be marked with a special offering of praise and prayer; praise for the great mercies vouchsafed to our land, and prayer that Prince and People may alike, from the consideration of those mercies, continually learn and practise better their own mutual duties. Greatly therefore is it to be wished that a form were prepared by Convocation and duly sanctioned by Parliament, in which all could gladly and without scruple take part; a form which would be indeed at once the annual solemn confession by the Church on behalf of the People that by God alone "Kings reign and Princes decree justice," and the annual witness to the old loyalty that jealously guards alike the Altar and the Throne.

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICES.

§ *Service in Commemoration of the Fire of London.*

A Form of Prayer appointed to be used annually on September 2, in commemoration of the Fire of London (which

commenced on that day), appears in some Oxford Prayer Books printed between 1681 and 1683. It was first issued for use, "by his Majesty's special command," on October 10, 1666, and contained, like other special forms, a hymn instead of the Venite, proper Psalms and Lessons, etc., but was without any special mention of the Fire or of the City of London. In 1686 it was revised and reissued under Archbishop Tenison's authority, with a different hymn, and other changes, and with a Collect added which prayed for the preservation of the City from fire. The service was reprinted in a separate shape by the king's printers from time to time, even as lately as the year 1821: and a Latin version of it is included in the Latin Prayer Book published by Thomas Parsell, of which the last edition appeared in 1759. Its use was continued in St. Paul's Cathedral until the year 1859, when the observance of the day ceased, together with that of the State holidays abrogated by Parliament.

#### § The Office used at the Healing.

Prayer Books printed in the earlier part of the last century, and particularly during the reign of Queen Anne, frequently contain the prayers used on the occasion of the touching by the sovereign for the cure of the king's evil. The earliest edition in which the Office has as yet been found is of the date of 1706, and the latest is that printed by Baskett in Oxford in 1732. [*Bodl. Libr.*] A Latin version, however, continued to appear in the later editions of the Latin Prayer Book published by Thomas Parsell, of Merchant Taylor's School, to the year 1759. But as the service possessed no liturgical authority, and had no rightful place in the English Service-book, it is not necessary to notice it here in any detail. It was first, as it seems, compiled in a regular form in the reign of Henry VII., whose Office was printed by Henry Hills, the king's printer, in 1686, in quarto,<sup>1</sup> and is to be found reprinted in Pegge's *Curialia Miscellanea* (Lond. 1818), and in vol. iii. of Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia*. The order of the service appears to have varied with each sovereign, and the ceremonial used by Queen Anne was considerably shorter than that adopted by her predecessors.

Although the service appears in Prayer Books of the Georgian era, it is said that it was never used by a sovereign of the house of Hanover. The power of touching was exercised by the son of James II. as James III. in the hospitals at Paris, and by Prince Charles Edward at Edinburgh; "and two silver touch-pieces for distribution at the healing were struck by the last representative of the house of Stuart, the Cardinal

of York, under the title of Henry IX., who appears occasionally to have practised the rite."<sup>2</sup>

An English form from a Prayer Book of 1710 is given, as well as the earlier Latin form, in Pegge's *Curialia Miscellanea*, and from a Prayer Book of 1715 (also with the Latin form) in the Notes to A. J. Stephens' edition of the Prayer Book, vol. ii. pp. 990-1005, in both cases accompanied with notices of the rite; but the fullest historical account of the whole subject is to be found in a pamphlet by Edw. Law Hussey, Esq., M.R.C.S., of Oxford, reprinted in 1853 from the *Archæological Journal*, and entitled, *On the Cure of Scrofulous Diseases attributed to the Royal Touch*. See also a paper in the *British Magazine* for 1848, pp. 122-146.

The *Form of Consecrating Cramp-rings on Good Friday*, as a remedy against contraction of the nerves and the falling-sickness—a practice used by Henry VIII. and Queen Mary, in the assertion of a similar power to that claimed to be exercised in the preceding rite, was never printed in the Prayer Book, as it was never used by any sovereign since the Reformation, although apparently revised and prepared for use in the reign of James II. It is printed in English (from a MS. of the latter date) in Pegge's *Curialia Miscellanea*, in vol. iii. of Maskell's *Monumenta*, and in Stephens' Prayer Book [*Ecc. Hist. Soc.*], vol. ii. p. 921; a Latin form, prepared for Queen Mary in 1554, is to be found in Burnet, and in Wilkins.

