

THE CASE FOR INCENSE

SUBMITTED TO HIS GRACE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

ON BEHALF OF

THE REV. H. WESTALL

ON MONDAY, MAY 8, 1899

TOGETHER WITH

A LEGAL ARGUMENT

AND

THE APPENDICES OF THE EXPERTS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY,
1899

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| GENERAL HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STATEMENT | 3 |
| OUTLINE OF LEGAL ARGUMENTS | 22 |
| APPENDICES – | |
| A. NOTES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE USE OF INCENSE. W. H. FRERE | 29 |
| B. ON THE USE OF INCENSE IN THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH. W. J. BIRKBECK | 60 |
| C. THE THEOLOGICAL VALUE OF INCENSE – | |
| 1. H. R. PERCIVAL | 62 |
| 2. D. STONE | 67 |
| D. THE RUBRICS COMPARED AND THEIR EVIDENTIAL VALUE CONSIDERED. E. GELDART | 71 |
| E. TWO CASES ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE PERMANENCE OF ACCUSTOMED USAGES. W. H. FRERE | 91 |
| F. THE USE OF THE CENSER AFTER THE ACCUSTOMED MANNER. T. A. LACEY | 94 |
| G. ON THE EDWARDIAN INVENTORIES OF CHURCH GOODS. W. H. ST. J. HOPE | 99 |
| H. THE POST-REFORMATION USES OF INCENSE. W. H. FRERE | 104 |
| J. INCENSE UNDER THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1549. T. A. LACEY | 114 |

A STATEMENT
OF THE CASE OF
THE REV. H. WESTALL
ON BEHALF OF

The Use of Incense & Processional Lights

IN obedience to the Bishop of London, I submit to your Grace the following Statement in justification of two points of ceremonial practice observed in my church in the performance of the Holy Eucharist and Divine Worship for the last twelve years.

In doing so, I desire to state at the outset, as was done by the Bishop of Lincoln when formally cited to appear before the late Archbishop of Canterbury in reference to certain points of ceremonial observance, (1) that the only authority which I can recognize as competent finally to determine and settle such matters is the Synod of the Province, and (2) that in thus appearing before your Grace I base my conduct, not on a particular clause in the Preface of the Prayer Book which I believe can be shown to refer to a totally different class of matters, but on the obedience due to the inherent authority of my Bishop, and to that of your Grace, in so far as your Grace represents the authority of the Synod of the Province.

The ceremonial practices referred by the Bishop of London to your Grace are two: the use of Incense as it has been accustomed to be used in the Church of England from early times, and the carrying of Lights in procession and at other accustomed times in the performance of Divine Worship.

A.

In regard to the use of Incense, I have to state that Incense is burnt in the accustomed manner at processions; during the celebration of Holy Communion, at the Approach to the Altar, at the Gospel, at the Offertory, and at the Consecration; and at Evensong on Festivals at the *Magnificat*.

I respectfully submit that the use of Incense in the accustomed manner is not contrary to the laws and customs ecclesiastical of this Church and Realm, and I humbly crave the protection of your Grace and that of the Synod of the Province for myself and my people.

I. The use of Incense in the solemn celebration of Divine Worship is universal, and that from very early times, throughout the whole Church, East and West alike.

It had previously formed part of the Temple worship, where it was enjoined by Almighty God Himself. The offering of Incense was part of the daily morning and evening services in the Temple, and also of the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement. It was included as a regular part of the sacrificial system, especially in connexion with the unbloody Sacrifice. The censuring was among the most solemn privileges of the Levitical Priesthood. Other Levitical ceremonies passed away, but this, as an accompaniment of

the unbloody Sacrifice, has been retained and become one of the signs of the Universal Christian Church.

It can claim our Lord's sanction, not only from His connexion with the Temple worship, but also from the facts (1) that the moment of the offering of Incense by Zachariah was chosen as the moment for the opening of the new dispensation; (2) that it was among the gifts offered to Himself by the Wise Men.

Further sanction is to be found in the Apocalypse, where it is twice mentioned as forming part of heavenly worship, and as being ceremonially used. In fact, it is not too much to say that on Biblical grounds there is no ceremonial custom so well established as the use of Incense in Divine Worship.

The Christian Church has carried on the precedent thus set, and has for centuries used Incense as part of Divine Worship. The use may not have been continuous, for in the earliest days there were many circumstances which militated against it and forced the Church to deny herself for the time the privilege of this beautiful piece of Biblical symbolism. In the days of persecution Christian worship was necessarily cramped, and, moreover, such things as savoured of Paganism were necessarily abjured; nothing was more crucial in this connexion than the burning of Incense, for it soon became the test of Paganism *versus* Christianity. But when the Church emerged victorious from the conflict, the burning of Incense ceased to be a dangerous seduction of heathenism, Christian worship began to claim the external dignity which till then it had foregone, and the liturgical use of Incense was one of the first evidences of the new state of things which had come about. When once it was restored it was steadily taken up, and spread till it became universal. And such it has continued: it is neither Roman nor Mediaeval nor Eastern; it has won a permanent place in all the great Christian liturgies; orthodox and heretic, Eastern and Western, all unite in using it as a solemn part of their devotions. ¹

In the East Divine worship is never celebrated without Incense, ² and it is one of the reproaches which the East makes against the West that it allows the Holy Communion to be celebrated without an adjunct which the Orthodox Church holds to be of Ecumenical obligation; in this connexion constant reference is made to the Seventh General Council, on the ground that the censuring of persons and things is a witness to the change which the Incarnation has produced in the relation of the whole material creation to God.

The symbolism is transparently clear, and needs no explanation to any devout and intelligent mind, least of all to one that is familiar with the Bible. Various interpretations have at times been put forth of the censings in detail, but the broad reference that underlies all these is to the power of intercessory prayer and the mediation of our Blessed Lord. ³

II. In the West, and in England as part of the Western Church, Incense has continuously been used at processions; in the solemn celebration of Holy Communion, at the Approach to the Altar, the Gospel, and the Offertory; and in honour of the Incarnation at the singing of the Evangelical Canticles *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* on Sundays and Festivals⁴; it has only dropped out of general use during these later years in England, when the celebration of Holy Communion itself on Sundays and Saints' Days, together with so much else of primitive practice and obligation, has been allowed by the negligence of the ecclesiastical authorities to fall to so large an extent into abeyance.

The manner of its use is prescribed in all the old Service Books in greater or less detail, nor is there, in any of the later Service Books of the Church of England beginning with the Order for Communion put out in 1548, and the First English Prayer Book put out in 1549, any rubric forbidding its use.

In regard to Mattins and Evensong it cannot be said, with any semblance of truth, that the changes made by the Church of England, when those responsible for the spiritual government of the Church put out a translation and abridgment of such of the Breviary Services as were then in common parochial use, involve any prohibition of the accustomed use of Incense at the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*.

In regard to the Holy Communion it cannot be maintained that when the same authorities, including men of the old learning such as Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, and Day, Bishop of Chichester, put out an Order for “The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse,” in English, they forbade and made illegal what for generations had been an accustomed adjunct of the service; in all the changes, which they then made, there is no indication of such a prohibition; and failing any express direction to that effect, it cannot be held that such was intended; especially when it is borne in mind that these changes were designed to restore the services to that model which should be most in harmony with the teaching and practice of the ancient fathers and doctors of the Church.

III. Such an opinion, it is most respectfully submitted cannot be maintained, and that for the following amongst other reasons: –

(1) The Church of England, throughout all the changes of the Reformation period, steadily, and without flinching, has declared her intention and wish to retain all that was Catholic and primitive, and merely to get rid of what was superstitious, or had been abused to superstitious practice. She disclaimed any intention of separating herself from the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany; she “doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men: and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders.”⁵ She repudiated all changes that struck at any “laudable practice of . . . the whole Catholick Church of Christ.”⁶

In a Declaration put out by Elizabeth in 1569, and ordered to be read in churches, it was denied that any claim was made “to change any ancient ceremony of the Church from the Forme before received and observed by the Catholick and Apostolick Church.”⁷

This principle is not only expressed in a passage here and there in the formularies of the Church of England, but pervades her entire Prayer Book, Articles, and Canons. It is interwoven into and inseparable from Acts of Parliament, Injunctions, Royal Proclamations, and the like, and it was reasserted emphatically in 1661 by the Bishops, from whose hands the Church of England received the Prayer Book in its present form. In their reply to the *Exceptions of the Presbyterian Brethren against some passages in the present Liturgy* (1661), they condemn in every variety of form a “departure” from the “custom of the Churches of God,” or, as they otherwise express it, a “crossing upon the practice of former ages”; they intend to “observe that golden rule of the venerable Coun-

cil of Nice, Let ancient customs prevail, till reason plainly requires the contrary”; they refuse to “divide from the Church Catholick” or to “give offence to sober Christians by a causeless departure from Catholick usage.”⁸

It is not claimed that no alteration of ceremonial took place at the Reformation; but that such alterations as were made were made on conservative lines, and only in view of certain specific and well-defined abuses; and, further, it is claimed that clear proof of such alteration is to be required before any innocent portion of the old ceremonial is held to be abrogated. There is no such proof of any abrogation of Incense in the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, which are, however, very explicit wherever a definite alteration was intended.⁹

The principle, then, of appeal to Primitive and Catholic usage being a fundamental one of the Church of England, I submit that the Prayer Book must of necessity be so interpreted as to be made to harmonize with, and by no means to contradict, that principle.

It is not denied that the use of Incense at the celebration of the Holy Communion is a custom of the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, and is in widespread use in parts of the Anglican communion outside the Province of Canterbury.

No one has ventured to say that it is a custom which is open to the charge of having “been turned to vanity and superstition” (Preface to Prayer Book).

Neither is it one involving “a burden which is intolerable” (Preface to Prayer Book). Rather it is one well calculated “to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God by” its “signification” (Preface to Prayer Book), since there is no symbol throughout the whole of the Old and New Testament so often used to symbolize the prayers of the Church as that of Incense. As such it was not objected to, even by those who, in the sixteenth century, found most to complain of in other practices and ceremonial customs of the Church.

(2) It is true that neither the rubrics in the Prayer Book of 1549, nor in that of 1559, nor in the existing Book of Common Prayer prescribe where Incense is to be used, as was done by the rubrics in some of the later forms of the Latin Service Books; but in determining the question of what the Church of England intended to prescribe or permit, the fact of such omission cannot be held to involve a prohibition, unless it can be proved that the rubrics of the various editions of the Book of Common Prayer either are, or were intended to be, in any sense an exhaustive and complete set of directions for the performance of Divine Service.

The rubrics in the Missal and Breviary made no pretension to such completeness; much was assumed to be a matter of general custom or local regulation, for which no special directions were given. For example, in the Hereford Missal no mention is made of Incense except at the Gospel, and in no English Missal are the lights on the Altar prescribed, any more than they are in the Prayer Book. But it would be very perilous to argue in consequence that Incense was not used at the Offertory according to the use of Hereford; or that no lights were accustomed to be burnt in England on the Altar at Mass.

The same thing may be asserted of the Prayer Book, only to a still greater extent, in view of the fact that the Book of Common Prayer was primarily intended for popular use; it therefore assumes knowledge on the part of the clergy, and largely concerns itself

with directions for the behaviour of the people; presenting in this respect a marked contrast to the Latin books, which, while they contain fuller directions for the clergy, are almost silent as to the congregation. As a rule traditional usages are taken for granted, and slightly, if at all, alluded to, and only such rubrics are full and explicit as were concerned with the definite alteration of the accustomed use or with arrangements which were novel altogether.¹⁰

It is notorious that this incompleteness and scantiness of rubrical direction was a marked feature of the Prayer Book of 1549, and this was also the case in regard to Elizabeth's Prayer Book of 1559.

(1) For example, the rubrics in the Book of 1549 make no mention of the fair linen cloth or of any covering for the Altar. The vesture of the priest that "shal execute the holy ministry" is referred to shortly as "the vesture appointed for that ministracion," which is explained to be "a white albe plain with a vestement or cope."¹¹ It is admitted that by the "vestment" the chasuble is unquestionably meant, and that the term is wide enough to cover the use of the amice, stole, and other vestments worn by the priest. In the same way the ministers who are to help in the ministracion are to wear "the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to saye, Albes with tunacles." It is no new order which is given, but the existing order which is shortly referred to; and that this was what was understood at the time is certain from contemporaneous history.

Hooper, writing to Bullinger on December 27, 1549, says, although "the Altars are here [in London] in many churches changed into tables" [by order of the Council in defiance of the then law of the Church], "the public Celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of our Lord. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the Supper is administered three times a day. Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the Mass of the Apostles, they now have the Communion of the Apostles. Where they had the Mass of the Blessed Virgin they now have the Communion which they call the Communion of the Virgin. Where they had the principal or High Mass they now have, as they call it, the High Communion." [These were all sung Masses. Incense would probably have been used at the High Mass, and possibly at the others.] "They still retain their vestments and the candles before the Altars. In the Churches they always chant the hours and other hymns relating to the Lord's Supper, but in our own language."¹² And again, in a letter to Bullinger of March 27, 1550, Hooper says, "It is no small hindrance to our exertions that the form which our Senate and Parliament as we commonly call it has prescribed for the whole realm is so very defective and of doubtful construction, and in some respects indeed manifestly impious. . . . I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Supper."¹³

In 1550 the celebration of the Communion Office of the English Prayer Book, with the old ceremonial hitherto used in the Mass, was continued in St. Paul's. The Report to the Council in October, 1550, the fourth year of Edward VI., in regard to "the usage of the Communion in Paul's," was "that it, was used as the Very Mass."¹⁴

Bucer, writing in 1551, says, "I may add, on ceremonies that in many of your churches there is still found a studied representation of the execrated Mass, in vestures,

lights, bowings, crossings, washings of the cup, carrying the book from left to right, lifting the paten, cup, etc., etc. All these should be expressly forbidden.”¹⁵

It is to be observed here how things definitely prescribed by the rubrics of the First Prayer Book, then in use, and things not mentioned in the rubrics, are all put on the same level.¹⁶

In the face of such facts it is impossible to say that Incense was not used under the Communion Office of the First Book of Edward, or that the action of Bishop Ridley and the Council, or the opinions and wishes of Hooper and Bucer, can be held to be a true indication of the mind of the Church of England, or of what is covered by the very scanty rubrics of the Prayer Book of 1549.

(ii.) In regard to the Prayer Book of 1559, one crucial case will be sufficient to prove the point. The provision for an additional Consecration of the Eucharistic Elements, when necessary, was omitted in that Prayer Book, though it had been included in the *Order of Communion* of 1548. Nevertheless, a priest in Elizabeth’s reign, who pleaded on trial this omission in justification of his practice of not reciting the words of consecration again over such additional bread and wine as might be required, was condemned, with the additional censure of having brought forward an entirely unjustifiable plea in his defence.¹⁷

The case was heard on Feb. 20, 1573-4, before Queen Elizabeth’s High Commissioners. The Commissioners were Sandys, Bishop of London; the Lord Chief Justice Catlin; Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster; and others. The party accused was Robert Johnson, “of late Preacher at Northampton.”¹⁸ One of the charges laid against him was the omitting “*to repeat the words of Institution*” when in the Administration of the Sacrament more wine was required than had been previously consecrated.

Johnson’s defence was as follows, as he himself recorded in prison shortly afterwards: – “I answer under protestation that at no time in the celebrating of the Communion have I omitted any prayer or words of Institution which the order of the Book prescribeth, but have used them in as full and ample manner as they are appointed; but sometimes upon occasion, when wine failed, I sent for more, which I delivered to the people with the words appointed in the Book to be said at the delivery of the Sacrament, not again repeating the words of Institution, partly for that, it being one entire action and one Supper, the words of Institution afore spoken were sufficient, as I do take it; and partly for that in the Book of Common Prayer there is *no such order appointed*, unto the which in this case I do refer myself.”

After his reply to the charge of omitting the ring in marriage and the cross in baptism, “Then the Bishop rose up and spake: Those last two be but trifles and matters of no weight; but the chiefest is the Consecration of the Sacrament; for, in that it had not the word, it was no Sacrament, and so the people were mocked. – Robert Johnson: My Lord, I did not mock the people, for it was a Sacrament. – Dean of Westminster: Saint Augustine saith, ‘Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.’ Now you lacked the word, therefore it was no Sacrament. – Robert Johnson: I had the word. – Bishop of London: How had you the word, when you confess that, you recited not the Institution? – Robert Johnson: I had recited the Institution afore, and that was sufficient. – Dean of Westminster: Yea, for that bread and wine that was present, but when you did send for more bread and wine you should again have rehearsed the words of Institution. – Robert

Johnson: *The Book appointed no such order.* – Bishop of London: Yes, Sir, the Book sayeth you shall have there sufficient bread and wine, and then the prayer of the Institution must be recited. Now forasmuch as you had not sufficient, therefore you should have repeated the Institution. – Robert Johnson: There is no such *caveat* nor *proviso* appointed in the Book. – Bishop of London: But that is the meaning of the Book. – Robert Johnson: Men may make what meaning they list, *but I refer myself to the Book whether it be so appointed or no.* – Dean of W.: You are not forbidden in any place to use the repetition. – Johnson: Neither yet am I commanded I pray you tell me one thing, whether be the wordes of Institution spoken for the bread or for the receivers? – Dean of W.: For both.” Robert Johnson was condemned by the Court of Commissioners and sent to the Gatehouse, where, after a short interval he died.¹⁹

This and some other omissions were supplied in 1662, but the rubrical directions still remain very incomplete.²⁰

It is submitted that on this showing alone it is impossible to hold that the omission of any rubric in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1559, and 1662 prescribing the use of Incense, in the accustomed manner, at the celebration of Holy Communion, and at the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* on Sundays and Holy Days, can be cited as proof that such use is forbidden.

IV. A careful consideration of the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer will supply indirect but positive proof that such use is in fact enjoined by them. The Ornaments Rubric prefixed to all the other rubrical directions of the Prayer Book, and governing their intention, after prescribing that the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past, and Mattins and Evensong shall be said in the *accustomed* place (no uncertain indication of what was intended by the rubric), goes on to direct that “such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of *England* by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King *Edward* the Sixth.”

(i) The *second year of Edward VI.* is fixed as, the date which in the first place determines what ornaments are to be retained, and *the ministrations* imposed upon the clergy by the Prayer Book are fixed upon in the second place, as the limit for determining which of those ornaments are to be in use.

With regard to the disputed interpretation of this rubric I cannot do better than quote Mr. Micklethwaite.²¹

Reference is made *to the authority of Parliament*, and it is important to bear this in mind because the matter has been much obscured by the frequent quotation of other authorities whose orders, apart from the question of date, were not constitutionally binding upon the Church when they were issued, and have not been accepted by the Church and lawfully enacted afterwards, as, in this matter, the ruling of Parliament has been. King Henry VIII. died on the 28th day of January, 1547, and consequently the first regnal year of his son and successor began on 28th January, 1547, and ended on 27th January, 1548, and his second year on the corresponding days in 1548 and 1549. We have therefore to enquire what ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof were retained and used by authority of Parliament in the year which began on 28th January, 1548, and ended on 27th January, 1549.”

“It has generally been assumed that the rubric refers to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. But an examination of the dates proves that this is not so.²² That Book received the authority of Parliament on January 21st, 1549, which is indeed just within the second year of the King. But the time when it was to come into use is named in the Act itself, which orders that it shall be used on the Whitsun Day following (June 9th, 1549), or, if it might be had sooner, then three weeks after a copy had been procured. So that, even if the Book could have been obtained within the remaining week of the second year, which is unlikely, it could not have been used by authority of Parliament before the third year of King Edward, and we must seek for something earlier. Now, late in 1547 an Act (1st Edward VI., cap. 1) had been passed ordering the restoration of Communion in both kinds. No form was included in the Act, but on the 8th of March following a form was put forth by proclamation. It is known as the *Order of Communion*, and perhaps it may be disputed whether technically it has the authority of Parliament. But the *Order* was approved by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury,²³ and it was considered at the time to receive its Parliamentary authority from the Act 31st Henry VIII., cap. 8.”

“The *Order of Communion* was to come into use on Easter Day, 1548, and it continued until it was superseded by the English Book of 1549. It was not an order for the *Celebration*, but only for the *Communion*, and it was to be inserted into the old Latin service, which, was to go on as before ‘without varying of any other rite or ceremony of the Mass.’ This at least is evidence of the continuance, all through the second year of King Edward, of the old Latin Mass and, by consequence, of the ornaments used in that service. As a matter of fact the same ornaments, or at least all of them which have been the subject of controversy in late times, were also used with the English Service of 1549.”

But it is not difficult to find the “reason why first in 1559 (so soon afterwards that the supposition of mistake or accident is impossible), and again in 1662, it was thought better to refer back to the time *before* the introduction of the English Service rather than to that in which it was used.”

From the moment of the publication of the English Book irregular “changes began to be made, and as the innovators became stronger . . . they arbitrarily put down the use of ornaments even whilst the book ordering them was still in force.” In 1559, in prescribing the ancient accustomed ornaments, it was thus far safer to refer to the second year and the period before the publication of the English Book than to that Book or its date. The rule at least was a definite one; but the earlier Bishops of Queen Elizabeth’s time never honestly accepted it, and the reign of lawlessness was fitly opened by the following passage in a letter from Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, to Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

Speaking of the provision in the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity (sec. 13), he says: “The last Book of Service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward VI., until it please the Queen to take other order for them: our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them; but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen.”²⁴

Here it must be noticed that, Sandys does not say *second* year, but *first and second* year, thereby making the reference unequivocally to the time of the use of the Lat-

in service. His object was to explain away the proviso, and his impudent gloss shows that he was not scrupulous as to the means he used. If he could have lessened its comprehensiveness by transferring the reference from the second year to the Book of 1549, he would certainly have done so. That he did not proves either that at the time of the passing of the Act the reference to the date named in it was not to be disputed, or that the ornaments used under the First English Book were so far the same as those used before it that it was no advantage to make any distinction between them.