#### § The Form used at the Meeting of Convocation.

This Latin form was first printed in 1700 by the king's printer, and again in 1702, with the title, "Forma precum in utraque domo Convocationis, sive Synodi Prælatorum et cæteri Cleri, seu Provincialis seu Nationalis, in ipso statim cujuslibet sessionis initio solemniter recitanda." It is found in Parsell's Latin Prayer Book, of which the fourth edition appeared in 1727, and a later one in 1744; and, from thence, in Bagster's *Liturgia Anglicana Polyglotta*, published in 1825. It consists of the Litany (which is said in the Upper House by the junior Bishop, and in the Lower by the Prolocutor) with a special application inserted after that for the Clergy, a prayer after that for the Parliament, and the following four Collects before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, viz. that for St. Simon and St. Jude, the second for Good Friday, and those for St. Peter and for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity. The form is reprinted in the Appendix to Perceval's *Original Services for the State Holy Days*, pp. 102, 103. W. D. M.

## II.

### THE SCOTTISH PRAYER BOOK OF 1637.

The Scottish "Service-book," as it was called at the time of its introduction, is alike interesting from the great names with which it is associated, from the calamitous circumstances of its first appearance, from its relation to the first book of Edward, and from the influence which, in spite of its failure in Scotland, it exercised on the final revision of the English book. A brief description of this Prayer Book—popularly, but inaccurately, called Archbishop Laud's—is now presented to the reader.

To begin with its historic antecedents. A real Episcopacy—as distinct from what is known in Scottish history as the "Tulchan Prelacy"—was provided for Scotland by the consecration, in 1610, of Archbishop Spottiswood, Bishop Lamb, and Bishop Hamilton, for the sees of Glasgow, Brechin, and Galloway. Spottiswood became Archbishop of St. Andrews in 1615; and in the same year he seems to have drawn up a list of the wants of the Scottish Church, among which was included the lack of a form of Divine Service. [*GRUB'S Ecc. Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 305.] At that time Knox's *Book of Common Order* was used along with extemporary prayer. In 1616 the General Assembly at St. Andrews, under Spottiswood's presidency, agreed to the proposal (which King James had expressly supported) that an uniform order of Liturgy should be framed, "to be read in all kirks on the ordinary days of prayer, and every Sabbath-day before sermon." "The King," says Mr. Grub, "certainly intended to

pave the way for the introduction of the English Prayer Book," while many of the Ministers of the Assembly merely contemplated a book on the model of the *Common Order*. [*Grub*, ii. 375.] James determined to accustom the inhabitants of Edinburgh to the presence of the English ritual (which he had once rudely and ignorantly satirized) by establishing it in the Chapel Royal at Holyrood, where, on Saturday, May 17, 1617, it was for the first time performed with "singing of choristers, playing on organs, and surplices," in the King's own presence. A celebration followed on Whitsunday, when Bishop Andrewes preached. The Dean of the chapel, Bishop Cowpar, at first declined to communicate kneeling: Laud, who was in attendance on the Court, gave offence by performing a funeral in a surplice; and it was evident that the example of the Chapel Royal would not be willingly followed by the Scottish kirks. One other public step was taken in James's reign—the promulgation in 1620 of an Ordinal for Scotland—a very unsatisfactory rite, which ignored the Order of Deacons. But the King received from Archbishop Spottiswood the draft of a Liturgy, which he caused to be revised by Dean Young of Winchester, and then returned, with marks of his own, to Spottiswood. [*LAWSON, Hist. Episc. Ch. i. 497.*]

Charles I., at his accession, resumed the project of a Scottish Liturgy, and carefully considered the book which his father had received. Rather more than a year after Laud's translation to the see of London—that is, in September 1629—the Bishop (then just able to sit up after a severe illness)

<sup>1</sup> This edition is in Latin, with English rubrics. An edition entirely in English was also printed by the same printer in the same year in duodecimo, of which a copy exists among Ant. & Wood's books in the Bodl. Libr., No. 898, iv.

<sup>2</sup> See *Notes and Queries*, 6th S., vol. vii. p. 411.

was visited by Dr. John Maxwell, one of the Edinburgh Clergy, who told him in the King's name that he was desired to communicate with some Scottish Bishops, including Archbishop Spottiswood, concerning a Liturgy for that Church. "I told him," says Laud [*Works*, iii. 427], "I was clear of opinion that if His Majesty would have a Liturgy settled there, it were best to take the English Liturgy without any variation. . . . He replied that he was of a contrary opinion; and that not he only, but the Bishops of that kingdom, thought their countrymen would be much better satisfied if a Liturgy were framed by their own Clergy, than to have the English Liturgy put upon them; yet, he added, that it might be according to the form of the English Service-book." Laud replied, that if this were so, he would take no further step until he was able to see the King. This he did in October; Charles "avowed the sending of Dr. Maxwell, and the message," but acquiesced in Laud's opinion. "And in this condition," says Laud, "I held the matter for two, if not three, years at least." Maxwell, meantime, was the bearer of a Royal Letter to Archbishop Spottiswood, pressing greater conformity to the Church of England." [Lawson, i. 449.]

In June 1633 King Charles was crowned at Holyrood; and Maxwell appeared among the prelates as Bishop elect of Ross. A few days later Laud preached in the Chapel Royal on the benefits of ecclesiastical conformity; and some thought that this would have been a favourable time for proposing the reception of the English Liturgy in Scotland. But it appears that in this summer—otherwise memorable for Laud's translation to Canterbury—Charles gave way to the urgency of some of the Scottish Bishops for a Liturgy of their own. They used not only the argument from national feeling, but another which would have great weight with the King and Laud: "that, if they did not then make the book as perfect as they could, they should never be able to get it perfected after." [Laud, iii. 343.] The King ordered an Episcopal committee in Scotland to prepare a Liturgy, and to communicate with Laud, who was commanded to give his "best assistance in this way, and work." "I delayed as much as I could," he says, "with my obedience, and, when nothing would serve but it must go on, I confess I was very serious, and gave them the best help I could." [Laud, iii. 428.] Bishops Juxon and Wren were to assist Laud. Charles, in the meantime, determined that nothing should be wanting for the due performance of the English ritual at Holyrood: in October 1633 he sent orders for that purpose, one of which was, "that there be prayers twice a day with the quire, according to the English Liturgy, till some course be taken for making one that may fit the customs and constitutions of that Church." Laud also wrote repeatedly to Bishop Bellenden, Dean of the Chapel, exhorting him to preach "in his whites" on Sundays, and otherwise to see to the due order of the worship.

The compilation of the Scottish Liturgy appears to have occupied between two and three years. Of the Scottish prelates, some, as the Archbishop of Glasgow, were more or less indisposed towards the undertaking, others were decidedly favourable, as Lindsay of Edinburgh, who was afterwards denounced at the Assembly of Glasgow as "a bower to the altar, a dedicator of churches," and even "an elevator at consecration;" Bellenden of Aberdeen, Whiteford of Brechin, and Sydserf of Galloway, who was pelted in 1637 by female fanatics, and accused of Arminianism and Popery, and driven into exile, where, alone of Scottish Bishops, he survived until the Restoration. But the two chief compilers were Maxwell, Bishop of Ross, and Wedderburn, of Dunblane. In fact, if the book were to be called after any one man, it should be known as "Maxwell's Liturgy." He was a person of much practical energy, and very obnoxious to the Scottish Puritans. As early as 1636, or earlier, he established the English ritual in his Cathedral of Fortrose, where he afterwards, for some time, upheld the Scottish; he was denounced in 1638 as "a bower at the altar, a wearer of cope and rochet," and as having "consecrated" Deacons. Wedderburn was a Scotsman educated at Oxford, had been intimate with Casaubon, and held prebends at Wells and Ely; Laud knew him personally, "wished him very well for his worth sake," and thought that although "a mere scholar and a book-man," he was certain to do good service, if "his heart" could be kept up. The Presbyterians denounced him as having, by lectures at St. Andrews, "corrupted divers with Arminianism," and left evidence "in all the nooks of the kingdom, of his errors and perverseness, having been special penner, practiser, urger of our books and all nova-

tions." As an orthodox theologian, he had objected to the inadequacy of the Ordinal of 1620, and he felt very strongly the desirableness of making the new Service-book more perfect, by conforming it in certain important points to Edward VI.'s first Liturgy; for Laud cites a note of his, to the effect that if the forms of administering the Sacrament be left as they stood in that Liturgy, "the action will be much the shorter; besides, the words which are added since, 'Take, eat, in remembrance, &c., may seem to relish somewhat of the Zuinglian tenet.'" [Laud, iii. 357.]