In spite of this disregard of the rubric it was enacted again in 1662, not blindly or *per incuriam*, but deliberately in spite of Puritan opposition²⁵ and in a modified form designed to obviate any possible misconception.

At that time, though it was supposed that the First Prayer Book belonged to the second year and that the Elizabethan rubric referred to it, yet it was not understood at any rate by Bishop Cosin, who was one of those chiefly concerned in the matter, as referring exclusively and solely to the First English Book, for he notes that the Ornaments referred to as having the authority of Parliament are those covered (a) by the injunctions of 1547; (b) by the Act which confirmed the First Liturgy of Edward VI.; and (c) “those ornaments of the Church which by former laws, not then abrogated, were in use by virtue of the Statute 25 Hen. VIII.”

“And for them,” he adds, “the Provincial Constitutions are to be consulted, such as have not been repealed standing then in the second year of King Edward VI., and being still in force by virtue of this rubric and Act of Parliament.”²⁶

It was no doubt on such grounds as these that Cosin based his own use of Incense and his apparent approbation of ceremonial censuring.²⁷ His testimony is first-class evidence as to the intention of the Revisers of 1662. So that at both the crucial dates there is proof that the rubric was held to refer to the true second year, and not to the First Prayer Book exclusively.²⁸

(ii) But whether the reference to the second year means the second year, or whether it refers to the First Prayer Book, is immaterial to the present argument.

There is no doubt that Incense was used in the accustomed manner in the second year of Edward VI. There is no reasonable doubt that it was so used under the First Prayer Book. There is not a word in Edward VI.’s First Prayer Book to the effect that Incense shall not be used as heretofore.

Had the intention been to prohibit it, there would have been a prohibitory rubric, such, for example, as is found in the Order for Mattins: –

“Then shall be said or sung *without any Invitatory* this Psalm, ‘Venite Exultemus.’ etc., in English.”

or, such as that occurring in the Communion Office of the Prayer Book of 1549, but omitted in 1552 and in all subsequent revisions where the following clear prohibition is made:–

“These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, *without any elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people.*”

or, again, in the end of the Communion, where we find: –

“It is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be *without all* manner of print.”

Sir Robert Phillimore categorically affirms²⁹ that Incense was used under the First Prayer Book, and if he affirms that only its “*inert use is now legal*” it is to be observed (1) that the point was not made before him that the censer was an ornament within the Ornaments Rubric: if it had been, it is to be presumed from his conclusion about Lights that he would have pronounced the accustomed use of the censer lawful; (2) that he produces no ecclesiastical authority for any use of Incense other than the *accustomed use*, which is the use as prescribed in the old Service Books. Now the use of Incense in the accustomed manner is, I submit, not an additional ceremony, but an adjunct to the ceremonies prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.³⁰ Therefore his negative argument falls, while his positive affirmation and argument in favour of Incense stand.

In any case it is impossible to prove that Incense was *not* used, and in such a matter the larger rather than the narrower interpretation is obviously the just one. I submit that existing liberty should not be curtailed, in regard to a practice which can claim such high authority as the use of Incense can claim, in Holy Scripture and elsewhere, by a narrower interpretation of the rubrics. when a larger one is possible.

V. Further it is clear that censers are among the ornaments covered by the rubric as having the legal authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., and they were presumably in use under the Prayer Book of 1549. It will be said here, perhaps, that censers were called in afterwards, and that this proves that their use was not contemplated. The fact is not correctly stated; all the church plate, not merely censers, was called in in 1552, but this was done with the simple object of replenishing the King’s exchequer, and not as an ecclesiastical matter.³¹ It is evident from the inventories of the Church goods which were taken prior to their confiscation by the Privy Council in 1552-3 that a large number of censers were then remaining, not only in cathedral and collegiate churches, but also in parish churches throughout the length and breadth of England, despite the constant sales of ornaments that had been going on since 1547. Thus an analysis of the goods found in 1,402 churches, distributed over twelve counties, and, many of them poorly furnished, shows that censers are noted as having been retained in 378, or 27 per cent., while they are recorded to have been sold in only 41 cases, or barely 3 per cent.³²

In Mary’s reign little was done to supply new censers, but these were retained sometimes in use in the early years of Elizabeth. Many were later sold or destroyed, but by no proper authority; and there is evidence of some being retained even after the period of robbery and destruction.³³ It would not, in itself, follow that because an ornament survived, therefore the use of it was justified. But the case is very different if the ministrations to which it was formerly attached is prescribed by the Prayer Book, and this is distinctly the case in regard to a censer and the purposes for which it was used. There is no evidence of any intention to divorce such ministrations from the ornaments proper to them, but every evidence of the intention to keep them together.

The Approach to the Altar, the Gospel, the Offertory, and the *Magnificat* are all ministrations prescribed by the Prayer Book. They are all ministrations at which a censer and Incense were accustomed to be used.

Not only on the strength of the rubrics themselves, but on the interpretation put on those rubrics by Dr. Lushington, in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*, a censer is an ornament the accustomed use of which is sanctioned by the Book of Common Prayer now.

But the accustomed use of a censer includes the censuring of persons and things, and, in default of any prohibition and of any fresh directions, it must be assumed that the ornament, when (as the rubric directs) it is retained and in use, should be used in the old way.

VI. Further, it is possible to point to a long catena of evidence that in some form or other Incense and censers have been retained and been in use continuously down to the present day. The value of such a catena was recognized in the Lincoln judgment as evidence in favour of Altar Lights.³⁴

The solemn ceremonial offering of Incense at the Eucharist on behalf of the Sovereign at the Epiphany is probably the most continuous use, though by no means the strongest piece of evidence for the purpose of the present argument. Episcopal authority may be quoted for the use of Incense and censers in Divine worship. In Bishop Andrewes' chapel the ornaments included "a triquertral censer wherein the clerk putteth frankincense at the reading of the First Lesson." It is recorded, in regard to a church consecrated at Wolverhampton in 1635 – "and so they went into the chancel where was Incense burned." The use of Incense by Bishop Cosin links the Church of Charles I.'s time to the Church of the Restoration, and is all the more noteworthy because the Bishop approved of ceremonial censuring.

In the form for the Consecration of a Church used by Archbishop Sancroft in 1685, the following passage is found: – "When a censer is presented and received they (the chaplains) say, While the King sitteth at his table, my spikenard sendeth forth the smell thereof. Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the Incense."

Earlier than this, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, the provision of fire for the offering of Incense on feast days was considered to be still a part of the duty of the parish clerk. The accounts of Churchwardens give evidence of the purchase of Incense from Elizabethan times down to the latter half of the last century.

The censers and ships for Incense are known to have been retained in the chapels of Elizabeth and Charles I., and not only there, but they were in use in parish churches as well, for otherwise there would be no meaning in such an indenture as that entered into between the Mayor of Bodmin and the Churchwardens of the Parish Church in 1566, for censers and Incense to be in perpetual use. The indenture records that "This Indenture made at Bodmin the Sunday after the feast of St. Michael the Archangel in the eighth year of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth witnesseth that the wardens and their successors wardens, hath taken and received into their hands and keeping of the Mayor and of the whole Parish aforesaid to be used and occupied to the honour of God in the same church from the day and year aforesaid forthward all such goods and ornaments as followeth." These include a ship of tin, and a censer of latten. Others were a lamp before the High Altar, a sacring bell, two Lent cloths for the Communion table, vestments – green and white, and one whole suit of blue with a vestment and copes for Good Friday.

At Ely the evidence for the use of Incense down to the last quarter of the last century is considerable: two lines of proof converge to support the statement that the Rev. W. Metcalfe, in acting as deacon in the cathedral, used to swing the vessel containing the Incense, and that it was given up in the time of Dr. Green – *i.e.*, between 1778 and 1780; the details are not altogether clear, but at least it is certain that bundles of bills for incense twice a year between 1798 and 1747, exist at Ely among the papers in the possession of the Dean and Chapter.

No doubt Incense was used, as in the case of George Herbert at Bemerton, for perfuming the church at great festivals, or for meeting the Bishop, as at St. Nicholas', Durham, or in processions, as at Coronations. At the Coronation of George III., after the children of the Chapel Royal, in surplices with scarlet mantles over them, came the choir of Westminster in surplices, and then side by side the King's Organ Blower in a scarlet coat with a silver-gilt badge on his left breast, the King's Groom of the Vestry in a scarlet dress, holding a perfuming pan.³⁵

There is a constant and continuous witness to such use,³⁶ it grows continually by fresh research, and its value has not yet been fully appreciated. In the first place it shows that Incense was not held to be forbidden. Secondly, the fact that it was so used, and not always in the traditional way, merely shows that the traditional use had, in some places, been forgotten; it does not show that it had ever been forbidden, and still less does it authorize the irregular uses of incense which were adopted in ignorance of the true traditional use.

VI. If, somewhat to shift the ground; it be said that the disuse of Incense in the traditional manner is the best proof that such disuse was intended by the changes made in the 16th Century, it may be replied (1) that, in view of the history of the Church of England, such an argument is worthless; (2) that, even if it be admitted, it proves too much. The Vestments are distinctly prescribed by the rubric; much less evidence, however, can be adduced for the use of the chasuble than for that of Incense.

It has shared the fate of much else that was distinctly prescribed or implicitly covered by the rubrics, or that was of traditional observance in the Church. After lingering on here and there up to the end of the sixteenth century, and recovering somewhat of its right place, during the Caroline revival, the use of Incense well nigh totally disappeared under the influx of Puritanism, which overspread the Church in Elizabeth's reign, and all but destroyed it during the reign of Charles I. and the Commonwealth; hence it survived into the Restoration era and the dreary Georgian period only in a sporadic and unauthorised manner. As the result of this history a Puritan evasion of the rubrics in regard to this and similar matters has become general, and, regardless of the verdict which with no uncertain voice history has passed about such matters again and again during the past half century, those of the clergy and laity who honestly seek to revive the accustomed and prescribed ceremonial of the Church of England are once again denounced as disloyal and lawbreakers.

I appeal to your grace not only on behalf of myself and my people but also on behalf of all loyal and conscientious churchmen to see that justice is done to us in this matter.

VII. To pass from the consideration of the enactments of the Church to those of the State, it is not without significance that among the Injunctions of Edward VI. (grant-

ing for the sake of argument that these have parliamentary authority) there is one which involved a prohibition of the ceasing of images, but forbad no other kind of censing.³⁷ The value of this argument will be seen from the analogous injunction concerning Lights to be burnt before images. In regard to Lights, the Injunctions put out in Henry VIII.'s reign had limited such lights to "the light that commonly goeth across the church by the rood loft, the light before the Sacrament of the Altar and the light about the Sepulchre."³⁸ The Injunctions put out by Edward VI., which shortly preceded the Order for Communion in both kinds, still further limit those lights by confining them to the "two lights upon the High Altar before the Sacrament" to signify "that Christ is the very true Light of the world."³⁹ No further limitation, however, is imposed on the use of Incense beyond what already existed. On the contrary, it was subsequently expressly declared in the Order of Communion above referred to, that none of the ceremonies usual at Mass were to be varied. The Injunctions, therefore, did not prohibit the use of Incense in the accustomed way at the services, and there is nothing else in the way of legal enactment, with the exception of the Act of Uniformity legalising the Prayer Book, which can be supposed even indirectly to touch on the subject.

The Council during Edward's reign, and individual Bishops constantly interfered with the manner of performing Divine Service and the ornaments of the Church and Minister. Bishop Ridley's breaking down the Altars in the Diocese of London, while the First Prayer Book was in legal use, is a case in point, but even here there is no sign of any interference with the use of Incense,⁴⁰ no doubt because on Scriptural grounds no objection could be raised to it; and if there were, such action was outside the exercise of any proper ecclesiastical or legal authority, and cannot be cited as evidence of what the Church of England as such allowed or forbad.

VIII. In addition to the historical and legal argument, I am anxious to bring forward certain considerations which; though they have not, in the eyes of the historian or lawyer, the same formal value as the foregoing, have yet, I submit, an important bearing on the case. In any question with regard to external observances in Divine worship it is important to consider their practical value to the *devout and instructed* worshipper. Observances which are historically and legally unexceptionable may yet be unedifying; and therefore, though my main argument is on the question of legality, and not of expediency, I am anxious to point out that the use of incense is not merely legal but also edifying. As a piece of symbolism it stands less in need of defence than any symbolical usage of the Church. In many cases the symbolical value of a thing is only an afterthought, grafted on to it after it has on other grounds come into use: this is no less true of the ordinary symbolism of everyday manners and customs than of Christian services. But incense has for thousands of years been employed in the worship of God, and always from the first with the same symbolical meaning attached to it. It has an import familiar to every reader of the Bible, and not open to any danger of misconception. Its value is best estimated by the universality of its use throughout all branches of Christendom, and by the place which it has won in the hearts of Anglican Churchmen in those churches where during the last forty years its use has been revived, both in England and elsewhere.

IX. On a review of the whole case I respectfully submit that there is nothing to show that the Church of England by the changes for which she was responsible in the

Sixteenth Century, intended to prohibit the use of Incense in the accustomed manner in the performance of Divine worship, or did so prohibit it.

That, though it may not be possible to prove the fact of its use under the Prayer Book of 1549, there is every reason to believe that it was so used. That it certainly was so used in the second year of Edward, to which on any strict construction of the rubrics the reference is made. That there is continuous witness down to the reign of George the Third, if not later, that English Divines did not believe its use to be forbidden, even if it cannot be denied that they sometimes used it, not in the accustomed manner, but in some way for which no authority can be cited, and which cannot be legally justified.

That if in any case there be a doubt as to what is covered by the rubrics, such doubt ought and must be determined, in accordance with one of the fundamental principles of the Church of England, by a reference to what is the practice of the whole Catholic Church; that loyalty to the Church of England makes it impossible to argue as to what is enjoined by or permitted under the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer on such propositions as the following: – “By necessary implication a rubric must be construed as abolishing what it does not retain.” “All acts not prescribed . . . to be taken as forbidden”; that in a case like the present no narrow provincial or insular discussion of the question can be satisfactory in view of the sanction given to the use of Incense in the Old and New Testaments, and by the practice of the whole Church from early times.

That the symbolism of Incense is at once Biblical, luminous and edifying, incapable of misunderstanding and naturally congenial to a devout and unprejudiced Christian mind; and that for these and other similar reasons it cannot be held that any ecclesiastical offence has been committed by using and permitting the use of Incense according to the accustomed manner in the Church of St. Cuthbert; and I therefore pray the protection of the Archbishop, both for myself and my people.

B.

In regard to the use of Lights in procession I have not much to add. It is clear that a large part of what has been urged already with regard to Incense is applicable here also *mutatis mutandis*. There is no question that they were in use in the second year of Edward VI., and this use can be traced back unchanged to the earliest date at which it is possible to get any full information as to the ceremonial of the Western Church. The candlesticks equally with the censer are ornaments covered by the Ornaments Rubric. The Edwardine Injunctions, while they abolished certain stationary Lights, did not touch the accustomed use of portable Lights; so that even supposing for the moment that these Injunctions had parliamentary authority and so had a bearing on the rubric, the argument for Processional Lights is not affected, thereby. It has already been argued that the use of Incense is not an additional ceremony, and the same argument applies with even greater force to the Lights, which are merely carried.

In view of the long disuse, I do not ask for any pronouncement which should enforce the use of Incense or Processional Lights on others, or seem to blame them for not using them; but I would ask for a statement to the effect that I am breaking no law of the Church, by such use of Incense and Lights as prevails in St. Cuthbert’s Church, and has for years been appreciated by my people. I would add that as long as perfectly distinct

and definite rubrics are not enforced, and practices contrary to the custom, and rule of the whole Church, such, for example, as Evening Communion, are allowed, it would be a gross violation of justice to attempt to enforce a disputed interpretation of the rubrics on one section of the Church, and this more especially in view of the fact that the agitation against the practices in question is due to the action of those who egregiously disregard Church law themselves.

I subjoin a legal argument and several appendices, and, while bowing with all respect to your Grace's authority, I must conclude by urging once more that the Synod of the Province, which determined the rubrics in the first instance, is the only power which can finally and conclusively determine beyond all controversy, whether the use of Incense in the old accustomed manner, and in accordance with the use of the whole Church, is, or is not, to be permitted in this Church of England.

NOTES

¹ For the History of the use of Church, see Appendix A.

² See Appendix B.

³ See Appendix C.

⁴ As well as on other occasions at the Service of Nocturns.

⁵ Canon XXX.

⁶ Preface to the Prayer Book.

⁷ *Burghley State Papers* (1542-1570). Ed. S. Haynes (1740), p. 591.

⁸ *An Accompt. of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both Perswasions, &c.* . . London, 1661. Esp. pp. 31, 42.

⁹ See Appendix D.

¹⁰ See Appendix D.

¹¹ Bucer, writing from Lambeth, April 26, 1549, speaks of "the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the use of candles, &c.," as being retained. (*Orig. Lett.* ii. 535.)

¹² *Orig. Letters*, Parker Society, p. 72.

¹³ *Orig. Letters*, p. 79.

¹⁴ Council Book in Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* II., p. 372 (i. 236).

¹⁵ Dixon's "History of the Church of England" vol. iii., p. 291.

¹⁶ Similarly ceremonies not mentioned in Edward's Ordinal were retained in practice. John Burcher, writing to Bullinger, Nov. 21, 1550, says, "Hooper claims to be inaugurated only by the imposition of hands; the Bishop (Ridley) contends, on the contrary, that he must submit to Popish ceremonies or at least to those agreeing with the Popish doctrine, namely, that he must carry the Bible on his shoulders, and put on a white vestment, and that thus habited and bearing the book *he is to turn himself round three times* (*Orig. Letter*, p. 673). The same to the same, June 8, 1550, Hooper "could not allow himself with a good conscience to be consecrated with the vestments and *tonsure* of the Papacy, which is not yet abolished in the case of Bishops. They allowed the tonsure to be dispensed with, but he must put on the white linen robe when he goes to Parliament." *Ibid*, p. 665.

¹⁷ Grueber, *Three Recent Decisions* (1875), p 21, from *A Parte of a Register*, pp. 105-111.

¹⁸ He has been much confused with another R. Johnson, Archdeacon of Leicester. See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

¹⁹ For the acceptance of other traditional usages not specified in the rubrics see also the case of Sir Francis Gawdy, and that of Eliza Shipden, before the Court of King's Bench in the reign of James I. They are printed in Appendix E.

²⁰ See Appendix D.

²¹ *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 15 (Alcuin Club, 1897).

²² The mere style of reference proves the same: no Act of Parliament ever could have referred to another Act of Parliament in so cumbrous and ambiguous a fashion.

²³ It was issued by Royal Proclamation on the "deliberate advice" "after long conference together" of sundry "most grave and well learned prelates" (see the Council's letter in Wilkins' *Concilia*, iv. 32).

²⁴ *Parker Corr.*, p. 65.

²⁵ *Accompt. of all the proceedings, &c.*, pp. 13, 83.

²⁶ Cosin, *Works*, v., 439.

²⁷ Bene B Lutherus in formula Missae sive communionis quam Wittenburgensi ecclesiae anno superioris saeculi vicesimo tertio prescripsit "Nec candelas (inquit) nec thurificationem prohibemus, sed nec exigimus: esto liberum." *ib.*, 232.

²⁸ In Services additional to the Prayer Book without doubt ceremonies and ornaments not provided for by the First English Book were used after 1559. The Maundy Services and the Coronation Services are cases in point. A description is extant of Queen Elizabeth's Maundy as performed at Greenwich, March 19, 1572-3. The use of Holy Water and of the Sign of the Cross will be noted. The description is due to the lawyer and antiquarian William Lambarde, and it is printed as his in J. Nicholls *The Progress of Queen Elizabeth*, i. 327 (London. 1823); cp. also, p. 83 for the Maundy in 1559-60, and Add. MS. 5.832 f. 219 for the year 1595.

"First the hall was prepared with a long table on each side, and forms set by them, on the edges of which tables, and under those forms, were laid carpets and cushions for her Majesty to kneel when she should wash them. There was also another table laid across the upper end of the hall, somewhat above the foot pace for the chaplain to stand at. A little beneath the midst whereof, and beneath the (said) footpace, a stool and cushion of estate was pitched for her Majesty to kneel at during the service time. This done, the holy water basons, alms, and other things being brought into the hall, and the chapelan and poor folks having taken the said places, the Yeoman of the laundry, armed with a fair towel, and taking a silver basin filled with warm water and sweet flowers, washed their feet all after one another, and wiped the same with his towel and so making a cross a little above the toes, kissed them. After him within a little while followed the sub-almoner doing likewise, and after him the almoner himself also. Then lastly her Majesty came into the hall, and after some singing and prayers made, and the Gospel of Christ's washing of His disciples' feet read, thirty-nine ladies and gentlemen (for so many were the poor folks, according to the number of the years complete of her Majesty's age) addressed themselves with aprons and towels to wait upon her Majesty; and she, kneeling down upon the cushions and carpets under the feet of the poor women, first washed one foot of every one of them in so many several basins of warm water and sweet flowers,

brought to her severally by the said ladies and gentlemen, then wiped, crossed, and kissed them as the almoner and others had done before. When her Majesty had thus gone through the whole number of thirty-nine, of which twenty sat on one side of the hall, and nineteen on the other, she resorted to the first again and gave to each one certain yards of broadcloth, to make a gown, (so passing to them all). Thirdly, she began at the first and gave to each of them a pair of shoes. Fourthly, to each of them a wooden platter, wherein was half a side of salmon, as much hng. six red herrings, and cheat [manchet] loaves of bread. Fifthly, she began with the first again, and gave to each of them a white wooden dish with claret wine. Sixthly, she received of each waiting lady and gentlewoman their towel and apron, and gave to each poor woman one of the same; after this the ladies and gentlewomen waited no longer nor served as they had done throughout the courses before. But then the treasurer of the chamber (Mr. Hennage) came to her Majesty with thirty-nine small white purses, wherein were also thirty-nine pence (as they say), after the number of years to her Majesty's said age, and of him she received and distributed them severally. Which done, she received of him so many leather purses also, each containing twenty shillings, for the redemption of her Majesty's gown, which (as men say) by ancient order she ought to give some of them at her pleasure; but she, to avoid the trouble of suit, which accustomedly was made for that preferment, had changed that reward into money, to be equally divided amongst them all, namely, twenty shillings apiece, and she also delivered particularly to the whole company. And so taking her ease upon the cushion of state, and hearing the choir a little while, her Majesty withdrew herself, and the company departed: for it was by that time the sun was setting."