Archbishop Laud himself disclaims, and with perfect justice, the authorship of the Scottish Liturgy, but allows that he took a deep interest in, and prayed heartily for, its success. Again, he writes, "I like the book exceeding well, and hope I shall be able to maintain anything that is in it, and wish with all my heart that it had been entertained there." [Laud, iii. 335.] We find him urging on the English printers, revising proofs, encouraging Maxwell, receiving his queries as to certain suggestions, and "notes" from Bishop Wedderburn, as to which he takes the King's pleasure, "sits down seriously" with Bishop Wren to consider them, remits them to Charles with remarks, receives back from him those which he has approved, and sends them to Wedderburn written in an English Prayer Book, April 20, 1636. [Laud, vi. 456.] One or two of the points which he takes may illustrate the minute carefulness of his criticism. The Psalms cannot be well sung without a colon in the middle of each verse. As to the Offertory sentences, "we admit of all yours," but some others from the English book are recommended in addition.—"God be thanked," he concludes; "this will do very well, and, I hope, breed up a great deal of devout and religious piety in that kingdom." He asks Wedderburn to send him a list of *desideranda* which would make the Liturgy still more perfect, whether the times will bear them or not: he may find some use for them. The King himself was eager and painstaking; having sanctioned a first draft of the book on September 28, 1634, he gave a Royal Warrant in April 1636, for the revised form sent by Laud to Wedderburn; and most of Laud's alterations were written down in his presence. As early as September 30, 1633, Laud had urged Spottiswood to proceed strictly according to law, "because His Majesty had no intendment to do anything but that which was according to honour and justice, and the laws of that kingdom." [Laud, iii. 429.] And he tells us that he ever advised the Scottish Bishops, both in the King's presence and at other times, both by word and writing, "to do nothing in this particular but by warrant of law," protesting that, as he knew not the Scottish laws, he must leave the manner of introducing the Liturgy wholly to them. "And, I am sure, they told me they would adventure it no way but that which was legal." [Laud, iii. 336.]

The misfortune was, that some of the Scottish Bishops, as well as Charles I. himself, appear to have regarded as legal what to the Scottish nation seemed an intolerable excess of power. Spottiswood, if we may trust the report of his conversation with the Earl of Rothes, relied on royal prerogative as sufficient to warrant the introduction of the Liturgy, or indeed of any other ecclesiastical change. [Lawson, i. 519.] But Maxwell took a higher line, to the effect that the Bishops, who "had the authority to govern the Church, and were the representative Church of the kingdom," had as such concurred with the King in introducing the Liturgy. [Lawson, i. 511.] Maxwell on this occasion spoke of General Assemblies as "consisting of a multitude;" whereas it is remarkable that Laud in his History expresses an opinion that "the Bishops trusted with this business went not the right way, by a General Assembly and other legal courses of that kingdom" [Laud, iii. 278]; and in letters to Strafford and Spottiswood, he speaks of the Bishops' "improvidence" in being too desirous to "do all in a quiet way," in not "taking the whole Council into consideration," "engaging" the lay lords, and "dealing with" the ministers. "The King," he writes, "ought to have dealt more thoroughly with the lords of the Council, and sifted their judgements" [Laud, vi. 555]; and he proceeds to impute treachery to one whom he had trusted, the Earl of Traquair: an imputation which Collier in his History repeats [viii. 114]. The gross mistake of publishing the Canons, which commanded the use of the Liturgy, before the Liturgy itself appeared, has often excited astonishment. The Canons were promulgated by letters patent, on the ground of royal prerogative in causes ecclesiastical, May 23, 1635, and published early in 1636. The Service-book was authorized by a Royal Warrant of October 18, 1636, and by an Act of the Scottish Privy

Council, December 20, 1636. But although a new Ordinal, of which no copy is now supposed to exist, but which appears to have recognized the Order of Deacons, and to have had the form "Receive the Holy Ghost," appeared at the close of 1636 [Grub, ii. 368], the Service-book was not actually published until Lent 1637.

We may lay all due stress on the various instances of mismanagement in this memorable transaction; but if Charles I. had taken a moderate course, avoiding the display of high-handed authority and the appearance of English dictation, and laying the proposed book before the General Assembly and the Parliament, its chance of acceptance could not have been materially improved, although there might have been fewer outbreaks of fanatical wrath, fewer outrages in the name of religion.<sup>1</sup> The book—although, as we shall see, not faultless—was, in fact, too good to be appreciated by a people so deeply alienated, as Mr. Grub observes [ii. 399], "from what had been the common heritage of Christendom for fifteen centuries." Bramhall, then Bishop of Derry, wrote to Spottiswood that the book was "to be envied, perhaps in some things, if one owned all," and agreed with Dr. Duppa, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, that since the first six centuries there had been no such Liturgy; and Maxwell declared it to be "one of the most orthodox and perfect Liturgies in the Christian Church." But this, to the Scots, was no recommendation.

Passing by the disasters which followed the attempt to introduce it at Edinburgh, July 23, 1637, we proceed to take a survey of its contents:—

"Prefixed to it was the royal proclamation enjoining its use. . . . A preface followed, which made reference to the constant use of some prescribed order of prayer in the Church, to the desirableness of uniformity, and to the propriety of adhering to the English form, even as to some festivals and rites which were not yet received in Scotland." [Grub, ii. 382.] Then came some remarks on ceremonies, the order for the Psalms (which were taken from the Bible version) and the Tables of Psalms and Lessons. "The Lessons for Sundays are almost precisely identical with those in the Elizabethan Table of 1561. . . . The same may be said of the Holyday Proper Lessons, except that some First Lessons are omitted, and a few unimportant substitutions." [*Scottish Eccles. Journal*, iv. 199.] By the King's express order (October 18, 1636), six chapters from Wisdom were appointed for three Saints' days, six from Ecclesiasticus for three others. He also commanded that some names of Scottish Saints, especially those of royal blood, and some of the most holy Bishops (as David, Kentigern, Colman, Columba, Palladius, Ninian, Margaret) should be placed in the Calendar; no Lessons for ordinary days were taken from the Apocrypha, the space thus left being filled by a large increase of chapters from the Old Testament Canon. Thus, instead of our four chapters from Leviticus, eight were prescribed; from Numbers, twenty-four instead of eighteen; from Ezekiel, twenty-eight instead of nine; and between November 22 and December 17, fourteen chapters from 1 Chronicles, and thirty-four from 2 Chronicles, two very important books passed over in our arrangement. Ecclesiastes was finished on July 27, and was followed by Isaiah. Jeremiah was begun on August 31; on Michaelmas Day, which had no Proper Lessons, Ezekiel was begun at Evening Prayer; Hosea on October 19; and Malachi was finished November 22. Then, on December 17, the latter chapters of Isaiah were begun again, from the forty-seventh onwards; so that the sixty-sixth concluded the year, as in our course. The rubric before the Daily Office ordered that the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel, should be used, except it should be otherwise determined by the Ordinary; that chancels should remain as in times past; and that the "ornaments" of the Clergy should be such as should be prescribed by the King, according to the Act of Parliament in that behalf. The duty of saying the Daily Office, either privately or openly, was laid on the Clergy, "except they be hindered by some urgent cause; of which cause, if it be frequently pretended, they are to make the Bishop of the diocese, or the Archbishop of the province, the judge and allower."

In the Daily Office the first sentence was, "Cast away

from you all your transgressions;" and there were fewer sentences than in our book. The Confession was to be said by the people *after or with* the Minister. The "Presbyter" was to pronounce the Absolution "standing up and turning himself to the people, but they still remaining humbly on their knees." This was a considerable improvement on the English rubric as it then stood, "the Absolution to be pronounced by the Minister alone;" and here we may observe a case in which the Caroline revisers of our own book looked to the Scottish Service-book, although they altered "Minister" into "Priest," avoiding (as they avoided some other faults) the concession to anti-Catholic prejudice implied by the substitution of "Presbyter." The "power and commandment" was said to be given to the Presbyters of the Church of God, the Ministers of His Gospel; but after "and His Holy Spirit," came a clause which might be interpreted in a sense which would favour Puritanism: "that we may receive from Him absolution from all our sins." The twenty-third Psalm was substituted for the Benedicite. "Presbyters and Ministers" were named in the third versicle before the Collects. The Collect for Clergy and People was called a prayer "for the holy Clergy." The second of our Ember Collects was placed before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom.

In the Athanasian Creed one or two alterations were made in the English text: "He therefore that would be saved, let him thus think," etc. "So He Who is God and Man," etc. Laud, writing to Wedderburn, April 1636, had refused to allow any more emendations in this Creed. The Litany prayed for the governing of "the Holy Catholic Church universally."

There was a peculiar Collect for Easter Even, which has been the model of our present noble one, the work of the last revisers. It is:—

"O most gracious God, look upon us in mercy; and grant that as we are baptized into the death of Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, so by our true and hearty repentance all our sins may be buried with Him, and we not fear the grave; that as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of Thee, O Father, so we also may walk in newness of life, but our sins never be able to rise in judgement against us, and that for the merits of Jesus Christ that died, and was buried, and rose again for us."

The Communion Office was in more ways than one indicative of Wedderburn's desire to return to the first Liturgy of Edward; and "great need there was," said David Mitchell, afterwards for a few months Bishop of Aberdeen, "to return to it, *propter Sacramentarios*." [Lawson, i. 547.] Bishop Horsley's expressed admiration of the Scottish Communion Office, which is a revised form of the Office of 1637, is well known: he considered that it was decidedly better than the English Office of 1662, although the latter was "very good."

The introductory rubric ordered that the Holy Table (which was never spoken of in the Office simply as the Table) should have "a carpet, and a fair white linen cloth upon it, and other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated," and should "stand at the uppermost end of the chancel or church." The Presbyter was to begin "at the north side or end thereof;" our book has nothing about "end." He was to turn to the people when reciting the Commandments, a direction not given in England until 1662. An anti-Sabbatarian feeling expressed itself in the words, that the people were to ask God's mercy for their transgression of the law, "either according to the letter, or to the *mystical importance* of the said Commandment:" and it is remarkable that the difficulty felt as to the prayer referring to the Fourth Commandment not only suggested this qualifying clause, but afterwards led many of the Non-jurors to substitute the Evangelical summary of the Law, commonly called "the Short Law," for the Ten Commandments. Instead of "Have mercy upon the whole Church," the reading was "Have mercy upon Thy Holy Catholic Church, and in the particular Church in which we live so rule," etc.