After the Stuart Kings the washing of Feet at the Royal Maundy seems not to have been performed by the Sovereign in person, but deputed to the Lord Almoner, and as such the Archbishop of York performed it in the Palace of Whitehall as late as 1731. (Feasey, *Ancient Holy Week Ceremonial*, p. 111.)

²⁹ See *Martin v. Mackonochie*. 2. Law Reports (Adm, and Eccl.) p. 15 anno, 1868.

³⁰ See the argument in Appendix F.

³¹ The greater number of the censers were confiscated with other plate, in accordance with a decree passed by the Privy Council on 31d March, 1550 [1550-1],

"that forasmuche as the Kinge's Majestie had neede presently of a masse of mooney, therfore Commissions shulde be addressed into all shires of Englande to take into the Kinge's handes suche church plate as remaineth, to be employed unto his Highnes use," (*Acts of the Privy Council of England*, edited by John Roche Dasent, New Series, vol. iii., A.D. 1550-1552, p. 225. London, 1891.)

³² See Appendix G.

³³ The Inventory of Church ornaments remaining in Lincolnshire churches in 1566 is printed in Peacock's *English Church Furniture* (1866). Among the ornaments which were not then defaced or confiscated are vestments, copes, albs, sacring bells, censers, rochets for the clerk, candlesticks, crosses, &c. For censers remaining see pp. 53., 92. In other Elizabethan inventories the censers are also included. For example: –

"An inventory of all the church ornaments remaynyng in the vestry of the Church of Wymondhm. taken by Stephen Vardon, Willm. Kett, John Neve, Thoms. Wysemn., churchwardens, the first daye of December Anno Dom. 1564 & comytted to the custody & charge of John Powle then parisse clarke except

such ornaments as be layed into the cheast which be then accordyngly named as appereth.

Imprimis. One vestment of redd velvett embrodered with imagery of gold fared into the cheast.

Itm One other like vestmentte,” &c., &c., &c.

* * * * *

Itm One shippe of tyne and censer of latten.

Visitors Guide to Wymondham. (Robert Forster, Church Street, Wymondham, 1853.)

1559. 28 Nov. Inventory of Poole, Dorset.

One peace of vestments of satten of Brydges and one cope of the same.

One crosse, one peare of sensers and one shippe of brasse, &c., &c., &c., &c.

The administration of the sacraments are decently preparyd for accordyng to the boke of comon prayer and the quene’s maties, injuncions.

(Hutchins, *Hist. of Dorset*, i., 58.)

1560, at Chelmsford, Essex,

an old shype for franckensence, a latten senser.

1567-8, at St. Edmunds Sarum,

a pere of sansars of lattyn were sold this year.

³⁴ For details see Appendix H.

³⁵ Parallel to the use of Incense is the use of other ornaments, which equally are not mentioned by the First Prayer Book, or which were used in ways other than those specified by that book. The Houselling Cloth has been in continuous use at Wimborne down to the present time: it was used by Queen Elizabeth on Christmas Day, 1565 (Nicholls’ *Progresses*, i., 199); it was provided for use in Prince Charles’s Chapel when he went to Spain (see the King’s instructions in Collier, ii., p. 726); its use has in this century been restored in a few churches, and without being questioned. Copes are prescribed by the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. only in connexion with the celebration of Holy Communion, but at Westminster in the time of Archbishop Williams they were worn by the singing-men. At the *Te Deum*, followed by Evensong, in King’s College, Cambridge, at which Queen Elizabeth assisted in 1564, the Provost and Company of that House (College) were all vested in copes (Nicholls’ *Progresses*, i., 163). Numerous other examples might be given. If the Bishop’s pastoral staff may be ceremonially used in the accustomed manner, let it be remembered that the use of Incense stands on exactly the same ground. The authority for the crosses borne before the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and for Bishops’ mitres, is equally good for censers; for it is to be noted that the latter have no authorization unless the ornaments rubric legalizes ornaments beyond those expressly mentioned in the First Prayer Book. The verge of the vergers is not mentioned in the Prayer Book; and the ceremonial observances used by vergers especially in cathedrals, e.g., in escorting the reader to the lectern or the preacher to the pulpit, rests upon no authority but that of custom: the idea which underlies it is that of doing honour to the person escorted, and this is also *part* of the idea which underlies the censuring of persons, though in this case there is further a devotional aspect to recommend and justify the practice.

³⁶ See Appendix H.

³⁷ This follows upon the line of Henry VIII.'s "Articles to stablish Christian quietness" of 1536. See C. Lloyd's *Formularies of Faith*, p. xxviii. (Oxford, 1825). Censing is not there mentioned among the general "Rites and Ceremonies," but only in this connexion by the way. It is not mentioned in the later Book of Ceremonies (printed by Collier, *Hist.*, Pt. II., Book iii., 191-198) among the "Ceremonies used in the Mass." This to a certain extent follows the line of the "Articles," but it aims more at explaining the rite than the ceremonies of the Mass; and those ceremonies of which it treats are the exceptional ones of Candlemas, Holy Week, and the like, rather than the unchanging ceremonial of the Mass. This omission of all reference to censing at the Mass is an interesting commentary on the similar absence of all reference to it in the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

³⁸ Crumwell's Injunctions of 1538, § 7. Gee and Hardy, *Documents*. p. 277.

³⁹ Edwardine Injunctions, § 3. Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i., 7.

⁴⁰ See Appendix J.

OUTLINE OF LEGAL ARGUMENTS.

The use of Incense as an accompaniment of worship is of great antiquity, and common to many religions other than the Jewish and Christian religions – *e.g.*, those of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Buddhists, and Hindus. ¹ Its use, it is submitted, in Divine worship is in entire accordance with Holy Scripture, ² and, indeed, it would be difficult to name any adjunct of worship for which more direct authority can be found in the Bible.

The purpose of its use appears to have been twofold – (1) for fumigation and sanitary reasons (probably the earliest use); whence it came to signify the purification of persons and things engaged or used in worship; (2) as an offering to God, and in the Jewish and Christian Churches specially symbolising prayer, or perhaps, in Christian times more particularly, the intercession of Christ which makes prayer acceptable. It is submitted that its use for both these purposes is lawful in the Church of England under the Ornaments Rubric, and that censers (implying necessarily the use of incense) were “retained and in use . . . in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.”

Prima facie, the words “second year” would seem to refer to the things in use in the second regnal year of Edward, which ended on the 27th January, 1549, and although it was decided in *Westerton v. Liddell* that the ornaments referred to were the ornaments retained and in use under the First Prayer Book, and the Act 2 and 3 Ed. vi., c. 1, which gave that book legal effect, it is to be noted that when that case was decided it had not been pointed out, ³ as it since has been, that the Act, although it passed both Houses in the second year, did not receive the Royal assent, and so become law, until the third year of Edward, *viz.*, on the 14th March, 1549, it being provided by the Act itself that the Book should come into use on Whitsun Day, which that year fell on the 9th June, or if it might be had sooner, three weeks after a copy had been procured. ⁴ Now it is submitted that there can be no doubt that censers and incense had been in use in the Church of England down, at all events, to the end of the second regnal year of Edward VI., as they had been before he came to the throne; for the only alteration which had been made on this head ⁵ was that made by Item 3 of the Injunctions of Edward VI., which ordered the removal of such images as were known “to be or have been abused . . . or shall be hereafter censed unto.” This provision would seem to have forbidden the censuring of such images, and at all events would have attained the same end by making the censuring of them a cause for their removal, but in no wise interfered with the use of incense in the accustomed manner; except as to the censuring of these particular images. If, therefore, the reference in the Rubric is to the second regnal year, apart from the Statute 2 and 3 Edward VI., c. I., it is claimed that censers and incense were for the reasons above indicated retained, and in use, in the Church of England. Whatever the exact legal force of the Injunctions of Edward may be, they are at least useful as evidence of the then existing practice, and the alterations intended to be effected in that practice. Further, these ornaments were retained and in use in the second year by the authority of Parliament – *viz.*, under 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, s. 7, which kept in force “Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals Provincial already made and not contrariant nor repugnant to the Laws, Statutes, and Customs of this Realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King’s prerogative royal.” And it was further provided that they should “still be used and executed as they were afore the making of this Act.” Thus, in Edward’s second year the use of Incense was authorized indirectly,

if not directly, by Parliament, inasmuch as Parliament had not only not forbidden it, but had expressly retained the old order and the authority of the Ecclesiastical laws and customs so far as they did not conflict with the law of the realm or hurt the royal prerogative. To say the least, the use of incense had as much Parliamentary authority in the second regnal year of Edward as any other observance of the Church.

But assuming that it is to the First Prayer Book, and the Act which gave it legal force, that reference must be made to ascertain what are the ornaments of the Church and Ministers intended by the present Ornaments Rubric, it is submitted that the use of incense is equally in accordance with law. Sir. R. Phillimore, in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (L. R. 2 Ad. and Ecc., at p. 215), gays of incense, "It certainly was in use in the Church of England in the time of King Edward the Sixth's First Prayer Book." The Reformers of 1549 intended to preserve the continuity of the Church and her Services except so far as the latter contained, or seemed to authorize, superstitious practices or mediæval accretions of erroneous doctrine, and except so far as was necessary to effect the main purpose of simplifying and reducing to order the complex and confused methods of worship which had come into use. The Statute 2 and 3 Ed. I., c. 1, in its preamble, expressly states that the Commissioners appointed to draw up the First Book would have "as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture as to the usage in the primitive Church," and the Act which established the Second Book (5 and 6 E. 6, c. 1) described the First Book as "a very Godly order set forth by authority of Parliament," and "agreeable to the Word or God and the primitive Church." Nor are there wanting in the phraseology of the First Book itself evidences that it was to be used and interpreted in accordance with ancient practice and custom, so far as the same were not incompatible with the order prescribed by the Book. For instance, the Holy Communion Service is said to be "commonly called the Mass"; the vestments prescribed by the fourth Rubric before the Holy Communion Service are described as "the vesture *appointed* for that ministration"; those prescribed for the assistant Ministers are called "the vestures *appointed* for their ministry." The same Rubric proceeds: "then shall the Clerks sing in English for the Office or Introit (*as they call it*) a psalm." In the first Rubric at the end of the same Service mention is made of "the *accustomed* blessing," and provision is made for cases "where the people hath not been *accustomed* to pay any Holy Bread," and there is an express direction that the Bread for the Communion shall be "something more larger and thicker than it was." Again, in the preface to the Order for Confirmation, that rite is stated to be "agreeable with the usage of the Church in times past." So, again, the Banns of Marriage are to be asked "in the Service time, the people being present, *after the accustomed manner*." Again, "the woman that is purified must offer her chrisom and other *accustomed* offerings." Lastly, in the Service for Ash Wednesday, "the English Litany shall be said *after the, accustomed manner*," and the 51st Psalm is to, be said "where they are *accustomed* to say the Litany." ⁶

It is submitted, therefore, that under the First Prayer Book the Service of Holy Communion continued to be celebrated with the accompaniment of incense in the accustomed manner, there being nothing in that book to forbid or alter the manner of its use, and the Injunctions of Edward, though forbidding many things, not prohibiting or limiting in any way (except the censuring of images above-mentioned) the old use. In *Westerton v. Liddell* Dr. Lushington speaks of "the irresistible argument, that the last Statute of Uniformity, by referring to the First Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., excluded not

only the Second Book of Common Prayer, but everything else effected in the interval between 1549 and 1662, whether by Act of Parliament or by Canon, which could or might have altered what existed in 1549.”⁷ But, as a matter of fact, what was done in 1558-9 by Elizabeth’s Act of Uniformity, and re-enacted by the present Ornaments Rubric under the Caroline Act of Uniformity, was to establish those ornaments of the Church, whether worn or otherwise used by the Minister, as were used under, if not those used before, the First Book. The words of the judgment of the Privy Council in the same case on this point are very clear, and are as follows⁸: “After the overthrow of Protestantism by Queen Mary, and its restoration on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, a great controversy arose between the more violent and the more moderate Reformers as to the Church Service which should be re-established, whether it should be according to the First, or according to the Second Prayer Book of Edward the VI. The Queen was in favour of the First, but she was obliged to give way, and a compromise was made, by which the Services were to be in conformity with the Second Prayer Book, with certain alterations; but the Ornaments of the Church, whether those worn or those otherwise used by the Minister, were to be according to the First Prayer Book. In conformity with this arrangement, the Act 1 Eliz., c. 2, was passed.” And further on, speaking of the Rubric in Elizabeth’s book, “Here the term ‘ornaments’ is used as covering both the vestments of the Minister and the several articles used in the Services; it is confined to such things, as in the performance of the Services the Minister was to use.” And again, “The Rubric to the present Prayer Book adopts the language of the Statute of Elizabeth; but they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses and the same utensils, or articles, which were used under the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. may still be used.” In support of this view, a very important piece of evidence is contained in the letter written by Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, on April 30th, 1559 – two days after the passing of Elizabeth’s Act of Uniformity – and addressed to Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. This letter is to be found quoted in Cardwell’s “Conferences,” p. 36, and it is the more worthy of attention as Sandys was not himself in favour of the ornaments. Speaking of the provision in the Elizabethan, Act of Uniformity (sec. 13), he says, “The last Book of Service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King. Edward VI., until it please the Queen to take other order for them: our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them; but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen.”⁹ Notwithstanding the dishonesty of this gloss, the statement of fact is strong contemporaneous evidence of the real meaning of the compromise which was made effective by that Act.

In the Appendix will be found a collection of instances showing the existence of censers, and the use of incense, since 1549; but, in considering these, it should be noted that the Church of England has never, since that date, decreed that it shall be used in any other manner than as it had been used before that time, and it is the old use that is to be followed unless and until the Church should make fresh regulations for its use, and this although the use may have in later times varied in different places and under different surroundings.

Next, if censers are, as it is submitted they are, ornaments, they must have been retained for use, and the use of them is not an additional ceremony, but is either not a ceremony at all but only a subsidiary detail of the act of worship or entire ceremony composing the Service in which it is used, or, if a ceremony, is one allowed, if not prescribed,

by the Rubric and Statute as above construed, and therefore not a ceremony additional to or other than those provided for by the Statutes of Uniformity and the present book. Moreover, the use of incense, if the above argument is correct, has statutory authority; for the Ornaments Rubric has the force of a Statute, being part of a book prescribed by and incorporated into the Act of Uniformity (14, Car. 2, c. 4, s. 1) and annexed thereto. Now a Statute loses none of its validity by disuse. A familiar illustration of the principle that the effect of a Statute cannot be lost by disuse is the case of Wager of Battle.¹⁰ Long continued desuetude of a Statute may be a very cogent, and perhaps a conclusive, argument against enforcing obedience to its provisions. It cannot make that unlawful which the Statute either enjoins or permits. The Civil Wars, and then the Commonwealth, and then the sleep of religious feeling under the Georges, account for disuse for a time, but afford no reason why, when the sleepers awake, they should be deprived of a form or accompaniment of worship which is innocent in itself, and to which they are impelled as their forefathers were before them. A very exhaustive answer to the argument from disuse is to be found in Sir R. Phillimore's judgment in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, L. R. 2 Ad. and Ecc., pp. 175-190.

It has sometimes been urged that what is not stated to be permitted is prohibited, and that the effect of the Acts of Uniformity and the directions contained in the Prayer Book is to exclude every ornament and every ceremony which is not the subject of express provision. If this argument were allowed to prevail, the Services of the Church could not be carried on. The compilers of the Prayer Book were well aware that there had always existed in the Church of England a large body of usage or ecclesiastical common law, which had been carefully preserved by the Statute of Henry VIII. The compilers of the Prayer Book did not intend to invalidate the whole of this usage, or to repeal the whole of the common law of the Church not expressly incorporated in the Prayer Book.

But further, it is a rule of English law laid down by Lord Coke¹¹ that "a Statute made in the affirmative without any negative, express or implied, doth not take away the common law," and Blackstone¹² says that though where the common law and a Statute differ the common law gives place to Statute, and an older Statute to a new one, yet this is to be understood only when the latter Statute is couched in negative terms, or by its matter necessarily implies a negative, but that if both acts be merely affirmative, and the substance such that both may stand together, here the latter does not repeal the former, but they shall both have a concurrent efficiency.

At the present time it is not doubted by anyone that the use of coloured altar cloths, and the cross, and credence table, and candlesticks, and turning to the East during the reading of the Creeds, and the saying of "Glory be to Thee, O Lord" before the reading of the Gospel, and the expression of thanks after it, and the use of hymns, are legal, although each would be unlawful if it were true that omission is equivalent to prohibition.

A typical illustration of the inconvenience which would arise if such an argument were sound is afforded by the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., which contained various directions concerning the administration of the Holy Communion; but no reference to "a fair linen cloth." If only that which is expressly permitted, or directed, is lawful, the use of a "fair, linen cloth" at the time of the Celebration would have been illegal in the year 1549. Other illustrations might be adduced even from the present book, but the truth is that both law and common sense require that in such a case, as in every other, not expressly provided for, the minister of the Church must look to "an unwritten use, the

foundation of a common law for the Church not less than for the State.”¹³ The real question to be determined is what was the use of the Church of England, and if the practice in question appears to have been the practice of the Church of England, and not to have been expressly or by necessary implication prohibited, liberty to restore that practice, provided that the ministrations to which it is subsidiary has been retained, is respectfully claimed.

What has been said above with regard to incense is, it is submitted, applicable also to the use of lighted candles at the reading of the Gospel and in processions. The lights which were forbidden or taken away by the Injunctions of Edward VI. were stationary and more or less permanent lights in front of statues, etc.; and the Injunctions did not interfere with the lights which at that time were part of the accustomed ritual. Luther, in his “Formula Missæ et Communionis,” written for the Church of Wittenberg in 1523, speaks of incense and candles in connection with the reading of the Gospel as follows: – “Sexto, sequitur Evangelii lectio. Ubi nec candelas neque thurificationem prohibemus, sed nec exigimus, esto hoc liberum.”

The spirit which animated Luther in framing this regulation is the spirit which also animated the Reformers of 1549, and it was their design not to forbid or interfere with the accustomed ornaments of Divine Service where those ornaments were not productive of superstitious practice or erroneous doctrine. They meant to extirpate abuses, leaving the worship of the primitive Church after such extirpation to continue as of old time, and Parliament, in establishing forms for worship in spirit and in truth in the place of perversions and delusions, intended that prohibitions sanctioned by the most grave penalties should apply to rites, ceremonies, and forms of public worship supposed to be of pernicious danger, and did not intend that the prescribed form should be construed to be a precise ceremonial with a hard and fast line, so that any addition, however minute, however indifferent in regard to the opinions then in conflict; should nullify the prescribed Form, and create thereby another Form, such as the Statute intended to prohibit. The command to do things forbids the leaving of those things undone, and where the intention of the legislature appears by legitimate construction the command to do forbids the violation of that intention. Beyond that line the command does not operate to restrict, but leaves action free. Worship is the attempt of the mortal spirit to hold converse with the Almighty Eternal, and all public worship must be for order’s sake on an agreed Form. But the Form should be construed with latitude, taking care not “in any case to restrict within narrower limits than the Law has imposed the discretion which within those limits is justly allowed to Congregations by the rules both of the Ecclesiastical and the Common Law Courts.”¹⁴

NOTES

¹ See Article in the “Encyclopædia Britannica,” title, “Incense.”

² See, for example, Exodus xxx., verses 7 and 8; Numbers xvi., verses 46-48; Malachi i., verse 11; Revelation viii., verses 3 and 4.

³ See Moore’s special report of *Westerton v. Liddell*, p. 160.

⁴ The earliest dated edition, is that of the 8th day of March in the third year of Edward.

⁵ The injunctions of 1536 and Thomas Cromwell's Injunctions of 1538 did not deal with Incense; though the latter enjoined that "preachers were to instruct their people against the ordinary superstitions of wandering on pilgrimages and offering candles and tapers to relics."

⁶ In the first Rubric at the end of the Communion Service it is provided that the Litany shall be said "after such form as is appointed by the King's Majesty's Injunctions."

⁷ Moore, pp. 31 and 32.

⁸ Moore, pp. 158 and 159.

⁹ Lambeth MSS. 959 [40].

¹⁰ See Judgment of Dr. Lushington Moore, p. 45.

¹¹ 2 Inst. 200.

¹² Blackstone's Commentaries, Introd., sec. 3, para. 7, Vol. 1., 7 Edn., p. 89.

¹³ Sir R. Phillimore, 2 Ad. and Ecc., at p. 198.

¹⁴ Moore, p. 189.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

NOTES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE

USE OF INCENSE.

I. The use of Incense in the ceremonial of the Old Covenant was very prominent. Twice daily Incense was offered on the Altar of Incense (Ex. xxx. 7, 8) which stood in the Holy Place before the Veil, and was reserved for this special purpose. On the great Day of Atonement the High Priest brought Incense into the Holy of Holies that the cloud of the Incense might cover the, mercy-seat (Lev. xvi. 12). Incense was included among the offerings made to God (Numb. vii. 14, and Ex. xxv. 6, &c.), and formed part of some of the sacrifices, especially in connexion with the meal-offering and the shewbread (Lev. ii. 1, 15; vi. 15; xxiv. 7; Mal. i. 11). Special directions were given for its composition (Ex. xxx. 34), and the use was reserved for worship (*Ib.* 37, 38), and confined to the Levitical priesthood, (Numb. xvi.), and accepted from them by way of propitiation (Numb. xvi. 46) and as symbolizing the acceptableness of prayer (Ps. cxli. 2).