It was expressly provided that the people should say, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord," at the announcement of the Gospel, and also, "Thanks be to Thee, O Lord," at its end. The Nicene Creed was to be said *or sung*: this alternative was given in England in 1662. The Offertory began with the account, in Genesis iv. 3, of Cain and Abel. The thanksgiving of David [1 Chron. xxix. 10, sq.] was one of the sentences; the Scottish Office, since the revision of 1755, has ordered it to be said at the moment of presenting the alms. There were no sentences from the Apocrypha. The alms were loosely called oblations (in the present English book a distinction is observed), and they were to be "humbly presented on the

<sup>1</sup> In the *Remains* of Dean Granville, of Durham, published by the Surtees Society (Part ii. p. 117), he states that on Holy Thursday 1688 he had a conversation with Burnet, Archbishop of St. Andrews, who, "sadly bewailed" the want of liturgical worship in Scotland, "as also that they had not at first, after the King's restoration, attempted to introduce the Liturgy of the Church of England, together with the Bishops: which he and the Bishops of Scotland were now convinced they might have done with as little trouble as they did the other."

Holy Table," an order which our present book has adopted. There was another order for the "offering up and placing" of the Elements upon the Lord's Table; and our present book has substantially adopted this also, and has a reference to the Elements as "oblations" in the prayer, whereas the Scottish book had no such reference. The words "militant here in earth" were retained. Where we read, "all Bishops and Curates," the Scottish reads, "all Bishops, Presbyters, and Curates." At a Celebration these words were added: "And we commend especially unto Thy merciful goodness the congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most precious Death and Passion of Thy Son and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The Liturgy of 1549 was not followed in its mention of the Blessed Virgin, the Patriarchs, Prophets, etc., nor in its commendation of the departed faithful to God's mercy; but other parts of the language of 1549 were adopted, the Prayer, after "any other adversity," proceeding, as now the Scottish form does: "And we also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants who having finished their course in faith do now rest from their labours. And we yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy Saints, who have been the choice vessels of Thy grace, and the lights of the world, in their several generations; most humbly beseeching Thee that we may have grace to follow the example of their stedfastness in Thy faith, and obedience to Thy holy commandments; that at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which are of the mystical Body of Thy Son, may be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Grant this," etc. It is easy to see that the Caroline revisers had this before them when they framed the commemoration of the departed servants of God for the book of 1662.

The service then proceeded as it was settled in the second book of Edward, until the Preface, the word "blessed" being inserted before "Virgin" in the Christmas Preface. The Invitation, Confession, Absolution, Sentences, Preface, and Tensanctus were kept in the place which they held in the

*First Book.*

And with Thy Holy Spirit and word<sup>1</sup> vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ: Who in the same night . . .

And of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son: so that we receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of the same His most precious Body and Blood: Who in the night . . .

It is remarkable that early in the eighteenth century Bishop Rose of Edinburgh was accustomed, when using the English Office of 1662, to insert this Invocation: and it became one of the famous Usages. The present Scottish rite, since 1755, has placed the Invocation after the Oblation, and, since 1764, has omitted the Western phrase "to us," and the sentence, "so that we receiving," etc.

The English Office until 1662 had no directions for any "manual rites" in consecration. But the practice, as we infer from Laud's letter to Wedderburn, and from Cosin [*Works*, v. 340], was for the Priest to take the paten and chalice into his hands. But the Scottish book prescribed all the four manual rites, just as the book of 1662, evidently borrowing from it, has prescribed them. This is one of the most important instances of the beneficial effects of the Scottish book on the Caroline revision.

After the words of Institution came, "Immediately after this shall be said the Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation as followeth:"

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts" [here the present Scottish Office, since 1743, has added "which we now offer unto Thee;"] an express oblation in this place being

English rite by Laud's desire; but the Prayer of Access was deferred until just before Communion. The rubric before consecration was:—

"Then the Presbyter, standing up, shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth. But then during the time of consecration, he shall stand at such a part of the Holy Table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands."

On this it is to be observed: [1] That Laud had expressly required that "every prayer or other action in the Communion should be named in the rubric, that it might be known what it was,—The Prayer of Consecration, the Memorial or Prayer of Oblation." And until 1662 the English book had no such words as "the Prayer of Consecration." [2] That from Laud's own words [Laud, iii. 347], and from the obvious sense of the passage, it is plain that the celebrant was intended to perform the consecration standing in front of the Holy Table. This was objected to in *Rome's Master-piece*, as "smelling very strongly of Popery." [Laud, iv. 495.] In reference to such changes, Laud argues that "the north end of the Table in most places is too narrow, and wants room, to lay the Service-book open before him that officiates, and to place the bread and wine within his reach." [Here again Laud allows the word "end" to stand for "side."] And [3] that this throws light on the present English rubric, which was clearly framed with the Scottish rubric in view; and discourages that interpretation of it which would have the Priest stand before the Table only while ordering, not while consecrating, the Elements.

The actual Prayer is like our own until "Hear us," except that it reads "which" for "who" after "Father," and also inserts "and Sacrifice" after "precious death"—an insertion not taken from the Liturgy of 1549; then after the words, "beseech Thee," comes the Invocation, a passage of which Laud says [iii. 354]: "'Tis true, this passage is not in the Prayer of Consecration in the Service-book of England; but I wish with all my heart it were. For though the consecration of the Elements may be without it, yet it is much more solemn and full by that invocation." The form may be compared with those of Edward's First Liturgy and the present Scottish Office.

## 1637.

*Present Scottish.*

And of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.

one of the greater "Usages," and ranking as such with the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, the mixed cup, and the non-exclusion, to say the least, of prayer for the departed;]<sup>1</sup> "the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion," [the present Scottish adds, "and precious Death,"] "mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same." [Here the present Scottish inserts the Invocation.] "And we entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness," etc., as in our present book down to "humbly beseeching Thee," when following the book of 1549, it proceeded, "that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we be unworthy," etc., as in the present English. Then came the Lord's Prayer; Laud, it may be added, having thoroughly approved the placing of it and of the Prayer of Oblation before the Communion. Then the Prayer of Access; and then the Communion, the Bishop or the celebrant being ordered first to receive, and then to administer to the other Clergy, "that they may help him that celebrateth" (as it then stood in the

<sup>1</sup> It seems certain that by "word" is meant the words of Institution.

<sup>1</sup> Of these four usages the book of 1637 sanctioned only one, the Invocation.

English book, "that they may help the chief Minister") "all humbly kneeling;" the English book then had no such adverb; "meekly" was added in 1662. The Benediction, "the Body of our Lord," etc. (which was much objected to by the Puritans, as suggestive of transubstantiation!) was to be said by the Celebrant himself when receiving, and to be followed by Amen; and the "Take and eat this," "Drink this," which had been first inserted in 1552, were, according to Wedderburn's request, omitted. Laud writes, "I see no hurt in the omission of those latter words, none at all. And if there be any, it proceeded not from me." [Laud, iii. 357.]

After the administration, the Celebrant was to cover the remains of the Sacrament "with a fair linen cloth or corporal;" no such rule then existed in the English book, but it was adopted—excepting the word "corporal," and with the addition of the word "reverently"—in 1662. The Collect "Almighty and everliving God" then followed, as in the English book; the strange error which from the first book downwards had made this prayer, while addressing the Father, speak of "Thy mystical Body," was not corrected. The Office was concluded by the Gloria in Excelsis and the Blessing. Among the rubrics after it there was a direction that after service what had been collected from the people should be divided in the presence of the Presbyter and churchwardens; half was to be for the Presbyter's use, "to furnish him with books of holy divinity;" half for purposes of piety and charity within the parish. There was also a careful provision,—which did not then exist in the English book, but was adopted in 1662,—for the prevention of irreverent use of the consecrated remnants. To this was added: "And to the end there may be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least; and then, if there be want, the words of consecration may be repeated again, over more either bread or wine; the Presbyter beginning at these words in the Prayer of Consecration: 'Our Saviour, in the night that He was betrayed, took'" etc. This provision was also adopted, and made somewhat more definite, in 1662. The last rubric provided that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, "of which Pasch or Easter shall be one; and shall also receive the Sacraments and other rites according to the order in this book appointed." This, excepting the word Pasch, which was a peculiarly Scottish term for Easter, was then the language of the English book; but the Scottish omitted the rule about parishioners reckoning at Easter with the parson, vicar, or curate, etc., and paying all ecclesiastical dues.