All this was in full force in the time of the Incarnation: the offering of the Incense in the Temple was considered the highest honour of the priesthood: it was daily assigned by lot, and the privilege was allowed only once in a priest's lifetime. It was the day when this unique privilege fell to the lot of Zachariah that God chose as the time for sending the first immediate intimation of the coming of our Saviour. ¹

Incense was one of the significant offerings brought by the Wise Men to Our Lord (Matt. ii. 11), and from the point of view of symbolism was an offering of permanent value, for while the offering of myrrh as symbolizing Our Lord's Passion may be held to have become obsolete, this can hardly be urged about Incense, which symbolizes Our Lord's priestly intercession, any more than it can be urged about the offering of gold which we retain in the Eucharistic Offertory.

The use of Incense in Christian Worship as set forth in the Apocalypse is most definite and full, and this gives the highest Christian sanction to what might otherwise have been looked upon as one of the transient parts of Levitical ceremonial. At the Adoration of the Lamb "the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders" had "each one a harp and golden bowls full of Incense which [bowls] are the prayers of the saints" (Rev. v. 8).

At a later stage "Another angel came and stood over the Altar having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much Incense that he should add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden Altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the Incense with the prayers of the saints went up before God out of the angel's hand" (Rev. viii. 3, 4).

The witness of the Bible is then strongly in favour of a ceremonial use of Incense as symbolizing prayer, especially the mediatorial intercession of Christ, and as being in itself an offering acceptable to God.

II. In spite of the precedent set by the Jewish ceremonial and continued in the ceremonial of the Apocalypse the Christian Church in the earliest days seems to have made

little or no use of Incense as a part of liturgical worship. Athenagoras, in answer to the charge that Christians were atheists, because they offered no sacrifice replied: –

JO tou'de tou' panto;" dhmiourgo;" kai; path;r ouj dei'tai aiomato",
oujde; knivssh", oujde; th" ajpo; tw'n ajnqw'n kai; qumiamavtwn eujwdiva",
aujto;" w[n hJ teleiva eujwdiva, ajnendeh;" kai; ajprosdehv". kaivtoi
profevrein devon ajnaivmakton qusivan kai; th;n logikh;n prosavgein latreivan.
Legatio pro Christianis, § 13. Migne. P. G. vi. 916.

Similarly Tertullian, in describing Christian worship in response to a similar charge, says: –

“Illuc [in cœlum] suspicientes Christiani, manibus expansis quia innocuis, capite nudo quia non erubescimus, denique sine monitore quia de pectore oramus, precantes sumus omnes semper pro omnibus semper imperatoribus. . . . Hęc ab alio orare non possum quam a quo scio me consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat, et ego sum cui impetrare debetur, famulus eius qui ei offero opimam et maiorem hostiam, quam ipse mandavit, orationem de carne pudica non grana thuris unius assis, Arabicę arboris lacrymas, nec duas meri guttas. . . .”
Apologeticus, § xxx. Migne. P. L. i. 442-444

Again, in a string of sentences describing the Christian's avoidance of heathen ceremonies and the parallel usages which they encouraged: –

Thura plane non emimus: si Arabię queruntur, scient Sabaei pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari quam diis fumigandis.
Apologeticus § xlii. P. L. i. 493.

These passages show clearly that the Christian use of Incense in the second century was confined (so far as the evidence goes) to funerals, where it was used primarily for sanitary and not for liturgical purposes. Another passage in Tertullian bears this out, where, in defending the Christian's privilege to use rightly the things wrongly used in idol-worship, he says: –

Nam et ego mihi gallinaceum macto non minus quam Æsculapio Socrates, et, si me odor alicuius loci offenderit, Arabię aliquid incendo, sed non eodem ritu nec eodem habitu nec eodem apparatu quo agitur apud idola.
De Corona x. P. L. ii. 90.

Clement of Alexandria complains that the heathen will believe in the sanctity of the altar at Delos: –

bwmo;n de; ajlhqw" agion th;n dikaivan yuchvn, kai; to; ajp! aujth" qumivama th;n oJsivan eujch;n levgousin hJmi'n ajpisthvsousin.
Strom. vii. 6, [§ 32]. P. G. ix. 445.

And in the *Pedagogue* he argues that the heathen ceremonies, with unguents, garlands, and incense, are not for Christians: –

Eij gou'n th'" eujwdiva" to; qumivama to;n mevgan ajrciereva to;n kuvrion ajnafevrein levgoien tw'/ Qew', mh; qusivan tauvthn kai; eujwdivan qumiavmato" noouvntwn. ajlla; ga;r to; th'" ajgavph" dekho;n ajnafevrein to;n Kuvrion, th;n pneumatikh;n eujwdivan, eij" to; qusiasthrion paradecevsqwn.
Pædagogus ii. 8, [§ 67]. *P. G.* viii. 473.

Origen continued the same apologetic line in the next century: –

bwmoi; mevn eijsin hJmi'n to; eJkavstou tw'n dikaiavn hJgemoniko;n, ajf! ou\ ajnapevmpetai ajlhqw'" kai; nohtw'" eujwvdh qumiavta, aiJ proseuca; ajpo; suneidhvsew'" kaqara'". quoting Apoc. viii., and Ps. cxli.
Contra Celsum viii. 17. *P. G.* xi. 1541.

Oujdemiva suvgkrisiv" ejsti ou[te tw'n par! hJmw'n ajgalmavtwn pro;" ta; ajgavlmata tw'n ejqnw'n, ou[te tw'n par! hJmi'n bwmw'n kai;, i[n ou[tw" ojnomavsw, qumiamavtwn pro;" touv" ejkeivnwn bwmou;" kai; ta;" par! aujtoi'" knivssa" kai; aiãmata.
Ib. 20. *P. G.* xi. 1548.

Arnobius at a still later date discusses the point at length,² and argues, in reply to the heathen objector, that the use of incense among the Romans was novel, and in itself senseless and inapplicable to Divine beings. The contempt which he pours upon it, as a mere gum, is enough to prove that in his experience it was not used in Christian worship. Similar treatment is found in Lactantius.³

In the fourth century S. Austin supplies a trace of the same spirit when commenting on Ps. xlix.(l.) 14, *Immola deo sacrificium laudis*, he says: –

Securi sumus: non imus in Arabiam thus quaerere, non sarcinas avari negotiatoris excutimus: sacrificium laudis quaerit a nobis Deus.
Enarr. in ps. xlix. 21. P. L. xxxvi. 578.

Such language as this is hardly to be regarded as compatible with any widely-recognised liturgical use of Incense: it is true that it would not weigh heavily against any positive evidence of such a use⁴; but it is only during the latter period of the prevalence of such language that any such contrary evidence is forthcoming, and in the absence of any such evidence during the earlier period such passages as these can only be taken as disproving (so far as they go) the liturgical use of Incense.

Another argument in the same direction is afforded by the character of the early patristic comments on Mal. i. 11. "Though its Eucharistic reference is nearly always maintained, the allusion to Incense is either passed over in silence or explained as referring to prayer in connection with Rev. v. 8."⁵

The only conclusion to be drawn is then that the liturgical use of Incense is not attested during the first three centuries, except in so far as its use in funerals can be called

liturgical. The result is remarkable, because it might well have been expected *a priori* that the Christian Church would have followed the precedent set alike by the Old and by the New Testament.

In view of the scantiness of the evidence available about any of the liturgical customs of the first three centuries, it is open to anyone to hold that this lack of attestation is not in itself a strong argument. But, on the other hand, there is a fact ready to hand to serve as a presumptive explanation why the Christian Church should have thought best to forego the liturgical use of Incense – an explanation which is entirely in harmony with the passages from Christian writers quoted above.

Incense was intimately associated with pagan rites: the burning of incense at a tripod before a statue or a picture of the Emperor was the overt act of apostasy to which it was sought to force the Christians; to consent was to deny Christ, to refuse was equivalent to courting martyrdom. Under such circumstances it is no wonder if incense found no place in services of Christians; the wonder is that they could bring themselves, as Tertullian boasts that they could, to make any use of it whatsoever.

There are signs, also, that in the early days the Church was not greatly disposed to follow Jewish lines, and therefore the Biblical authority for incense, so far as it was drawn from Levitical ceremonial, would have told against the use of incense rather than for it. This consideration would thus strongly reinforce the repugnance to incense as a pagan ceremony.

III. On the other hand, from the time of Constantine onwards there are clear signs of the use of Incense in at any rate some parts of the Christian Church; and passages such as that quoted from St. Augustine, which *at a later date* speak against the use of incense, ought, perhaps, to be treated as merely rhetorical. The custom seems so well established, at least in Rome, early in the IVth century, that we can only conclude that at least during the later part of the IIIrd century the attitude of the Church to incense had been altering. With the decay of paganism it was ceasing to carry with it objectionable associations, and was becoming more available for Christian use. Consequently the objections which had so far prevented the Church from following on the Jewish and Biblical line were being removed in various quarters and in various degrees.

At first, however, there is very little trace to be found of its use ceremonially. The traditions were mainly those of a use at funerals, and the first step to be taken was to graft upon this utilitarian custom a symbolical and spiritual meaning; it was a very natural and easy step, since the Biblical symbolism of incense as representing acceptableness and prayer was such an obvious and clear one.

In the East the following passage in the Testament of St. Ephraim Syrus seems to show the transition from the funeral and precautionary use to the definite liturgical use.

Lay me not with sweet spices: for this honour avails me
Nor with incense and perfume: for the honour befits me not.
Burn sweet spices in the Holy Place: and me, even me, conduct to the grave with
prayers;
Give ye incense to God: and over me send up hymns
Instead of perfumes of spices: in prayer make remembrance of me.
What can goodly odour profit: to the dead who cannot perceive it?

Bring them in and burn them in the Holy Place: that they which enter may smell the savour.

Testament of St. Ephraim (tr. Gwynn),

Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, vol. xviii., 135 (1899).

The document has probably been interpolated, but, this passage has the metrical rhythm of the authentic text, and is recognized by Dr. Gwynn as genuine; it may, therefore, be taken as good evidence of the last quarter of the fourth century.

It is more difficult to estimate two other valuable pieces of evidence. A passage in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which occurs in the second book, speaks thus: –

αια te ch'rai kai; ojrfanoi uJmw'n ei;" tuvpon tou' qusiasthrivou
lelogivsqwsan uJmi'n, αια te parqevnoi eij" tuvpon tou' qumiathrivou
tetimhvsqwsan kai; tou' qumiavmato".

Ap. Const. ii. 26; for similar comparisons see iii. 6 & iv. 3.

A comparison, such as this is no mere mystical or rhetorical passage, but shows evidently that it was addressed to people who were familiar with the use of incense in their worship. But it is significant that while the first part of the comparison is ancient, being part of the *Didaskalia* – the early IIIrd century document which forms the groundwork of the *Apostolic Constitutions* – the second part, which concerns Incense, belongs to the writer who compiled the *Apostolic Constitutions* at the end of the IVth century. This evidence, then, belongs to the later date.⁶

The third of the *Apostolic Canons* mentions incense with oil as among the things which were to be accepted as offerings at the offertory.

Mh; ejxo;n de; e[stw prosavgesqaiv ti eαteron to; qusiasthvrion h] e[laion
eij" th;n licnivan kai; qumivama tw' / kairw' / th'" aJgia" prosfora".

Bruns *Canones* i. 1.

This Canon cannot be traced to any early source, and is probably due to the hand which compiled both *Apostolic Canons* and *Apostolic Constitutions* towards the end of the fourth century. Its main interest lies in the fact that it connects the Incense with the oil for the lamp. This seems to point to a liturgical and not a mere funereal use. The Western evidence would lead one to suppose that it was to be burnt in a hanging censer, to perfume the church and symbolize prayer, just as the oil was burnt in a hanging lamp, both for symbolical purposes and for actual lighting; but there is no Eastern evidence forthcoming at this date of such a practice.⁷

A curious commentary is moreover supplied by a passage in Constantine's Oration to the Assembly of the Saints, where he says: –

Kai; toiauvth ti" eujcaristiva" qusiva toi" ajndravsin ajpotelei'tai, ααgnh
mevn αιαmato" ααgnh de; pavsh" biva". oujde; mh;n ojsmh; libavwn
ejpipoqei'tai oujde; purkai;a;, kaqaro;n de; fw'", o[son ejaxarkev sai pro;"
e[klamyin toi" eujcomevno".

This might be interpreted as a Christian disclaimer of incense were it not known that it certainly was used at any rate in some places at this time and that Constantine himself was familiar with it, for his benefactions at Rome (to be noted later on) prove this beyond any vestige of doubt. In the East such evidence as is forthcoming is not very conclusive.

Eusebius, in his panegyric delivered at Tyre in 312, has a passage on the use of Incense, which is certainly figurative, but which may perhaps refer to some actual use of Incense: –

Semno;n de; kai; mevga kai; monogene;” quasiasthvrion poi'on a[n ei[h h[th” tou' koinou' pavntwn iJerevw” th” yuch” to; ejlikrine;” kai; aJgivwn aagion; wβ/ parevstw” ejpi; dexia'/ oJ mevga” tw'n oalwn ajrciereu;” aujto;” @Ihsou” oJ monogenh;” tou' Qeou', to; para; pavntwn eujw'de” qumivama kai; ta;” di! eujcw'n ajnaivmou” kai; ajvvlou” qusiva” faidrw'/ tw'/ blevmmati kai; uJptivai” uJpodecovmeno” cersi; tw'/ kat! oujrano;n Patri; kai; Qew'/ tw'n oalwn parapevmpetai, prw'to” aujto;” proskunw'n kai; movno” tw'/ Patri; to kat! ajxivan ajponevmwn sevba”, ei'ta de; kai; pa'sin hJmi'n eujmenh' diamevnein kai; dexio;n eij” ajei; paraitou'meno”.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. x. 4, § 68.

The same writer, in describing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and other Churches founded by Constantine and Helena, makes no distinct mention of incense or censer,⁸ and if such passages as the above stood alone they would not be a very strong argument for the use of incense; but as it is, in view of the more detailed evidence available as to Constantine's foundations at Rome, they have their value.

When a metaphorical passage appears in Origen, and he argues that pride in the case of priests causes that –

De altari domini quod deberet incensi suavitate fragrare odor teterrimus superbiæ et elationis renidet.

Origen, Homil. in libr. Judic. iii. 2. P. G. xii. 693.

it is unsafe to build upon the passage, because we have no other witness to the use of Incense in the IIIrd century. Further, in subsequent periods similar passages are not uncommon where the use and terminology of the Jewish worship are mystically applied to Christian worship – for example, the following: –

katebavllonto men oi'koi proseuch” uJpo; ceirw'n ajnosivwn, ajnetrevpeto de; quasiasthvria, kai; oujk h'n prosfora;, oujde; qumivama ouj tovpo” tou' karpw'sai.

St. Basil, Homilia in Gordium Martyrem, § 2. P. G. xxxi. 496.

and it is difficult in such cases to say whether there is any real reference to the use of Incense or not.

Again, the well-known words of Hosius to Constantine are no doubt to be taken in direct reference to the presumption of King Uzziah, as narrated in 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, and it is questionable how far they have a bearing upon the Christian use of Incense.

Ou[te toivnun hJmi'n a[rcein ejpi; th'' gh'' e[xestin, ou[te su; tou' qumia'/n ejxousivan e[cei''.

Athanasius. *Hist. Arian.* 44. P. G. xxv. 745.

Another passage which is often quoted with confidence on behalf of the early use of Incense is of similarly doubtful value.

penqou'si de; kai; aiJ ejkklhsivai pevnqo'' mevga, diovti ou[te profora; ou[te qumivama ejktelei'tai, ou[te latreiva qeavresto''.

Pseudo-Hippolytus *De consummatione mundi.* xxxiv
Berlin Patrol. i. 303.

It is very probable that the date of this is no earlier than the sixth century; but in any case the passage is very inconclusive.

It must be recognized, therefore, that in spite of all these passages there is a great want of definite information as to the use of Incense in the East in the liturgical services of the fourth century. There is no mention of it in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, nor in the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. It is unfortunate for this purpose that there is no description of the Liturgy in the *Peregrinatio* of St. Silvia of Aquitaine, for an observant traveller such as she would have recorded many points which did not come within the scope of St. Cyril or the writer of the so-called Clementine Liturgy, but which would be of priceless interest to us. But in compensation for this we have her mention of the use of Incense at the weekly vigil of Sunday in the Church of the Anastasis.

Dictis ergo his tribus psalmis et factis orationibus tribus, ecce etiam thimiamateria inferuntur intro spelunca Anastasis, ut tota basilica repleatur odoribus. Et tunc ubi stat episcopus inter cancellos prendet evangelium et accedet ad hostium et leget resurrectionem.

Peregr. 57, Duehesne *Origines du Culte* (p. 474 or 476.).

This mention carries us beyond the point already suggested, viz., the use of Incense unceremonially in hanging censers, and brings us up to a definite ceremonial use, following on upon the solemn prayers of the Bishop and preparing for the reading of the Gospel. It seems hardly likely that such a ceremony as this in the new services which attracted St. Silvia's attention was without its parallels in the traditional use of the Liturgy.

In the next century there is more ample and more detailed evidence. The following description of censuring is given in the Pseudo-Dionysius.

oJ mevn iJeravrch'' eujch;n iJera;n ejnto;'' tou' qusiasthrivou poihsavmeno'' (aujto;n dh; oi\mai to;n eujloghtovn) kai; ejx aujtou' tou' qumia'/n ajrxavmeno'' perievrcetai pa'san th;n periovchn tou' naou'. eì\ta

ajnaluvsa” pavlin ejpi; to; qei’ on qusiasthrivou ajpavrcetai meta; tw’n a[l]lwn th” yalmwdiva”.

De Eccl. Hierarch. ii. Migne. P. G. iii. 452:

!Epeidh; toivnun tuvpo” ejsti tou’ Qeou’ oJ ejpivskopo”, i[dwmen pw” a[r]cetai qumia’/n ajpo; tou’ qusiasthrivou eaw” tw’n ejscavtwn kai; pavlin ejpanastrevfei ejj” to qei’ on qusiasthrion.

Ib. iii. 3. P. G. iii. 456.

Another reference will be found in the Life of St. Eutychius Patriarch of Constantinople, †582, written by his chaplain, Eustratius.

Tauvthn ou\ n th; n aJgivan eJovthn [tou’ Pavsa] faidrw” eJortavsa”, oJ ajei; ta; peri; aujth” ejxhgouvmeno” wJ” a[l]lo” oujdei;”, th; n aJgiwtavthn megavlhn tou’ Qeou’ ejkklhsivan qumiavsma”, poinvsa” kai; ta; aqgia baptivsmata, pavnta” ajspasavmeno” ajrcierei” kai; ijerei” kai; to; n eJautou’ klh’ron, k. t. l.

Vita S. Eutychii x. P. G. lxxxvi. 2377c.

The former passage no doubt describes a Liturgy of the Vth century and leads on to a consideration of the evidence of the Greek Liturgies in general. It is difficult to estimate the real age of the rites⁹ and ceremonies contained in the earliest MSS. available; so it seems wisest simply to investigate the use of Incense in the best texts available without any attempt to assign a date to the various portions of the various Liturgies.

IV. In the Oriental Liturgies the use of Incense is universal and on the whole marked by uniformity of method. It is to be found (i.) in the Prothesis or solemn preliminary Service of Preparation of the Elements. This use, however, is not ancient, as the service is itself a comparatively recent development. See for examples of this the Liturgy of the Nestorians, of the Armenians, and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in common use in the Orthodox Church of to-day.¹⁰ (ii.) It is used in the beginning of the Liturgy proper; in the Liturgy of St. James the prayers of incense are said preliminary¹¹ to the “Mass of the Catechumens,” but in other cases they come at the opening of this section of the Liturgy. In the Liturgy of St. Mark this censuring is in connexion with the “Little Entrance,”¹² but its position may best be defined as being the opening of the Mass of the Catechumens, as, for example, in the Liturgies of the Syrian Jacobites, the Coptic Jacobites, and the Abyssinian Jacobites.¹³ In the case of the Armenian and St. Chrysostom Liturgies the place of this censuring seems to be taken by the latter part of the censuring at the Prothesis, for in both cases there is no censuring at the Little Entrance which marks the opening of the Mass of the Catechumens, but the Prothesis is followed by an elaborate censuring of the Church and people.

Thus, in any case, there was the solemn censuring as preliminary to the Service.¹⁴

The censuring of the Syrian Jacobites is interesting in detail, because of its similarity to the Western use. *He burns Incense and says, To the glory, &c., and he takes the Incense and, worshipping, censes the midst of the table of life three times, which is a type of the Father, saying, Adoration to the Gracious Father, and the north horn he censes*

three times, which is a type of the Son, and says, Adoration to the merciful Son, and the south horn he censes three times, which is a symbol of the Holy Ghost, Adoration to the living and Holy Spirit, and he ascends the step and raises the Incense over the mysteries on the east side, and says this Voice, Rejoice, &c.; and bringing it to the west side he says, Praise Him, &c., and to the north side saying, Glory, &c., and to the south side saying, From everlasting, &c.; and he lowers the censer in a circle over the mysteries three times and descends from the step.

(iii.) Incense is used during the reading of the lections, and especially at the Gospel. The following is the simple form used here in the Liturgy of St. Mark, but derived from the Byzantine Liturgy, and there used in the Prothesis.

@O iJereu;” pro; tou’ eujaggelivou bavlei qumivama levgwn ouαtw”.
 Qumia’ma profsevromen ejnwvpion th” aJgiva” dovxh” sou oJ Qeov”, oα
 prosdexavmeno” eij” to; ααgion kai; uJperouravnion kai; noero;n sou
 qusiasthvrion, ajntikatavpemyon uJmi’n th;n cavrin tou’ aJgivou sou
 pnevmato”. oαti eujloghmevno”. k. t. l.¹⁵

In the Coptic the Incense begins at the reading of the Praxis, the third of the four Lections, while in the Abyssinian Liturgy it begins in the first Lection, and is renewed in the third (Praxis) and fourth (Gospel). In the present Liturgy of St. Chrysostom the censuring at the Gospel is¹⁶ considerable, and includes the censuring of the Altar, the Sanctuary, and the Priest.

(iv.) Again, at the beginning of the “Mass of the Faithful” Incense is used: sometimes in connexion with the “Great Entrance,” as in the Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, St. Chrysostom, and the Armenian, or, failing that, in connexion with the opening prayers, as in the Syrian Jacobite, the Coptic and the Abyssinian.¹⁷ In the case of the latter class the oblations have been set upon the Altar earlier in the service, and some sort of censuring of them has already taken place at an earlier point, viz., at the beginning of the Mass of the Catechumens.¹⁸ In the Nestorian Liturgy the case is different: the paten, which was brought in before the main service, is censed at the prayers at the opening of the “Mass of the Faithful”: the mysteries are set upon the Altar shortly after, but a long interval ensues before they are censed.¹⁹

Underlying all this variety there is a certain clear measure of uniformity, viz., (a) that (apart from the Prothesis) Incense is used in three places, (i.) at the opening of the main service, (ii.) at the Gospel (iii.) at what corresponds in place and often in circumstances to the Western offertory: and (b) that in some or other way the oblations, are censed.

There is no need to pursue the subject further in the East: there is considerable early evidence of the use of Incense in processions outside the Church, and instances of a number of other interesting uses of Incense might be collected, but they would not be germane to the present subject.²⁰

V. We turn to the West to see what signs are visible of liturgical use of Incense from the beginning of the IVth century onward. There is abundant evidence of the still

use of Incense, burning in hanging censers in a way similar to the lamps. We have seen cause to suspect that use in the East, and it is even more clear in the West.

(i.) The *Liber pontificalis* contains in the biography of St. Silvester (314-335) a list of the gifts of Constantine to the Church: the biography is not in the main contemporary evidence, but it seems clear that this particular information is inserted from some very ancient source, which has every appearance of being an authentic record of Constantine's gifts compiled from the actual contemporary Acts of Donation.²¹

Among the ornaments provided for the new Churches are censers (*thymiamateria*), two weighing thirty pounds for his Basilica and one of fifteen pounds for the Baptistery.²² In the former case there is mention also of *Donum aromaticum ante altaria annis singulis, lib. cl.*, which seems to be a benefaction for the supply of Incense, analogous to the many benefactions given and catalogued for the support of the lamps: there is a similar provision for Incense and oil in the case of the Church of SS. Marcellinus and Peter.²³ Further, a censer is also among the ornaments given to St. Peter's²⁴: in the case of the remaining Churches there is no mention of such ornaments; but the inventories seem to have been abridged.²⁵

A similar gift appears later among the ornaments of the basilica of St. Mary in the life of Xystus III. (432-440),²⁶ and another in the list of ornaments in the Charta Cornutiiana of the year 471,²⁷ but the former weighed only five pounds and was therefore very likely a portable censer.

2. Further light is thrown upon this custom by an order recorded in the notice of Boniface I. (418-422): –

Hic Bonifatius constituit ut nulla mulier aut monacha pallam sacratam contingere aut lauare aut incensum ponere in ecclesia nisi minister. *L.P.*, 227.

This is a recast of a similar order ascribed to Soter (162-170), but then excluding monks, not women: –

Hic constituit ut nullus monachus pallam sacratam contingeret nec incensum poneret in sanctam ecclesiam. *Ib.*, 135.

It is clear that if this order really belongs to the earlier date this use of Incense is traced back into the second century, and the foregoing conclusions as to the first three centuries must be entirely altered. But there are many difficulties in the interpretation of the passage.

3. The Inventory of Constantine's gifts seems to show that the censers hung before the Altar: but at a later date also before the images of saints: –

Hic [Sergius (687-701)] fecit imaginem auream beati Petri Apostoli quæ est in partem mulierum. Hic fecit tymiamaterium aureum maiorem cum columnis et coperculo quem suspendit ante imagines tres aureas beati Petri Apostoli, in quo incensum et odor suavitatis festis diebus, dum missarum solemnities celebrantur, omnipotenti Deo opulentius mittitur.²⁸

Ib., 374.

4. At about the same date we are able to pass over into England and find a similar use of Incense. Archbishop Theodore (668-690) gives, among various directions as to the right use of Churches, the following: –

Incensum Domini incendatur in natale Sanctorum pro reverentia diei, quia ipsi sicut lilia dederunt odorem suavitatis et asperserunt æcclesiam dei sicut incensu aspergitur æcclesia primitus juxta altare.²⁹

Penit. II. i. 9.

P. L. xcix. 927.

The forty-third of the Canons of King Edgar ordains as follows: –

“And we enjoin that no holy thing be neglected, neither holy water, nor salt, nor incense, nor bread, nor anything holy.”

Tr. Thorpe in *Ancient Laws and Institutes, of England*, p. 399.
(London, 1840.)

5. As a comment on this it will be well to quote St. Aldhelm’s description of the censer which hung in the Church built by Princess Bugga, daughter of Centwin, King of Wessex (*c.* 725): –

Hic quoque thuribulum capitellis undique cinctum
Pendet de summis fumosa foramina pandens;
De quibus ambrosiam spirabunt thura Sabæa,
Quando sacerdotes missas offerre jubentur.

P.L. lxxxix. 290.³⁰

An echo of this is found in a passage of Ethelwolf, of Lindisfarne, at the beginning of the IXth century, describing a church seen in a dream: –

Omnibus his rutilo capitellis undique cinctum
Thuribulum pendet fabricatum cominus auro,
De quibus altithrono spirabant thura tonanti.

Carmen de Abbatibus Lindisf. P.L. xcvi. 1344.

The hanging censer thus has a long history, reaching from the IVth century onward.³¹ This use survived in a few places, apparently even till the Reformation, as the following reminiscence of Lambarde, the Kentish lawyer, shows: –

“I myself being a child, once saw in Paul’s Church at London at a feast of Whitsuntide, where the coming down of the Holy Ghost was set forth by a white pigeon that was let to fly out of a hole that is yet to be seen in the midst of the roof of the great aisle,

and by a long censer which, descending out of the same place almost to the very ground, was swung up and down to such a length that it reached at one sweep almost to the west gate of the church, and with the other to the choir stairs of the same, breathing out over the whole church and company a most pleasant perfume of such sweet things as burned therein.”³² Mr. Mackenzie Walcott identifies the censer as “a great large censer all silver with many windows and battlements used to cense withal in the Pentecost week in the body of the Church of Paul’s at the Procession time,” weighing clvij ounces iij quarters; he also cites Bishop Pilkington in confirmation of this custom: –

“In the midst alley was their long censer, reaching from the roof to the ground, as though the Holy Ghost came in their censening down in likeness of a dove”;³³

and notices a similar opening in the centre of the nave roof at Norwich, which was also used as an aperture through which to let down a man dressed as an angel to cense the rood. A gigantic censer of this nature, hung from the roof, is said to be still visible in a Spanish Cathedral.

A somewhat similar non-ceremonial use is that described as still existing in France in the early part of the last century, in the Church of St. Martin at Tours.

Le jour de S. Michel on allume du feu dans neuf pots, qu’on pose en neuf endroits de l’Eglise sçavoir aux quatre coins du Sanctuaire autour du tombeau de S. Martin et du Chœur, & on y jette de l’encens dedans au commencement de la Messe et de la Préface. On en distribue aussi quelques grains pendant l’Epitre à tous les Bénéficiers qui vont à l’Offrande les presenter au Célébrant. Et tout cela par rapport a l’Offertoire *Stetit angelus*, &c.

De Moleon, *Voyages Liturgiques*, 132 (Paris, 1718).

This illustrates also in a very interesting way the persistence of old customs.

VI. Incense was not infrequently sent as a complimentary gift, but for liturgical use, for example, by St. Gregory: –

Aloa vero, thimiamata storacem et balsamum sacrorum martyrum corporibus offerenda latore præsentium deferente transmisimus.

St. Greg., *Ep.* ix. 52. *P. L.* lxxvii. 989.

Again, by a deacon, Gemmulus, to St. Boniface (c. 744): –

Transmisimus enim . . . aliquantum cozumbri quod incensum domino offeratis temporibus matutinis et vespertinis sive dum missarum celebratis solemnia.

St. Bonif., *Ep.* 143. *P. L.* lxxxix. 755.

It is not clear whether this involves anything more than the still use of Incense in a hanging censer such as we have already seen, or whether it involves the more ceremonial use which we now proceed to consider.

VII. The most crucial passage is one of St. Ambrose in his commentary on St. Luke i. ii, and the ministry of Zacharias at the Altar of Incense in the Temple.

Atque utinam nobis quoque adolentibus altaria, sacrificium deferentibus, assistat, angelus, immo præbeat se videndum.

Expos. Evang. sec. Lu. i., § 28. P. L. xv. 1545.

This has been, on the one hand, claimed as testimony to the ceremonial censuring of the Altar at Milan in the IVth century, and, on the other hand, it has been ruled out of court altogether as a passage occurring in the midst of a highly mystical exposition, and therefore valueless altogether as evidence.

There seems no reason to suppose that St. Ambrose had in view only on a Jewish or figurative Altar; it seems clear that, though Milanese customs differed from those of Rome in some respects, he must have been familiar with the use of Incense in Church. In another passage³⁴ he refers to it, not in a very conclusive way, no doubt, but clearly enough for the words to be a probable reference to the use of Incense in some shape or form:

Nec verearis ne in convivio ecclesiæ, aut grati odores tibi aut dulces cibi desint.

De Cain et Abel, 19. P. L. xiv. 326.

This is, however, very far from proving that, in using the term *adolentibus altaria*, he had in mind any censuring of the Altar, or, indeed, any use of Incense, for, apart from this context and the use of the term in the Vulgate, the phrase does not naturally refer to Incense at all, but is a general sacrificial term.

We shall, later on, see reason to believe that the full ceremony of censuring the Altar was one of the later forms of ceremonial use, so that it is probable that, at any rate, there is no question of this here. For the rest, our view of these two passages of St. Ambrose will largely depend upon what ceremonial use of Incense we can find elsewhere. It may be best, then, now to correct a mistaken idea which is often held to militate against interpreting the passages as referring to Incense.

It is said that the censer with chains for swinging in censuring was unknown till the ninth century or thereabouts; but this is a mistake.

The transition from a censer, hanging by chains to a beam, to a censer swung by chains in a man's hand is so natural that it seems incredible to suppose that the vessel for Incense was exclusively confined to a shape like a spoon up till so late a date. As a matter of fact, archaeological researches have proved the existence of a censer designed to be swung by the hand at a much earlier date than was formerly assigned; and this evidence applies both to East and West.

There is a Byzantine ivory bas relief at Trier representing the Solemn Translation of the Robe of the Blessed Virgin Mary to the chapel of the palace of Blachernæ in the middle of the fifth century. At each window of the palace there is represented a man standing swinging a censer out of the window.³⁵ For the purposes of comparison with this there is a sculpture of the VIth century in St. Mark's, at Venice, which shows a similar censer of a pattern exactly like the modern manual censer,³⁶ but hung in an arch. The two forms were thus identical in shape. The Mosaics of Ravenna of the same century supply

two further examples of manual censers, one at San Vitale and one at San Apollinare in Classe; but it is noticeable that neither of these has a cover. Each mosaic represents the Consecration of the Church.³⁷ The Mannheim censer, the earliest now existing, is a beautiful specimen of early Christian bronze work. Fleury ascribes it to the sixth century, but Kraus to the fourth. There is no doubt then that the manual censer is as old as the fourth century, and possibly older. No doubt some of the early censers were held by handles and not hung by chains, either from the hand or from the roof, but this form was commoner in the East than in the West, and, as a matter of fact, it makes little difference to the ceremonial use of Incense, for either sort is alike available for censuring, though the chains make a censer more convenient to handle.

VIII. Having now freed our hands with regard to the censer, and holding our judgment in suspense with regard to the meaning of the passage in St. Ambrose, we must try to trace out from the very scanty evidence which is available, what was the course of development in the use of Incense ceremonially in the Western Church. There seem to be two chief points of departure – there is the prophylactic value of Incense, which has from the first dictated its use at funerals, and there is the symbolical use, which is to develop in the free sphere of worship and in many ways to absorb the other. The use of Incense at funerals seems, however, to have been the starting point of a great deal.

Documentary evidence from liturgical books only seriously begins at the close of the seventh, or the opening of the eighth century.

At Rome, just as we have seen in the East, the use of Incense in procession is, next to the still use of Incense, perhaps the earliest liturgical use.³⁸ It is possible that this arose out of the funeral procession; the Incense was at first a sanitary precaution, but later was regarded as preparing the way by making a religious atmosphere.³⁹ The explanation given by Amalarius is not very convincing: –

Portatur et thuribulum quod Christi corpus significat sicut scriptum est in eadem Apocalypsi: “Alius angelus venit et stetit ante altare habens thuribulum aureum (Apoc. viii.). Quod sic expositum est – in conspectu scilicet apparuit ecclesiae, factus ipse thuribulum ex quo Deus odorem suavitatis accepit et propitius factus est mundo.”
Ecloga de officio missae. P. L. cv. 1317.

But such explanations are not to be taken very seriously. Liturgical self-consciousness does not seem to have been awakened till the IXth century; till then ceremonial was in its infancy and was performed without any questions asked or reasons given. From that time forward it has always been more or less in dispute; but we are not concerned so much with the value of the explanations, which were (then as now) often very crude, but with the facts and history.

1. The earliest Roman *Ordo* describes the use of Incense both in conducting the Pope on his way to the Stational Mass⁴⁰ (§ 4) and also thus at the service itself.

Statim subdiaconus sequens tenens thymiamaterium aureum pro foribus ponat incensum ut pergat ante pontificem.

Tunc subdiaconus sequens cum thymiamaterio procedit ante ipsum, mittens incensum.

Ordo I., § 7, 8. Mabillon *M.I.* ii. 7, 8.
P. L. lxxviii. 941.

Similarly before the Gospel: –

Procedunt ante ipsum [diaconum] duo subdiaconi regionarii levantes thymiamaterium de manu subdiaconi sequentis mittentes incensum.

Ib. § 11. Mabillon 9. *P. L.* 942.

2. The second Roman *Ordo* has the first passage in the same words, but has in place of the second: –

Tunc ministri cum thymiamaterio et thuribulis non amplius ternis procedunt ante ipsum mittentes incensum.

Ordo II. § 4. Mab. 43. *P. L.* 970.

It has slight alterations only in the third passage: it adds there: “cum duobus thuribulis siue uno”; and a little later on further directions are given as to the movement of the subdeacons at the ambo: –

Subdiaconi autem duo cum thuribulis ante evangelium in ambonem ex una parte ascendentes et ex altera parte statim descendentes redeunt stare ante gradum descensionis ambonis.

Ordo II., § 8. Mab. 45; *P. L.* 971, 972.

Of still greater significance is a passage added in *Ordo II.* at § 9: –

Post lectum evangelium candelæ in loco suo extinguntur et ab episcopo *Credo in Unum Deum* cantatur, et thuribula per altaria portantur; et postea ad nares hominum feruntur et per manum fumus ad os trahitur.

At a later stage a further addition prescribes Incense at the offertory, when the oblations have been finally placed in order for consecration (the italics represent the additions): –

Post oblationem ponitur incensum super altare, et pontifex, inclinans se paululum ad altare, respicit scholam et annuit ut sileant, et convertit se ad populum dicens “Orate.”

Ordo II., § 9. Mab. 47. *P. L.* 973.

The comparison of these two Ordines is of great interest in connexion with the development of the use of Incense in the West. This portion of *Ordo I.* is of purely Roman origin, and dates to the beginning of the VIIIth century. *Ordo II.* is based upon this, but does not represent the Roman use. It is clear that of Rome at the date of this part of *Ordo*

I. incense was only used in connexion with a procession, *i.e.*, at the approach to the Altar and on going to the ambo for the Gospel.

Elsewhere Incense was used also in a rudimentary censuring of persons at the Creed and of the oblations at the Offertory. The *Ordo II.* is not very much later than the first, and the use of Incense which it records may well be much older than the record.

3. The Romans still in Amalarius' time (c. 830) used no Incense at the oblation. So he notes expressly: –

Post Evangelium non offerunt incensum super altare.
De. Eccl. Off. Prol. s. fin. P. L. cv. 992.

But, in his general account of the order of the Mass, he notes its use first at the approach to the Altar: –

Prævenit in thuribulo thymiana quod significat Corpus Christi plenum odore bono.

Ib. iii. 5. P. L. cv. 1,109.

Then at the Gospel: –

Deinde ponit episcopus thymiana in thuribulum super prunas ut suavem odorem excitet. Thuribulum Corpus Christi significat in quo est ignis scilicet spiritus sanctus, ex quo bonus odor procedit, quod unusquisque electorum ad se vult rapere. Idem odor bonam operationem de Christo exire demonstrat quam qui vivere vult in suum cor trajicit.

...

Duo cerei qui portantur ante evangelium legem et prophetas designant præcessisse evangelicam doctrinam: thuribulum vero opinionem bonarum virtutum procedentem de Christo. Ipsum thuribulum in tribunal ascendit ante evangelium ut ibi suavem odorem ministret. Christi enim bona opera præcesserunt evangelicam doctrinam.

Ib. iii. 18. Ib. 1,125.

And at the Oblation as well: –

Deinde suscipit oblationes sacerdotum et diaconorum quibus licitum est accedere ad altare ex thuribulo quod superimponit post orationem, demonstrat per quem ei propitiari possit Deus videlicet per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum cuius corpus designat thuribulum.

Ib. iii. 19. Ib. 1,130.

In all this he is clearly following the line of *Ordo II.*

4. Micrologus comments on this discrepancy of use in these terms: –

Item Romanus Ordo præcipit ut incensum semper præcedat Evangelium cum ad altare sive in ambonem portatur: non autem concedit ut oblatio in altari thurificetur: quod

et Amalarius in prologo libri sui de officiis Romanos devitare fatetur, quamvis modo a pluribus immo pene ab omnibus usurpetur.

Bernold of Constance († 1100) *Micrologus*,
De Eccles. Observ., § 9.

5. It is further emphasized by a *Capitulum* of Hincmar of Rheims given in 852, which is explicit as to the non-Roman custom: –

Ut omnis presbyter thuribulum et incensum habeat, ut tempore quo Evangelium legitur et finito offertorio super oblationem incensum ut in morte videlicet Redemptoris ponat.

I. vi. Hardouin v. 392. *P. L.* cxxv. 774.

6. Compare the opening Canon of the Synod held at Rouen in 878: –

Ut tempore quo evangelium legitur finitoque offertorio super oblationem incensum in mortem videlicet Redemptoris nostri ponatur decrevimus.

Cap. 1. Hardouin vi. 205.⁴¹

This evidence seems to point to the fact that the processional use of Incense at Mass was specially Roman, and the censuring of the oblations and clergy specially a Frankish ceremony, adopted, as were many others, by the Romans only after a long and rigid resistance.

The censuring of the priest and people took place at this date after the Gospel, during the Creed, in connexion with the kissing of the Gospel-book, but it is not mentioned by the first *Oxdo*, nor by Amalarius, nor by the Pseudo-Alcuin *De Officiis*, which merely quotes the second Roman *Ordo* at the Offertory and does not otherwise allude to Incense.⁴²

As to the censuring of the Altar, the ceremony is not only not mentioned by the *Ordines* or by Amalarius, but the character of the directions given for the celebrant excludes it: –

Pertransit pontifex in caput scholæ et in gradu superiore inclinato capite ad altare primo adorat Sancta, et stat semper inclinatus usque ad versum prophetalem, &c., &c.

Ordo II. 4, 5: *P. L.* lxxviii. 970.

IX. The history of the ceremonial censuring of the Altar must probably be traced along a very different line of evidence. We have already seen evidence for the use of Incense at funerals, and it is probably from this use (at least in part) that this particular form of the ceremonial use of Incense grew. In early days Altars were erected over the bodies of the saints. The consecration of a Church often coalesced with the translation of the saint's body there⁴³; and this connexion between the Altar and the relics gained such vogue that in mediaeval times every Altar contained some relics enclosed in a sealed stone in the body of the erection. The consecration of a new Altar was thus modelled on a funeral service: it was natural to cense the bones of the saints or the relics lying under it, and this became one of the regular ceremonies of the *consecratio altaris*.

1. The Gelasian Sacramentary, after providing for some Levitical anointing of the Altar, continues thus: –

Et offeres incensum super Altare odorem suavissimum Domino.
Benedictio Altaris. Prefatio consecrationis.

Dei patris omnipotentis misericordiam dilectissimi fratres deprecemur ut hoc altare santificet et spiritali placatus incenso precanti familiæ suæ promptus ex-auditor adsistat. Per.

Muratori, *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* i. 610. *cf.* ii. 185.

2. The later sacramentaries give much more detail and form various combinations of Gallican and Roman ceremonies in Menard's codex of the IXth century, after the sprinkling of the Altar and the Church, Incense was offered upon the Altar and it was anointed with oil *semper incensum in circuitu ipsius altaris alio sacerdote faciente*. Then after the anointing of the consecration crosses on the walls of the Church, *faciens crucem incensi super altare dicit* Oremus; and collects and blessings follow.

But all this preceded the actual bringing of the relics to be enclosed in the Altar; these were solemnly carried into the Church – *cum crucibus et thuribulis et candelabris multisque luminaribus* – and enshrined in the Altar.⁴⁴

In the Order of Consecration of a Church given in Muratori⁴⁵ the bringing in and enclosing of the relics is more elaborately done, and precedes the sprinkling and anointing of the Altar. Three grains of Incense are enclosed with the relics.⁴⁶ After the enclosing: –

*Postea deferant incensum. Et dum Episcopus cum eo facit crucem super altare dicat Antiphonam.*⁴⁷ *Dirigatur Domine oratio mea sicut incensum in conspectu tuo. Antiphona.* *Ascendit fumus aromatum in conspectu domini de manu angeli.*

Then follows the anointing, and it is ordered (as above): –

Et semper sacerdos præparatus faciat incensum per circuitum altaris donec consecratio finiatur.