The only features in the Occasional Offices worthy of special notice are the following. In the first prayer at Public Baptism, before the entreaty that God would mercifully look upon these children, came the sentence, "Sanctify this fountain of Baptism, Thou Which art the Sanctifier of all things." The first book had placed this sentence, together with a signing of the Cross, in a Collect beginning, "O most merciful God, our Saviour Jesu Christ," which, with other prayers, was to be said after the water in the font had been changed, and before any child was baptized therein. Bucer had objected to this; "his fear was, lest it should engender the

idea, that into the Elements themselves there was infused some magical efficacy." [WILBERFORCE on *Holy Bapt.* p. 247.] His objection, however unreasonable, had led to the omission of the benediction of the water in the second book: and the compilers of the Scottish Service-book resolved to return to the precedent of 1549, and to borrow from its elaborate benedictory Office one sentence which should represent the idea, and might be inserted in the actual Order of Baptism. This was one of the points which gave great offence; it was a "consecration of holy water." And in the prayer before administration, "Almighty everliving God," which had stood at the end of the benedictory form of 1549, the reading was, "this water, which we here bless and dedicate in Thy Name to this spiritual washing." The Caroline revisers substantially imitated this when they inserted the clause, "Sanctify this water," etc., into the latter of these two prayers.

The Communion address was to be heard by the people, "sitting and attending with reverence," a direction not found in the English book.

Such was the Service-book of 1637. Its history, to the thoughtful Churchman, is suggestive of much hope and comfort. After all the learned labour and devout solicitude bestowed upon it, after all the prayers made for its success, it comes forth associated with all that could most deeply prejudice the people of Scotland in its disfavour; it is made the occasion of sacrilegious outbreaks; it is spurned and denounced, with prayers that God would "confound" it; and it virtually kindles the first flame of civil war. Those who have been most heartily interested in it have to mourn, as Laud did, over the failure of their hopes, and to prophecy that Scotland "will one day have more cause" than themselves for sorrow. [Laud, iii. 338.] Bishop Wedderburn, driven, like most of the Scottish prelates, to seek a refuge out of Scotland, dies at or near Canterbury, in 1639. [Lawson, 611.] Bishop Maxwell, appointed by the King to Irish sees, plundered and wounded by Romanist insurgents, dies Archbishop of Tuam, February 14, 1646—being found lifeless on his knees; an end, surely, not unfitting for one who had so laboured to promote God's worship. Years pass away; the Restoration arrives, and the Church of England has to re-settle her Prayer Book. In this work the ill-fated Scottish Prayer Book is unexpectedly and manifoldly influential; it assists the orthodox Caroline revisers to raise the tone of the English book, by various significant though gentle alterations, and in this way it materially strengthens the hold of Catholic belief and devotion on the hearts of the English race. In Scotland, indeed, the restored Church, for the most part, worshipped without a Liturgy; but when disestablished in 1689, after some years, it adopts from the book of 1637 a Communion Office which, passing through several revisions, becomes the known standard of a deeply earnest churchmanship, imparts one of its main features to the American rite, and may yet, in God's Providence, do a work for Faith and Unity.

"Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain: yet surely my judgement is with the Lord, and my work with my God." [Isa. xlix. 4.] W. B.

## III.

## THE IRISH PRAYER BOOK.

The introduction of the Revised English Prayer Book into Ireland after the Restoration was effected, not merely by royal authority, or as an act of servile imitation and complacence, but as the result of deliberate and careful consideration on the part of the Convocation and Parliament of that kingdom. Among the MSS. of Archbishop King preserved in Trinity College, Dublin, is a volume containing the journals of the Irish Convocation in 1661—1665, from which it appears that in August and September the English book was examined by both Houses separately, and approved, the Lower House recommending the addition of Forms of Prayer for the Lord-Lieutenant and for October 23. In November they resolved that an Act of Parliament should be asked for, enjoining the use of the book on the Irish Church: but, from some unknown causes, the procuring such an Act was delayed for nearly four years.<sup>1</sup> At length, on January 17, 1664, the Bill for Uniformity

was read for the first time in the House of Commons; after the second reading, on February 1, it was referred to a committee, which reported that alterations were necessary in regard to dates which had already elapsed, and one or two other minor points. A new Bill was consequently introduced on May 18, 1666, which passed the House of Commons on May 22, and the House of Lords in due succession, and received the Royal Assent on June 18.

The English Prayer Book is therefore the Prayer Book also of the Irish Church by its own free adoption. But it contained, and still in a lesser degree contains, several additions which render it a distinct book, and which we now proceed to point out in brief detail.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See "The Irish Convocation of 1661," an article [by Rev. J. C. Crosthwaite] in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* for December 1848, vol. ii. pp. 290-292.

<sup>2</sup> The original MS. of the Irish Book is fortunately still preserved in the Rolls Office in Dublin; it was edited by Archibald J. Stephens, Esq., in 1849-50, in three vols. for the Eccl. Hist. Soc., with full and elaborate historical introductions. A valuable sketch of the history of the Irish book, by Rev. W. Keatinge Clay, B.D., is to be found in the *British Magazine* for December 1846, pp. 601-620.