Again, after the anointing of the consecration crosses on the walls: –

*Iterum autem offerat episcopus incensum super altare et cantat antiphonam, Ædificavit moyses altare Domino Deo.*⁴⁸

And after a Collect: –

Hic ponat incensum in medio et in quatuor angulis altaris et incendatur et dicatur. *Dirigatur oratio mea sicut incensum in conspectu tuo Domine V. Elevatio manuum mearum sacrificium vespertinum.*⁴⁹

It seems possible here to distinguish clearly two uses of incense: the first is connected with the relics; they are brought in with incense, enclosed with incense, and then censed: this is all on the same line as the use at funerals: the second is simply connected with prayer; the incense is offered and burnt on the Altar to symbolize prayer.⁵⁰

It seems probable that the censing of the Altar at Mass was due, at least in part, to a repetition of these ceremonies: it is significant that the prayer used *quando levantur reliquiæ*, or on the way to bring the relics into Church (*Aufer a nobis*⁵¹), became the prayer of approach to the Altar at the beginning of Mass according to many uses.⁵²

3. The earliest evidence of censing the Altar or relics at Rome is in connexion with the Divine Office, not with Mass at all. The *Liber Pontificalis* records of Stephen V. (885-891): –

“Cum in basilica beati Petri apostolorum principis ubi sacro ipse corpore requiescit cerneret nocturnis laudibus vix semel thumiamatis incensum offerri, instituit ut per singular lectiones et responsoria adoleatur.”

Liber Pontif., Ed. Duchesne, ii. 194.

It is clear from this that some censing took place before Pope Stephen's time, and possibly this was the purpose of the benefactions of incense cited above.⁵³ In any case this passage seems to emphasize the argument for the connexion of the censing of relics with that of the Altar.

4. It is equally clear that at Rome, at any rate, there was no ceremonial censing of the Altar at Mass till a much later date. We have found no trace of it in the *Ordines Romani* or in the early Liturgists. There is no mention of it in the Ratoldus Codex of the Gregorian Sacramentary of the latter part of the Xth century; but in the Codex Tilianus, a French *Ordo* of the eleventh century, the following three directions⁵⁴ are given for censing at the Offertory: –

Postea incensum accipiens ponat in thuribulum dicens, Per intercessionem sancti Gabrielis, &c.

Tunc Ponat incensum super sacrificium et in circuitu altaris dicat, Incensum istud, &c.

Quando odor eiusdem incensi episcopo vel ceteris porrigitur unusquisque dicat, Accendat in nobis Dominus, ignem sui amoris et flammam æternæ caritatis.

Here it is clear that the censing of the persons has been transferred from the Creed to the Offertory, which, as we shall see, was the case in England also at a later period.

5. John of Avranches, a writer of the same date (c. 1030), and also from North France, mentions the censing of persons after the Gospel, and says, with regard to the Offertory: –

Sacerdos oblationem ita componat ut . . . sicque corporali cooperta incensum desuper offerat et sic diacono præbeat: diaconus vero in circuitu altaris deferat, postea sacerdoti deinde ministro reddat ut clero populoque deferat.

Joann. Abrincens, *De. Off. Eccl.*, ed. Prevot, p. 20.
P. L., cxvii. 35, or lxxviii. 253.

6. The VIth Roman Ordo has as follows: –

Sumat incensum a custode ecclesiæ ponensque in thuribulum offerat illud altari, detque archidiacono. Ille vero postquam hoc commendaverit acolyto eat in sedem suam.
Ordo Romanus VI., § 10. Mab. 74. *P. L.* lxxviii. 993.

7. The censuring of the Altar is seen to be growing up in connexion with the oblation, but not yet to be fully developed. In the XIIth century, however, the censuring is fully provided for, not at the oblation, but at the approach to the Altar, in the *Gemma animæ*: –

Episcopus ingrediens pacem clero porrigit . . . deinde sanctuarium intrat inclinans coram altari orat confessionem faciens Post hoc duos sacerdotes osculatur deinde ceteris ministris a dextra pacem dabit Altare et Evangelium osculatur post hæc thuribulum accipiens altare thurificat in figura angeli qui in Apocalypsi cum aureo thuribulo altari astiterat, &c deinde altare osculatur deinde *Gloria in excelsis* incipit et chorus concinit.

Honorius of Autun *Gemma Animæ* vii. *P. L.* clxxii. 546.

Here is the definite censuring of the Altar, but not followed by the censuring of the priest.

At the creed which follows the sermon: –

Interim evangelium cum incenso per chorum defertur et singulis ad osculandum porrigitur.

Ib. xxv. *P. L.* clxxii. 552.

There is no censuring of persons, and the Incense is only regarded as an accompaniment of the Gospel Book.

There is only the barest mention of the censuring of the oblations.⁵⁵

These passages seem to show in outline the gradual growth of the ceremonial censuring of the Altar. At the approach to the Altar it formed a natural appendix to the processional censuring at the entry of the clergy. At the Offertory it seems to have grown out of the censuring of the oblations, and as the oblations themselves might include Incense it was a very natural growth that some of the Incense offered should at once be burnt upon the Altar at the Offertory. The censuring *in circuitu* by the deacon especially seems to derive from the *Consecratio altaris*.

X. It will be best; before coming to the later mediæval practice, to notice one or two other interesting uses of Incense. There is continual use on the old lines in procession, both before Mass and at other times.

It was also used in connexion with other benedictions besides the consecration of an Altar, *e.g.* in connexion with the blessing of a cross.⁵⁶ Its use in connexion with the Paschal candle is very ancient,⁵⁷ though it is said to be due to a mistake, and it is not a Roman custom; also in the consecration of the Holy Oils and at the Maundy on Maundy Thursday.⁵⁸ The Roman ceremony analogous to the Paschal candle was the making and distribution of lambs of wax, and in connexion with them Incense was burnt *ad suffumigandum in domibus suis pro quacunq[ue] tribulatione*.⁵⁹ At the solemn baptisms of Easter Eve Incense was burnt in procession,⁶⁰ and in the procession of Easter Day.⁶¹ In later days this use was considerably extended until some sort of censuring became finally an integral part of most of the ceremonial blessings.

We have already seen certain evidence of the use of Incense in England. No doubt in this, as in other respects, the English Church had much the same customs as elsewhere; but it is worth while to glance in passing at the use of Incense made by Abbat Ceolfrid (*c.* 716). On his leaving for Rome after Mass: –

Conveniunt omnes in ecclesiam beati Petri; ipse, thure incenso et dicta oratione ad altare, pacem dat omnibus stans in gradibus turribulum habens in manu.

Beda *Historia Abbatum*, ii. 17. *Opera Hist.*, Ed. Plummer, i. 382.

Compare with this the anonymous *Historia Abbatum*, § 25 (*ib.* i. 396), which gives a fuller account: –

Vocat omnes in æcclesiam beati Petri, rogat pro se orare, dicit et ipse orationem, accendit thymiamam habensque in manu turribulum consistit in gradibus ubi legere consuerat, dat osculum plurimis, nam ne omnibus luctu et suo et ipsorum præpeditur. Egreditur cum turribulo ad oratorium beati Laurentii Martyris quod est in dormitorio fratrum, sequuntur et ipsi cantantes antiphonam de propheta “Via iustorum recta facta est et iter sanctorum præparatum est,” et “Ambulantes de uirtute in uirtutem,” adiuncto et psalmo sexagesimo sexto “Deus misereatur nobis . . .” Et ibi incense thure, exiens rursus adloquitur omnes ut pacem invicem seruent. . . . Completa allocutione rursus adsumpta antiphona cum psalmo memorato egrediuntur ad fluvium, lugubre carmine patrem utpote iam decessurum deducentes, itidemque singulis osculum pacis dat, intercepto sæpius cantu præ lacrimis: et, dicta in litore oratione, ascendit nauem, residet in prora, sederunt iuxta diacones, unus crucem quam fecerat auream alter cæreas manu tenens ardentes.

This seems to show that liberty existed for other uses of Incense than those which normally formed part of the service.

XI. We turn now to England to see the directions for censuring at Mass in the later periods of the Middle Ages. First we have the following directions given by Archbishop Lanfranc to the Benedictine Order: –

1. Sacerdos ingrediatur ad altare ferens missale minibus suis præcedentibus tribus conversis cum candelabris et thuribulo, subdiacono post eos cum textu, subdiaconum sequente diacono, et posito missali super altare faciat orationem suppliciter inclinatus Qua [confessione] facta, imposito a sacerdote thure in thuribulo tribuat diaconus sacerdoti

thuribulum: sacerdos incenset altare ante et desuper reddatque diacono: diaconus incenset utraque altaris latera et altare matutinale et sic reddat converso qui deferens in chorum offerat primum cantori et ipsis qui cum eo sunt, dehinc in dextro choro omnibus per ordinem, et sic in sinistro, deinde infirmis qui extra chorum sunt

Ad evangelium dum canitur offerenda vel versus offerendae conversus afferat thuribulum cum acerra cantori cantor vero ponat incensum in thuribulo et mittat diacono ad altare et diaconus tribuat sacerdoti.

The censuring at the Gospel and the offertory seem to be run into one; but they evidently were distinct, for when a Bishop was present: –

Ad ipsum deferatur thuribulum cum acerra ad introitum et ante Evangelium a diacono et converso, post offerendam a cantore et converso.

Lanfranc, *Decreta pro O. S. B.*, § xi. *P. L.*, cl. 479.

At the beginning of the XIIIth century we have what is at once the fullest and the most authoritative of English directions previous to the Reformation as to the use of Incense at Mass in the Sarum Consuetudinary (c. 1210); this is supplemented by the directions given in the Customary (XIVth cent.), which later were incorporated as Rubric into the Mass book.⁶²

1. As to the entry (Customary only): –

Executor cum suis ministris presbiterium, intret et ad altare ordinatim accedant, primo ceroferarii duo partier incedentes deinde turribularius, post eum subdiaconus, exinde diaconus et post eum sacerdos.

2. At the approach (Consuetudinary § 6): –

Post humiliacionem uero sacerdotis ad altare factam ipsum altare sacerdos thurificet diaconi ministerio; deinde ab ipso diacono ipse sacerdos thurificetur.

The Customary gives fuller details: –

Deinde ponat diaconus thus in turribulum et dicat diaconus prius sacerdoti *Benedicite*. Sacerdos dicat *Dominus. Ab apso, &c.* Tunc diaconus ei turribulum tradens deosculetur manum eius, et ipse sacerdos thurificet medium et utrumque cornu altaris; deinde ab ipso diacono ipse sacerdos thurificetur. § 6.

3. At the Gospel (Consuetudinary § 19): –

Dum prosa canitur diaconus ipse altare thurificet. Deinde, accepto texto evangeliorum, et data ei humiliato benedictione, et ceroferariis et thuribulo precedente, subdiacono librum leccionis evangelice deferente per medium chori ad pulpitem accedat . . . § 22. Post inpcionem *Credo in unum* sacerdos ipse ministerio diaconi thurificetur et

postea ministerio subdiaconi textum sacerdos deosculetur. Quo peracto chorus ministerio pueri more solito incensetur.

In the Customary the censuring at the Kissing of the Gospels is omitted, but the earlier censuring is more fully described: –

Diaconus antequam accedat ad evangelium pronuntiandum thurificet medium altaris tantum. Nunquam enim thurificet lectrinum neque ad missam neque ad matutinas ante pronuntiacionem evangelii . . . procedat diaconus per medium chori . . . ad pulpitu[m] accedat cum ceteroferario et thuribulario precedente . . . Et cum ad locum legendi pervenerit . . . thuribularius stet post diaconum ad eum conversus. § 19, 20.

3. At the Offertory (Consuetudinary, § 24): –

Postea ordinato sacrificio et debito modo disposito, sacerdos sacrificium ministerio diaconi ter in signum crucis thurificet, deinde ter in circuitu, postea ex utraque parte sacrificii. § 25. Quo peracto sacerdos manus abluat ministerio subdiaconi et aliorum ministrorum, diacono interim ipsum altare in sinistro cornu incensante et reliquias more solito in circuitu.

The Customary gives much fuller directions § 24: –

Hoc peracto accipiat thuribulum a diacono et thurificet sacrificium videlicet ultra ter signum crucis faciens et ter in circuitu calicis et ex utraque parte calicis et sacrificii. Deinde locum inter se et altare (disponat) et dum thurificet dicat *Dirigatur domine, &c.* Postea thurificetur ipse sacerdos ab ipso diacono et subdiaconus deferat ei textum deosculandum. Deinde acolytus thurificet chorum (in order) . . . ita quod ipse puer singulos clericos incensando illis inclinet subsequente eo subdiacono cum textu ab omnibus deosculando. Si episcopus celebraverit et duplex festum fuerit duo veniunt cum thuribulo et duo diaconi cum duobus textibus vel reliquiis.

Si presens fuerit episcopus et non exequatur officium, diaconus . . . post lectum evangelium per episcopum transeundo eum primum incensabit et postea subdiaconus textum . . . porrigat.

Quando vero non dicitur *Credo* . . . thurificet (*i.e.*, sacerdos) sacrificium more solito sed chorus non thurificetur. Nunquam enim thurificetur chorus post evangelium ad missa nisi quando dicitur *Credo in unum* sed tunc semper.

§ 25. Hiis ita peractis eat sacerdos ad dextrum cornu altaris et abluat manus . . . diacono interim ipsum altare in sinistro cornu thurificante et reliquias more solito in circuitu.

It seems that the censuring of the celebrant and choir was transferred from the time of the Creed to the time following the censuring of the oblations in the interval between the date of the Consuetudinary and that of the Customary: but the earlier use was continued in the case of a Bishop being present: and this censuring was still governed by the consideration whether the Creed was said or no even after it had been dissociated from the Creed.

The actual censuring of the Altar is described once for all in full detail in connexion with Evensong, and then only briefly at Mass. The Consuetudinary lays down (xxvii. § 4): –

Deinde sacerdos ponat thus in thuribulo benedicendo et procedat ad altare; et facta genuflexione ante altare illud incenset, primo in medio deinde in dextera parte postea in sinistra: exinde imaginem beate marie et postea arcam in qua continentur reliquiæ: deinde thurificando altare circumeat.

To this description the Customary adds (i.) the details of blessing; (ii.) that the priest should kiss the altar step at the genuflexion, (iii.) that it is the patron saint whose image is censured, and (iv.) that the censuring in the case of the middle⁶³ and each side of the Altar and of the image of the patron is to be a triple censuring. Cap. 23 § 2, and cap. 37 § 1. (pp. 114, 183).

These directions are those which formed the rubrics of the printed Sarum Service Books, and they may therefore be taken to represent the use of Incense throughout the greater part of England in the second year of King Edward VIth.

There is, however, some evidence that Incense was also used at the Consecration.

At Chichester Cathedral a special benefaction existed to maintain the incense at this point: a document dealing with it of the date 1304 is cited by Mackenzie Walcott thus: –

Consensus Abbatis Laurentii et Conventus de Ponte Roberti super assignatione C.s. ad sustentationem duorum clericorum ad thurificandum Corpus Christi in elevatione ejusdem singulis diebus ad magnum altare cum summam missam ibidem celebrare contigerit.

Archæologia, xlv. 212.

There is no reason to suppose that this was unique: in fact this identical use is prescribed in the Roman ceremonial, and this evidence seems to show that it was one of the customs which, though not laid down in rubrics, were in fact in common vogue.

XII. With regard to the use of Incense in the Divine Office we have already had the testimony of St. Silvia and the evidence from Rome in the IXth century. To the same period belongs the information of Amalarius. In speaking of the verse *Dirigatur oratio mea sicut incensum* at Evensong he says: –

Cum ipso versu offertur Incensum quod Dominus præcepit offerri de quo scriptum est in libro Exodi (quoting Ex. xxx.). . . . Intendat summus sacerdos qui vicem tenet Aaron in ecclesia quis debeat incensum offerre Domino super altare. Post hoc sequitur hymnus Sanctæ Mariæ.

Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.*, iv. 7.

There is no mention of Incense at Nocturns nor at *Benedictus*; nor is the above note with regard to the use at Evensong repeated in the parallel passage in *De Ord. Antiph.*, 6. So that it would seem dangerous to argue from silence here. But on the other hand it is to be noted that Rabanus Maurus only speaks of Evensong as the time when the Jews

offered Incense, and says nothing of any Christian offering of Incense at the time; ⁶⁴ this suggests that Amalarius' language may after all only be figurative.

The literal interpretation is, however, confirmed by a passage in John of Avranches: –

Versu dicto hymnus Sanctæ Mariæ dominicæ incarnationis memoriam nobis reducit. Incipiente versus† juxta quod Dominus præcepit Moysi incensum super altare a sacerdote offertur.

De Off. Eccl., p. 6. P.L. cxlvii. 30.

This represents the use of Rouen at the time of the Norman conquest; but it is noticeable that here the *verse* spoken of is not the *Dirigatur oratio*, as in Amalarius, but the opening verse of the *Magnificat*; for John of Avranches, while keeping to the language, of Amalarius, has altered the sense. This is made more clear by the parallel passage with regard to *Benedictus*: –

Versu quoque excitati hymnum Zachariae concinimus in quo versu incepto, juxta quod Dominus Moysi præcepit sacerdos incensum super altare adolebit.

Ib. p. 10, col. 31.

On Christmas Day: –

Antiphona cum trina repetitione super *Magnificat* cantetur, duobus thuribulis altare incensetur. Ad matutinum in secundo quinto et octavo [sc. responsorio] et ad *Te Deum laudamus* sed et ad *Benedictus* altare incensetur Tria Evangelia in cappis incenso et candelabris præcedentibus pronuntientur.

Ib. p. 33, col. 40.

Again at the Mattins of St. Stephen's Day

Evangelium pronunciet diaconus dalmaticatus, thymiamaterio et cereis præcedentibus. Duo diaconi in dalmaticis chorum regant qui altare incensando *Te Deum* incipient.

Ib. p. 35, col. 41.

At Easter: –

Quo peracto [sc. officio sepulchri] *Te Deum laudamus* altari incensato cantetur et post unumquemque responsorium incensetur.

Ib. p. 65, col. 54.

This shews that the use of Incense at *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* as well as *Te Deum* and in the various Nocturns on great days was in full vogue in the XIth century in France at any rate. The first of these seems to have grown out of the Versicle *Dirigatur oratio*, &c., while the last carries us back to Pope Stephen V, and the quasi-funereal censuring of the tombs of the martyrs.

When we turn to England we find, in the Xth century a passage which presupposes at the least a part of this system of censuring. The *Regularis Concordia* notes incid-

entally with regard to Holy Innocents' Day, which always had a disputed character, half festal and half penitential: –

Ad matutinas vero . . . licet *Te Deum laudamus* non canatur et evangelium minime festivo more legatur, cereus tamen accendatur et signa pulsantur omnia et thuribulum turificando deportetur.

Dugdale, *Monasticon* I. xxxv. (London, 1846).

This document represents the practice agreed upon among the various monastic bodies in St. Ethelwold's Benedictine Reform movement at the end of the Xth century.

At Mattins of Easter Day there followed after the third Respond the ceremony of the Three Maries at the Sepulchre, in which Incense is mentioned: –

Dumque tertium percelebratur responsorium residui tres succedant, omnes quidem cappis induti, turribula cum insensu manibus gestantes . . . ad similitudinem . . . mulierum cum aromatibus venientium . . . &c.

Ib. xl.

But this seems to be a special use of Incense rather than the customary censuring during the nocturn on a festival.

There seems to be no evidence available of the custom of English secular Churches in Anglo-Saxon times, and the earliest evidence available in Norman times is again Benedictine, viz., that of Archbishop Lanfranc in his statutes for the Benedictine Order. The evidence testifies to the same system of censuring and carried out with considerable elaboration: –

Ad *Benedictus* sacerdos in alba incenset altaria.

Lanfranc, *Decreta pro O.S.B.* ii. P. L. cl., 448.

Again, on Christmas Eve (*Ib.* 450) the same order is given: but at Christmas Day:–

In nocte Dominicæ nativitatis omnia signa primum pulsantur; ad invitatorium quatuor fratres in cappis. In unoquoque nocturno ad terciam lectionem duo sacerdotes capis induti duo thuribula circumferant, primo duobus altaribus maiori et matutinali, dehinc fratribus in choro sedentibus. (*Ib.*)

Again, at Easter: –

Ad lectiones circumferantur thuribula sicut in die Dominicæ Nativitatis institutum est. *Ib.*, § v. 468.

Later on a comprehensive direction is given as to the censuring at *Magnificat* on the five chief festivals: –

Antiphona ad *Magnificat* ter dicatur: abbas et prior cappis induti incensent utraque presbyterii altaria ante et desuper utriusque simul, singuli singula latera. Parati sint duo alii sacerdotes hebdomadarii, scilicet maioris missae et minoris, qui thuribula de eorum manibus accipiant et hinc et inde per altaria quae extra sunt circumferant: qui revertentes in chorum abbati prius, priori postea ferant, post eis qui responsorium cantaverunt, non ambo simul sed unus hinc et alter inde; dehinc duo conversi in albis caeteris fratribus. Abbatum de libro serviat qui thuribulum de eius manu accepit.

Ib., § vii. 473.

At Mattins there is the censuring during the Nocturns: –

In tribus nocturnis dum legitur tertia lectio duo sacerdotes cappis induti incensent altaria maius et minus: dehinc ferant abbati et priori et caeteris fratribus per ordinem. (*Ib.*)

At Lauds the directions are analogous to those of the previous Evensong. At greater festivals of the second class Incense was used at *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*: –

Duo sacerdotes cappis induti ad thuribula sicut superius de precipuis festivitatibus dictum est. § viii. 475.

Antiphona ad *Benedictus* bis dicatur et thuribula similiter circumferantur: *Ib.*

At festivals of the third class: –

Sacerdos indutus cappa incesset altaria, conversus sit in alba. § ix. 478.

From this we pass on as before to summarize the provisions of the Sarum Consuetudinary.

The ordinary Sunday method of censuring the altar has been already given (pp. 79, 80): that done: –

Sacerdos accedat ad extremum gradum ante altare et ad altare se inclinet: et precedentibus ceroferariis et thuribulo installato huic officio deputato se recipiat. Deinde puer ipsum sacerdotem ibidem incenset.

Consuet. xxvii. 4, xxviii. 1 (*Use of Sarum*, p. 44).

And the censuring of the choir followed.

On the twelve greatest days more was done than on Sundays or lesser double feasts: –

Omnia altaria ecclesiae ad primas vespertas tantum incensabuntur: ad matutinas vero et ad secundas vespertas nisi tantum autenticum altare et chorus similiter

Et quodcumque novem lectiones contigerint, ad matutinas scilicet ad secundam ad quintam et ad octavam lectionem incensetur autenticum altare et chorus similiter ab uno sacerdote diacono ei ministrante: ad *Te Deum laudamus* simili modo fiat.

In ceteris autem festis duplicibus per annum ad utrasque uesperas et ad matutinas non incensatur nisi altare principale tantum et chorus: similiter in singulis nocturnis ad matutinas et ad *Te Deum laudamus* non incensatur [nisi] altare neque [et] chorus.

Consuet. xxi. 2. *Use of Sarum*, pp. 31, 32.

Later on the ceremonial of the censuring is more fully described.⁶⁵ There was less of ceremony on lesser days, but the censuring took place at *Magnificat*, at *Te Deum* (or the repetition of the ninth respond when there was no *Te Deum*), and at *Benedictus* on all Sundays and all festivals except those of the lowest class.⁶⁶

These are the regulations that were in force in the Second Year of Edward VI., and were to a greater or less extent incorporated into the Rubrics of the later Latin Service Books.

The history of the use of Incense at the Eucharist and the Divine Office presents a good many difficulties, and still more gaps; but the result finally arrived at by the time to which reference is made in the Prayer Book is in both cases clear. In considering the bearing of this on the use of Incense at the present time, with regard to the Eucharist there is no difficulty caused by the transition from the Latin to the English Service, because the form of the Service, so far as it concerns Incense, remains so much the same; but, in the case of the Divine Office, there is need of some modification, because of the change involved in the transition from the Latin Evensong, and the still more radical change involved in passing from the old Service of Nocturns with Lauds to the English Mattins. But it is only necessary to point out here that, in both cases, the use of Incense which was customary in the second year of Edward VI. is beyond all doubt or question, and that, whatever history lies behind, it is this only that is of practical importance and legal value.

W. H. FRERE.

NOTES

¹ See Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus," Book ii., c. iii. (S. Luke i. 9).

² Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes* vii. 26-28. *P. L.* v. 1253-1258.

³ Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* vi. 25. *P. L.*, vi. 730.

⁴ Any more than such passages in Holy Scripture as Isaiah i. 13, which depreciate and almost seem to condemn the use, though from other sources it is known to have been divinely ordered and actually prevalent.

⁵ F. E. Warren. *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 130, referring to *Didache* xiv.; Justin Martyr, *Dialog. cum Tryphone*, 28, 41, 116, 117; Irenæus *Hæres*, iv. 17, 18; Tertullian *Adv. Judæos*, 5; *Adv. Marcionem* iii. 22.

⁶ See Brightman's summary of the case in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I, xvii-xxix. (Oxford, 1896).

⁷ In 591 the Persian King Chosroes sent to Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, money to provide a golden chalice, altar cross, and censer for the Church (Evagr. *Hist.* vi. 21).

⁸ *Life of Const.*, i. 42; iii. 25-51; iv. 43-47, 58-60; unless indeed the *krath're*⁸ *megivstoi* mentioned in iii. 38 were meant for Incense, as is not impossible. These are the only ornaments specifically mentioned.

⁹ Mr. Brightman considers that the earliest extant Eastern evidence for the details of censuring is a document mainly of the IXth or perhaps Xth century (*Lit. E. and W.* 539 l. 31), but in this respect perhaps of even later date; and that the fundamental ceremonial use was for the lustration of the air.

¹⁰ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford 1896), i. 248-251, 418-420, 359-361.

¹¹ L.c. 32.

¹² L.c. 115.

¹³ L.c. 74-76, 150-152, 209-212.

¹⁴ L.c. 361 and 420.

¹⁵ L.c. 119, 359, and note the connexion with the Offertory Prayer of St. Basil, p. 319.

¹⁶ L.c. 154; 213-220; 238, 371, 372; see also 258.

¹⁷ L.c. See pp. 41; 122, 123; 378, 379. St. James and St. Mark copy the Byzantine Liturgy. See also on the other hand pp. 81; 161; 225; 262. Of these it seems likely that at least the Syrian Jacobite Liturgy once had a "Great Entrance": and this affords a certain presumption that in the other two cases the offering of the oblations has similarly been moved away from its original place to the place which it now occupies; and further, this suggests that originally all the Liturgies were alike in this respect.

¹⁸ *Ib.* pp. 75, 76; 150; 210.

¹⁹ *Ib.* 251, 262, 267, 282.

²⁰ (i.) At the deposition of Nestorius at Ephesus, in 431, St. Cyril, on announcing the news, was escorted through the city by processions with torchbearers and women carrying Incense. (Cyril Alex., *Ep.* xxiv. (xxii) P. G. lxxvii. 157.

(ii.) In 518, in the course of a great disturbance in Tyre, the Archdeacon, giving notice of a service to be held on the following Sunday, said:

th' de; aujth' aJgiva/ kuriakh'/ eawqen ejntau'qa sunercovmeqa iα.na
ejntau'qa meta; yalmwidiw'n kai; khrrw'n kai; qumiamavtwn ejn tw'/ aujtw'/
aJgiw'/ oi[kw/ katanthvsante' th;n livthn kai; th;n aJgivan suvnaxin
plhrwsw'men.

This order was confirmed by the Archbishop in the same terms. See Letter of Epiphanius, Bishop of Tyre, to the Council of Constantinople in 536. Labbe and Cossart *Concilia* viii. 1092 (Florence, 1762).

(iii.) Evagrius records how in 526 the Holy Man Zosimas becoming miraculously aware, though a great distance away, of the overthrow of Antioch by fires and earthquake, called for a censer to propitiate God with prayers and Incense. (Evagrius. *Hist.* iv. 7)

(iv.) Corippus records of Justin II. (565-578) Lib. I. De laudibus Justini Minoris (quoted in Martigny *Dict. des Ant. Chrét.* 232),

Ilicet angelici pergens ad limina templi
Imposuit pia thura focis arasque micantes
Obtulit.

- ²¹ *Liber Pontificalis*. Ed. Duchesne i. cx.-cliv.
- ²² *L.P.* I. 174.
- ²³ *L.P.* I. 183. (cf 177, 178, 179) aromata in incensum sanctis martyribus.
- ²⁴ *L.P.* I. 177.
- ²⁵ *L.P.* I. cli.
- ²⁶ *Ib.* 233.
- ²⁷ *Ib.* cxlvi.
- ²⁸ There were many similar gifts in the ninth century. *L.P.* II. 49, 75, 81, 94, 108, 120, 194, 195.
- ²⁹ Schmitz, *Bussbücher* ii. 567; Haddan and Stubbs *Councils* iii. 191. Compare a passage quoted in Magani, *L'Antica Liturgia Romana* ii. 109, from Troya, *Cod. Dipl Longob.*, p. II. p. 513, describing the benefaction of a priest to the Cathedral of Cremona: – In die festo S. Sisinnii accendantur ceri et comburantur thura et aromatha et de eisdem aromatibus condiatur corona et pharum ut accendantur in honorem eiusdem sancti martyris.
- ³⁰ The lines are wrongly ascribed to Alcuin. See *P.L.* ci. 1311.
- ³¹ For pictures of the hanging censer in Anglo-Saxon times see Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 603 of the XIth century, ff. 9, 13, 13^v, 29, 33, 34, 57^v. Sometimes it has a cover, and sometimes not.
- ³² *Topographical Dict.* of Wm. Lambarde (1536-1601), quoted in M. Walcott, *Traditions and Customs of Cathedrals*, 195. (London, 1872, 2nd Ed.)
- ³³ *Works*, P.S. p. 540.
- ³⁴ Another doubtful passage is that where he speaks of the evening as *hora incensi*. De Virgg. III. iv. 18, which may equally refer to lights: De Vert *Explication des Ceremonies* ii. 112. (Paris, 1710).
- ³⁵ Rohault de Fleury *La Messe* V. 152, and pl. cdxiv. Also Kraus *Geschichte des Chr. Kunt.* i. 501, 525.
- ³⁶ *Ib.* pl. cdxv.
- ³⁷ *Ib.*, and see a similar censer in Brit. Mus. MS. Tib. c. vi. figured there, and better in Westwood *Facsimiles*, pl. 46 (1868).
- ³⁸ Possibly the use of Incense in visiting the sick is also very early; all these three probably were in their origin sanitary precautions, or at least regarded as prophylactic in some sense. Traces of the use in visiting the sick may be seen in a Rheims MS. of *circa* 1000, quoted by Menard (see *P. L.* lxxviii. 530), and in Martene *De Eccl. Rit.*, as well as in some forms of *Benedictio incensi*, e.g., the following from the Jumieges Missal and Leofric Missal: –
- Domine deus omnipotens cui dignare domine respicere et benedicere hanc creaturam tuam incensi; ut omnes languores odorem ipsius sentientes effugiant et separantur, &c.
- Missal of Robert of Jumieges*, H. B. S. 281 and lxxvii. Cp. *Westm. Missal* ii. 577.
- ³⁹ So Rupert of Deutz (†1135) *De div off.* i. 36. Incensum bona opinionis signum locum ipsum aspergit in quo legendum est evangelium.
- ⁴⁰ Compare the procession which escorted the newly ordained clergy after an ordination in Rome to their respective tituli cum cereo stata et thymiamateriis. *Ordines of St. Amand.* Duchesne l.c., page 460.

⁴¹ Bruns gives the date of this Council as 650 (Canones II., 268, 320); but the earlier date is very improbable. See Hefele *Conciliengeschichte* iii. 96 (Freiburg i. B. 1877).

⁴² See cap. 40. *P. L.* ci. 1252. The work is not earlier than the XIth century, and this chapter is really Remigius of Auxerre's *Expositio Missæ*.

⁴³ Duchesne *Origines du Culte*, p. 388.

⁴⁴ *Greg. Sacr.* Ed. Menard, 149-152. *P. L.* lxxviii. 157-160. See also Remigius of Auxerre's Commentary (c. 900) on the Service. *P. L.* cxxxi. 858-862.

⁴⁵ ii. 46, and cp. for the Altar ii. 494.

⁴⁶ Cp. the Metz Sacramentary in Duchesne, p. 468, and Ducange s. v. "Incensum."

⁴⁷ *Dein faciat incensum accendi in quatuor angulos et medio et dicat Antiphonam*, ii. 494.

⁴⁸ The rubrics of both these Sacramentaries, with regard to Incense, so far, derive from the *Ordo Romanus*, which deals with the Consecration of a Church, as printed by Hittorp, *De divinis eccl. cath. officiis*, pp. 107-131 (Cologne, 1568): the first preserves some features, and the second others; the prayers differ.

⁴⁹ *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii. 479-484. This last provision is not in the *Ordo Romanus* above mentioned. The *Ordines of St. Amand* printed in Duchesne are not very full, and only mention Incense in the procession with the relics. Duchesne l.c., p. 461.

⁵⁰ This is so explained by Raban in his exposition of the ceremonies of the consecration of a Church. Quod vero tunc incensum a pontifice super altare ponitur significat puram super illud orationem esse debere. *De Clericorum institutione* ii. 45 *P. L.* cvii. 359.

⁵¹ *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii. 241, 479.

⁵² The use of Incense in connexion with relics under other circumstances than at the consecration of a Church is not uncommon, especially in the Translation of Relics in a procession which was in some sense a repetition of the funeral procession, or is indistinguishable from it. For example, in the life, of St. Lupicinus (c. 480). Rapuit sanctum corpus et ferre cœpit in feretro ad vicum Transaliacensem, dispositis in itinere psallentium turmis cum crucibus cereisque atque odore fragrantis thymiamatis. Gregory of Tours. *Vita Sancti Lupicini*. *P. L.* lxxi. 1067.

⁵³ See p. 58, especially note 3.

⁵⁴ In Menard. See *P. L.* lxxviii. 244 ff.; and for an account of the document, 20-22.

⁵⁵ c. xl., *ib.* 556 and cp. Rupert, *De Div. Off.*, i, 29, 36.

⁵⁶ Muratori, *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii. 504.

⁵⁷ *Gelasian Sacramentary*, Muratori, i. 565

⁵⁸ *Ordo Romanus* in Hittorp, *De div. Off.*, pp. 59, 62 (Cologne. 1568).

⁵⁹ *Ib.* pp. 72, 81. Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.*, i. 17.

⁶⁰ *Ib.* pp. 73, 76, 77.

⁶¹ *Ib.* pp. 77-79.

⁶² *Use of Sarum*, cap. xxxix. 66, pp. 61-105 (Cambridge, 1898).

⁶³ One MS. adds a second censuring of the middle of the Altar.

⁶⁴ *De inst., cler.*, ii. 7.

⁶⁵ *Ib.*, pp. 113-117, 121-123.

⁶⁶ *Ib.*, pp. 97, 183-187

APPENDIX B.

ON THE USE OF INCENSE IN THE ORTHODOX

EASTERN CHURCH.

IN the Orthodox Eastern Church Incense is used eight times (always) during the Liturgy, once during Vespers (twice, or three times, on Sundays and Festivals); and twice at Matins (four times on Sundays and Festivals). While the exact method of its use often differs in detail (*e.g.*, it may never be administered by anyone who is not at least in deacon's orders) it is an interesting fact that at each point of the service where its use is most confidently claimed for the English Church – immediately before the commencement of the Liturgy, before the reading of the Gospel, at the placing of the oblations upon the Altar, at *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, and in Processions, there is a corresponding use of Incense in the Eastern rite. The circumstances, however, differ in detail. The censuring in the East which corresponds with that of the Approach to the Altar is done by the Deacon and not by the Priest. As soon as the Proskomide is finished, the Priest, after censuring the oblations for the last time on the table of the Prothesis, gives the censer to the Deacon, who, after himself censuring the Oblations, censes the Altar, and then the whole church; the icons and people, and then the Altar again; after which the Deacon and the Priest say (secret) short prayers of preparation, including the beautiful prayer to the Holy Spirit with which every office commences, and which presents a striking parallel to our Collect for Purity: –

“O heavenly King, the Comforter, Who art in all places and fillest all things, come Thou, and dwell within us, and cleanse us from all that defileth, and save, O blessed One, our souls.”

At the Gospel the censuring, according to the directions of the rubrics, should take place during the Alleluia, but owing to the fact that the verses to the Alleluia (though in the books) are almost universally omitted, as a matter of fact it always takes place during the reading of the Epistle; the Deacon, just as at Sarum, censes not the *analogion*, or lectern, but the Altar with the Book of the Gospels lying on it, and then the sanctuary, the clergy in choir, the icons, the choir, and the people; he does not, however, go down into the nave for this.

At the Offertory the censuring of the Altar, choir, and, people is done by the Deacon immediately before the Great Entrance, while the oblation is censed by the Priest with three swings, as soon as it is placed on the Altar.

There is no censuring at the Consecration, but after the Consecration, during the Commemoration of the Mother of God and of the Saints the Holy Sacrament is censed. This is of course in allusion to the passage in the Apocalypse about the smoke of the Incense ascending before God with the prayers of the saints.

In the East *Magnificat* is sung at Matins, where; together with *Benedictus*, it forms the ninth “Ode” or Scripture canticle. The whole church is censed at this point, beginning with the Altar. The daily censuring at Vespers takes place at the Psalm *Kuvrie ejkevkraxa*, which practically (although not liturgically perhaps) occupies the place of

the Western *Magnificat*. It is the verse “Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the Incense;” which obviously suggests this custom.

It will be seen from the above, that, with the exception of the censuring which takes place after the Consecration, the choir and the people are censured at all the points which have been mentioned, as well as at some other points in the Eastern services for which no parallel is to be found in the Western service books. In the West, on the contrary, however often Incense is prescribed, the censuring of the choir and people seems always to have been confined to one occasion in each service. But however much the actual practice may differ in detail, it may fairly be said that the principles underlying its use are the same in East and West.

W. J. BIRKBECK.

APPENDIX C.

THE THEOLOGICAL VALUE OF INCENSE.

FIRST TREATISE.

By the Rev. H. R. PERCIVAL, Rector of the Church of the Evangelists, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

PART I.

THE MEANING OF INCENSE.

The burning of Incense seems to have had two distinct meanings, as used in the Christian Church, the meaning varying in accordance with the source from which the practice was taken.

(A) *A Mark of Respect to that before which it was burned.*

The Ancient Greeks and Romans burned Incense before their gods and before the likenesses of the Emperor in token of veneration and high regard. This heathen use of Incense was in a standing vessel (the *turibulum*) which was really a moveable grate, or more ordinarily a stationary altar (*ara*). A pinch of frankincense was taken out of the *acerra* and was thrown upon the coals. Incense was wont to be burned before the representations of the Emperors in heathen times, as a mark of respect, and this was carried over into the Christian days as Dr. Doellinger remarks in his "History of the Church" (Eng. tr., Vol. III., p. 55) and to this reference is made by the Bishop Theodosius, who had belonged to the Iconoclasts, but who made his submission at the second Nicene Synod, (Labbe *Concilia*, viii. 705c. Venice, 1729,) where he expressly says that even at that late date the custom had still survived, and that when the *Laurata et iconae* of the Emperor were sent to any city or town, the people went out to receive them "with lights and incense," and argues that "it was surely not the tablet covered with wax, but the Emperor himself, that was thus honoured." (On the subject of these *laurata*, cf. Du Cange, *Gloss*.)

It may well be supposed that this idea of marking the respect one bears towards some person or thing by burning Incense before him or it was the origin, not only of the Incense offered to the Christian Emperors and their likenesses, and of that which was offered in the path of the heathen victor at his triumph, but also of the offering of Incense before images, altars, the book of the Holy Gospels, and other objects and persons deemed by the early Christians worthy of special respect. In this connection, it may not be amiss to remark that no ceremonial act has any inherent meaning, its meaning being entirely dependent upon the intention with which it is performed. The same outward ceremonial act may mean different things, or different grades of the same thing. It is a complete mistake to suppose that the burning of Incense necessarily is an act of Divine worship, or has any necessary connection with sacrifice. As has just been pointed out, it may be nothing more than an act of civil and political respect. The removal of the hat in

Church and at the meeting of a friend or of a funeral is a precisely similar case. This heathen-derived idea of Incense seems to have been sanctified by the early Church, and by her to have been incorporated into her worship, and we find this idea expressed in the ordinary form for blessing Incense in the West – “Mayest thou be blessed by Him in Whose honour thou art to be burned.”

(B) *The mystical setting forth of Prayer.*

But there was a deeper meaning attached to the burning of Incense among God’s chosen people than was ever found among the heathen. To the Jews the smoke of the Incense was the sweet savour of prayer rising up before the Most High. “Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the Incense.” There is no need to cite other passages to the same purpose. The Jews not only knew that the Incense they offered set forth the power of prayer in general, but above all they connected it with that all-availing intercession which was to be made by the promised Messiah to whom all their ceremonies pointed. (On this, see, the Jewish Commentators. Ebrard has some good remarks on this head.) And yet this ceremony of burning Incense before God was peculiar and different from most of their rites. All those other rites would be fulfilled and vanish away when Christ was come, but this rite and the “pure Mincha,” with which it was so intimately connected, should continue on in the Gospel Days. The blood of circumcision would no more be shed, the blood of the beast would no more be poured forth, but from East to West among the Gentiles the pure Mincha would be offered to God’s Name with the smoke of the Incense. No un-biassed commentator can question the statement that if the “pure offering” is material and not merely symbolical, namely, the material offering of the elements of Holy Eucharist, then, too, the Incense must be material; nor is it possible to explain away the material character of the Mincha by interpreting “pure” to mean immaterial, as our profoundly learned Joseph Mede in commentating on this text well notes. He says that if “pure” be understood as meaning that it was “ajquvtw” quvesqai, to be sacrificed without sacrificing rites” “it would make the literal sense of our prophet to be absurd; and to say ‘in every place Incense is offered to My Name, and an offering without Incense.’ And yet this would be the literal meaning if ‘pure’ here signified without Incense.” (Book II., page 358, fourth edition, 1877.)

(It should be noted that the word “Incense” does not occur at all in this passage in the Roman Catholic Vulgate, but that version is undoubtedly incorrect here, the true meaning being found in the Septuagint.)

It would seem then that the use of Incense in the Christian Church, if not directly pre-ordained by Almighty God, is at least most agreeable to the Holy Scriptures; and as it has been in vogue in the whole Church from time immemorial, it would seem that it could hardly properly be laid aside even by the direct, clear, and unequivocal action of a particular Church, unless, indeed, it had become so associated with false doctrine as to be perilous to the purity of the faith of the people.

There seems to be only one more point in this connection to dwell upon. In the Jewish Church, besides the Altar of Incense, and the little cups of Incense on the top of the piles of Shewbread, censers carried in the hand were in constant use. Everyone will remember the case of Korah. Also, there was a censer, which on the great day of Atonement, the high Priest took with him into the Holy of Holies.

This method of using Incense in a swinging vessel is that most commonly mentioned in the New Testament, and is practically the only one now known to the Church of God.¹

¹ In the Orthodox Eastern Church, before the commencement of Mattins at midnight on Easter Day, Incense is burnt in two standing vessels, one in the centre of the nave, the other behind the *iconostasion*, in order that when the Resurrection is proclaimed the whole church may be filled with the sweet odour of frankincense. This, however, is the only occasion on which it is so burnt.

PART II.

THE DOCTRINAL MEANING OF THE CENSINGS

PRACTISED BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

WE come now to the consideration of the theological meaning to be attached to the censings of persons and things, as practised by the Christian Church from the earliest times. I do not think it is necessary to set down all the mystical meanings assigned to the use of Incense by the various Liturgical and Ritual writers. Their works are perfectly accessible, and can be examined by anyone, although no doubt there are many true and useful meanings to be attached to this ceremony of the Church, but I shall endeavour to arrive at one general underlying principle. This principle has been rather culled from many sources and digested, than found clearly set forth in any one writer, but yet it would seem to be none the less sound on this account. To set forth, then, the matter in a word, it may be said that – Whatever was sprinkled or touched with blood in the Old Law, to show the need of a dying Redeemer to come, is, under the New Law, censed, to show that there is no more any need of a fresh sacrifice for sin, that the sacrifice set forth in type and figure by the sacrifices of the Law has been offered by Christ, once for all (*αὐπάξ*), “A full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world”; that that sacrifice needs no repetition, that nothing can be added to it, and that all that now is needed is that we, who are still without the veil and yet parts of the mystical Body of the Eternal Victim, that we, together with our prayers, as a sweet smelling savour, should be gathered in one, and enfolded in His all prevailing intercession, which, as our Great High Priest, He offers, “through His Blood” on the Heavenly Altar. This seems to be the view held by St. Thomas Aquinas (III., 83, v. Ad. 2), “The offering of Incense represents the effect of grace, of which Christ (as of a sweet savour) is full; and which from Christ is derived to the faithful by the office of the ministry; and therefore, when the Altar by which Christ is signified has been censed on every side, all the people are censed in order.”

Of course the bestowal of grace and the Lord’s intercession are essentially the same, as having their source in the same blood-shedding of the Immaculate Lamb. A clearer and more profound statement I find in Smith’s “Dictionary of the Bible”; “Looking upon Incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritu-

al, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ.”

In the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is set forth the whole rationale of the ceremonial censings of the Christian Church. But before enlarging on this, a word should be said with regard to the use of Incense under the old dispensation. Nor should this point be left without referring to Bishop Westcott’s commentary on this Epistle, in which will be found the most perfect setting forth in the English, or probably in any language, of the mystery of the Lord’s present intercession.

It will be remembered that in the Tabernacle, outside the first veil, which separated the Holy Place from the people, stood the Altar of Sacrifice to show that the way to God was shut up by sin. Only by blood could that way be opened at all, and then only to few, and to them at fixed times. In the Old Law, without shedding of blood was no remission, and “almost all things were by the law purged with blood.” But immediately before the second veil, really belonging to (as the Apostle expressly tells us) the Holy of Holies, stood the Golden Altar of Incense. There, hidden from the sight of the people, rose up the smoke of the Incense, morning and evening, telling of a time that was to come, when no more would the shedding of blood be required, nor would veils shut out God’s people from access to His Presence, but that the veil should be rent apart and men might go freely to God, but even then only through the Incense of the intercession of the Great High Priest, Who ever liveth to make intercession for us, for no man cometh to the Father but by Him. This, however, was not all, for hidden likewise from the people’s sight was the Golden Table with the loaves of the Shewbread, which has been taken by the Fathers to be the type of the New Law’s new Oblation; the “pure Mincha” of the Holy Eucharist, the central act of worship of the Gospel; and it must not be forgotten that a vessel of burning Incense was set on the top of each heap to cense the oblations. No doubt it is to this that Malachi refers when he combines (as always in the Holy Scriptures) the offering of the meal-offering with the burning of Incense. All without the veil was to pass away, but that within was to endure. It is worthy of note in this connection that so much has the Eastern Church been impressed with this universal coupling in Holy Scriptures of the offering of Incense with the offering of bread, that Incense is offered by her at every celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and its omission is looked upon by Easterns as a Roman corruption.

But when once the Blood had been shed that “paid the price for sinners due,” then the symbolical sprinkling of blood lost all significance and efficacy. By the law, almost all things were purged by blood, but in the Gospel all things are brought to God, and sanctified, and knit in one, through the intercession of the Divine Atonement. Exactly in accordance with this is, and has been, the practice of the whole Church in the use of Incense. The Apostle says “that Moses sprinkled both the Book and all the people . . . both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the Ministry,” and in the law we read the particular way in which the four corners of the Altar were touched with blood, etc., etc. Now it is evident that, substituting censuring for sprinkling with blood, we have the custom of the whole Church of God. We need no more atoning Blood; that was shed once for all, and a full satisfaction made ages ago, but we need to be included in the Divine intercession, and hence we set this forth in mystery when we cense the book of the Gospels, and the holy ministers performing the service, and all the people, and the Altar at its four corners, and the Holy Oblations of bread and wine, and in procession the “tabernacle “ (*i.e.*, the

whole Church), and “the whole house is filled with smoke,” which mystically sets forth that we on earth are wrapped in the cloud of the heavenly intercession.

From the foregoing, it is clear that the offering of Incense in the Christian Church is the setting forth of the power of prayer, won by the Incarnation of the Divine Son; it will not, therefore, be a cause of surprise to find that by our Western custom Incense is offered in the morning at *Benedictus*, and in the evening at *Magnificat*,¹ the daily commemoration in the choir offices of the morning and evening sacrifices of the old dispensation; and since the object of the Incarnation was that He might have “a body” to offer to God in sacrifice, naturally it is about the Altar, where we keep the memorial of His precious death and sacrifice until His coming again, that the ritual censings are centred.

It does not seem necessary to enter here into the theological meaning of each separate act of censuring, all no doubt are the result of the teaching of the Spirit of God; but there is one point of such great antiquity, and of such singular pathos, that it should not be omitted. Of course it will be remembered how usually, almost universally, in the primitive Church, the martyrs were buried under the Altar, and so it came about that the Priest, while censuring the Altar at the South end, stooped down and censured the feet of the deaf servant of Christ, and then again his head, when he was come to the North, and the whole body as he passed back from North to South. The bodies of the Saints are but rarely there now, but the Church has continued her method of censuring, wrapping all, both quick and dead, in the all availing intercession of Her Great Head.

It is no part of our intention to claim a Scriptural authority, or suggestion even, of every detail of the present method of using Incense in the Christian Church. We distinctly affirm with St. Thomas (*vide loc. cit.*) that its use does not rest upon the authority of the Mosaic law, but upon that of the Christian Church alone. We are ready to admit with many of the learned, among whom may be numbered Aquinas, De Vert, and Scudamore (against others of equal learning), that the desire of producing a sweet smell in a place which otherwise would have been foul, may have had something to do with its introduction into the Christian Church, as it undoubtedly had something to do with its being ordered by Moses for use in the Tabernacle made of skins. We affirm, with Tertullian, that we use Incense in a fashion different from the heathen, to wit – in a swinging censer, and not in a standing vessel, as the Pagans did. We are of opinion that the censuring of persons and things is the only method of using Incense which is distinctly Christian; and finally we deny that it is possible to find in this custom of the Church (be its antiquity what it may) any superstition, or the setting forth of any doctrine other than the perfect sufficiency of the Sacrifice of Calvary, and the need of all being gathered in one through the intercession of the Eternal Victim, which for a sweet savour rises before the Mercy Seat on High.

¹ In the Orthodox Eastern Church *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* together form the ninth “Ode” or Canticle from Holy Scripture at Matins. Whilst it is sung the Altar and all the church and congregation are censured. At Vespers the censuring corresponding with that which is here mentioned in the text takes place during the Psalm *Kuvrie ejkevkraxa*, containing the verse: *Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the Incense*, etc.

SECOND TREATISE.

By the Rev. D. STONE, Principal of Dorchester Missionary College.

The method of using incense among the Jews was for the incense to be cast upon coals placed on the altar, so that the smoke of the incense arose from a fixed place. (See Mishna, *Tamid* v.-vi.; *Jena* iv.-v.).

Cf. Smith and Fuller's Dictionary of the Bible, i., 1438 (ed. 2).
Schürer History of the Jewish people, II., i., 295 (English translation).
Vigorous Dictionaire de la Bible, ii., 1778.

In Ezek. viii. 10-11, the vessel containing the coals may have been held in the hand while the incense was placed on it. Compare representations on Egyptian monuments.

See also Num. xvi. 6, 7, 17-8, 46-7; Rev. v. 8.

The incense of the Jewish service appears to have symbolized by its fragrance –

- (1) That God was pleased to accept the worship and sacrifice of man;
- (2) The gifts and blessing from God to man.

In the earliest Christian worship Incense was apparently not used, probably partly because of the necessary simplicity before there was a fully-ordered organization of worship, partly because of the need of distinguishing Christianity from both Judaism and heathenism.

When Incense came into use it is impossible to say in what manner it was used at the first.¹

Eventually the universal method of using Incense in Christian worship came to include the censuring of persons and things.

A custom which, so far as is known, differs from any either in Judaism or in heathenism needs explanation.

The Incarnation made clear much as to the relation of the material to the spiritual which was only dimly indicated to the Jews and introduced new relations, *e.g.*, (1) Christian teaching about the resurrection of the body with all that it involves as to the material part of man's life; (2) the institution of the sacraments. These are not isolated instances outside the general Christian system, but representative instances in which a Christian principle is embodied.

In consequence of this, it would be reasonable that, when the temporary necessity of distinguishing Christianity from Judaism and heathenism had passed, there should be in the Christian Church (1) the use of Incense; (2) an extension of the meaning attached to it; (3) a consequent extension in the method of use.

1. Part of the symbolical meaning of the Jewish use of Incense was to signify the acceptance by God of human worship and sacrifice. This symbol would remain in any method of using Incense in the Christian Church. It would have an extended meaning. The reason why the worship and sacrifice of Christians is acceptable to God is that they

are offered and pleaded in the Name of Christ and in the power of His merits. This extended meaning reasonably leads to an extended use. Each part of the Divine service can be rightly used only so far as the use of it is given its place in the pleading of Christ's merits. The censuring of holy things is part of the Christian witness to the truths that (1) matter is the creation of God, and as created is good; (2) matter has a sacred office to perform; (3) matter can be rightly employed in Divine service only as the spirit in which it is used is that of dedicating it to God in the power of the merits of Christ. The altar and the cross, the book of the Gospels, the elements of bread and wine, are all, with their different functions, brought into the Divine service. Apart from the perfect work of Christ, they could have no value. When they are censed the Church's testimony is borne that (1) they are accepted by God when offered by man; (2) they are accepted in and because of Christ's merits.

The same applies to the censuring of persons. The officiating priest offers to God an acceptable sacrifice. When he is censed the Church bears testimony that (1) it is the Will of God to accept the sacred offering at the hands of the officiant; (2) this acceptance is granted because the offering is made by the priest in the power of Christ's merits.

While the priest is given his office by God, it is also true that he is the representative and organ of the Christian laity. The offering which he ministerially makes is their offering. The act of worship and sacrifice is the act of the Christian body. That which the officiant ministerially does is the action of the congregation of baptized persons. When the congregation is censed the Church bears testimony that (1) it is the will of God to accept their offering; (2) the offering is accepted because of the merits of Christ. The censuring of a dead body similarly signifies (1) the Divine acceptance of the completed earthly life; (2) this acceptance is because of and in Christ.

The use of Incense in procession is parallel. The procession is the Church's supplication, or thanksgiving, or act of praise. The Incense symbolizes, again, that (1) it is the will of God to accept supplication; or thanksgiving, or praise; (2) there is acceptance because of the merits of Christ. For acceptance see, *e.g.*, Brightman, *Liturgies*, p. 359. qumivamav soi profsevromen Criste; oJ qeo;” hJmw’n eij” ojsmh;n eujwdiva” pneumatikh””. For merits of Christ see, *e.g.*, *ibid.*, 360, ejkavluyen oujranou;” hJ ajrethv sou Criste; kai; th”” aijnevsewv” sou plhvrh” hJ gh’.

2. The spreading of the fragrance of the Incense through the Holy Place symbolized the gifts and blessing of God to man. This symbol also would remain in any method of using Incense in the Christian Church and would have an extended meaning because it is through the merits of Christ that gifts and blessing are received from God by Christians. In this aspect there is both what is negative in protection against evil and what is positive in the gift of good. Here, again, the extended meaning reasonably leads to an extended use. That which God uses receives blessing so far as it is capable of receiving it. This capacity differs enormously. The merely material object, so far as we can see, is affected by the Divine blessing simply by becoming a holy thing and by being made an instrument used in Divine purposes. Man, in proportion to his spiritual power of reception, receives from the Divine blessing gifts which profoundly affect his life. In censuring things and persons the Church bears testimony that (1) they receive the Divine blessing both in separation from evil and in the gift of good so far as they are capable of receiving it; (2) this blessing comes to them by virtue of the merits of Christ.

For protection and blessing see – *e.g.*, Brightman, *Liturgies*, p. 360, skevpason hJma’” ejn th’ skevph/ tw’n pteruvgn sou, ajpodivwxon ajf! hJmw’n pavnta ejcpro;n kai; polevmion, ejrhvneuson hJmw’n th;n zwhvn.

That which is blessed belongs to God. The act of censuring claims for God that which is censured. The merely material thing is recognized as put apart for his service, set apart from any other use than that in worship. The person censured is claimed for God. He is recognized as a member of Christ set apart to live a Christian life.

3. The Incarnation made it possible for Christians to make representations of the human form which the Son of God took into personal union with Himself. Christian practice has made also representations of the saints. The doctrine of the Incarnation has an intimate bearing on the right attitude of Christians towards such representations. The human Body of our Lord is the Body of God, and in His Body He is to be adored. The body of a Christian is united to Christ and is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and, as such, is a sacred thing. The representations of Christ are sacred, and call for reverence because of Him of whom they are representations. So far as any saint is rightly revered, reverence is rightly paid to representations of Him. The essential point in the work of the seventh ecumenical Council was the assertion of the scope of the Incarnation in this respect. The declaration of the Council that the Lord by His Incarnation delivered from idolatry (Hardouin *Concilia* iv. 264-5) practically asserted that the Incarnation showed the right place of that which is material in human life and worship. The careful and accurate distinction between the *latreiva* which is due only to God and the *proskuvnhsi*” which may be directed to human and material objects (*e.g.*, *ibid.*, 456) carried this out. Of this *proskuvnhsi*” the use of Incense was regarded as forming part (*ibid.*) Apart from the Incarnation, the censuring of an image would be either meaningless or profane. In view of the Incarnation, such an act testifies that (1) the image itself is accepted by God as a help to those who see it; (2) the image is a holy thing as representing one who, by Divine Grace, has been made holy; (3) the life of the saint who is depicted is an acceptable offering to God; (4) the whole value of that which is saintly is derived from Christ’s merits.

The theological importance of the ceremonial use of incense to cense persons and things and in procession may then be said to be:

1. It is a witness to the scope of the Incarnation in bringing the material and the human into union with Divine work.

2. It is a witness that the material and human cannot be acceptable to God except by virtue of the Divine blessing and of the merits of Christ.

3. It has some special value at a time when there are widespread tendencies both to glorify the material in itself and to ignore the spiritual worth of the material in union with God.

4. The abandonment of it in English Churches in which it has been adopted would involve ceasing to lay instructive emphasis on Christian truths in the way in which this emphasis existed universally in earlier times and exists at the present time in the rest of the Western Church and still more markedly in the Churches of the East. It would be re-

garded by Eastern Christians in particular as a retrograde step, impairing the fulness of the witness of the Church in England to the truths resulting from the doctrine of the Incarnation, and affording a barrier to external union.

¹ See Appendix A

APPENDIX D.
THE RUBRICS
OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER COMPARED
AND THEIR
EVIDENTIAL VALUE CONSIDERED
IN RELATION TO THE USAGES OF
THE SECOND YEAR OF EDWARD VI.
BY
THE REV. ERNEST GELDART,
Rector of Little Braxted, Essex.

THE RUBRICS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER COMPARED

1548

THE ORDER OF THE COMMUNION AS IN THE MISSAL

WITHOUT VARYING ANY RITE OR
CEREMONY EXCEPT AS HERE GIV-
EN.

AS IN
1549

THE SUPPER OF THE LORD AND THE HOLY COMMUNION

COMMONLY CALLED THE MASS.

- ¶ SO many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning afore the beginning of Matins, or immediately after.
- ¶ And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed: The Curate shall call him, and advertise him, in any wise not to presume to the Lord's table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented, and amended his former naughty life: that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended: and that he have recompensed the parties, whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.
- ¶ The same order shall the Curate use, with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice: The Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate.
- ¶ 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

1552

THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION

SO many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning, afore the beginning of morning prayer, or immediately after.

And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours. by word or deed: The Curate having knowledge thereof, shall call him, and advertise him, in any wise not to presume to the Lord's Table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented, and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended: and that he have recompensed the parties, whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

¶ The same order shall the Curate use with those, betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the LORD'S table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive, from the bottom of his heart, all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice: The Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate.

¶ The Table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the chancel, where Morning prayer and Evening prayer, be appointed to be said.

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| | the Priest, in the ministracion, as shall be requisite: And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, Albes with tunicles. Then shall the Clerks sing in English for the office, or Introit, (as they call it,) a Psalm appointed for that day. | Glory be to thee, O Lord. |
| PREPARATORY PRAYERS. | | |
| Confiteor. | The Priest standing humbly afore the middes of the Altar, shall saie the Lordes praier, with this Collect. | |
| Etc. | | |
| Introit. [Incense.] | ALMIGHTIE God, unto whom all hartes bee open. | |
| | Then shall he saie a Psalme appointed for the introite: whiche Psalme ended, the Priest shall saye, or els the Clerkes shal syng, | |
| iii. Kyrie Eleison. | iii. Lorde haue mercie upon us. | |
| iii. Christe Eleison. | iii. Christ haue mercie upon us. | |
| iii. Kyrie Eleison. | iii. Lorde haue mercie upon us, | |
| | Then the Prieste standyng at Goddes borde shall begin, | |
| Gloria in excelsis Deo | Glory be to God on High. <i>The clerkes.</i> And in earth peace. | |
| | Then the priest shall turne him to the people and saye, | |
| Dominus vobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo | The Lorde be with you. <i>The Aunswere.</i> And with thy spirite. | |
| Oremus. | <i>The Priest.</i> Let us praie. | |
| Collect. | Then shall folowe the Collect of the daie, with one of these two Collectes folowynge, for the kyng. | |
| Oremus. Collects. | Priest. ¶ Let us pray. ALMIGHTY God. . . . | |
| | The Collects ended, the priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the Epistle, in a place assigned for the purpose, saying, | |
| Epistle <i>in English.</i> | The Epistle of Saint Paul, written in the Chapter of to the | |
| * Gradual. | The Minister then shall read the Epistle. Immediately after the Epistle ended, the priest, or one appointed to read the Gospel, shall say, | |
| Gospel <i>in English.</i> [Incense.] | The holy Gospel, written in the Chapter of | |
| | The Clerks and people shall answer, | |

[And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment nor Cope: but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet: and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only.]

And the Priest standing at the North side of the Table shall say the Lord's Prayer with this Collect following:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open.

¶ Then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments: and the people kneeling shall, after every Commandment ask Gods mercy for their transgressions of the same after this sort. . .

¶ Then shall follow the Collect of the day with one of these two Collects following for the king: the Priest standing up and saying.

¶ Let us pray. Priest.
ALMIGHTY God.

¶ Immediately after the Collects, the Priest shall read the Epistle, beginning thus.

¶ The Epistle written in the Chapter of

And the Epistle ended, he shall say the Gospel, beginning thus.

The Gospel, written in the Chapter of

Credo.

¶ Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments recited in English when there was no sermon.

First the Parson, Vicar, or Curate, the next Sunday or holy day, or at the least, one day before he shall minister the Communion, shall give warning to his Parishioners, or those which be present, that they prepare themselves thereto, saying to them openly and plainly as hereafter followeth, or such like.

DEAR friends, and you especially upon whose souls I have cure and charge, on next, I do intend

Offertory. [Incense.]

Dominus vobiscum.

The Priest or Deacon then shall read the Gospel: After the Gospel ended, the Priest shall begin,

I BELIEVE in one God.

The Clerks shall sing the rest.

¶ After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided: wherein if the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, then shall the Curate give this exhortation, to those that be minded to receive the same.

Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour

¶ In Cathedral churches or other places, where there is daily Communion, it shall be sufficient to read this exhortation above written, once in a month. And in parish churches, upon the week days it may be left unsaid.

¶ And if upon the Sunday or holyday, the people be negligent to come to the Communion: Then shall the Priest earnestly exhort his parishioners, to dispose themselves to the receiving of the holy Communion more diligently, saying these or like words unto them.

DEAR friends, and you especially, upon whose souls I have cure and charge, upon day next I do intend

¶ Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these Sentences of holy scripture, to be sung whiles the people do offer, or else one of them to be said by the minister; immediately afore the offering.

Where there be Clerks, they shall sing one, or many of the sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of the time, that the people be offering.

In the mean time, whiles the Clerks do sing the Offertory, so many as are disposed, shall offer to the poor men's box every one according to his ability and charitable mind. And at the offering days appointed, every-man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.

And the Epistle and Gospel being ended,
shall be said the Creed.

I BELIEVE in one God. . . .

After the Creed, if there be no sermon,
shall follow one of the homilies
already set forth, or hereafter to be set
forth by common authority.

Sursum Corda.

After such sermon, homily, or exhortation,
the Curate shall declare unto the
people whether there be any holy days
or fasting days the week following:
and earnestly exhort them to remember
the poor, saying one or more of
these Sentences following, as he
thinketh most convenient by his discretion.

¶ Then shall the Church wardens, or
some other by them appointed, gather
the devotion of the people, and put the
same into the poor men's box: and
upon the offering days appointed,
every man and woman shall pay to the
Curate the due and accustomed offerings:
after which done, the Priest shall
say.

Preface.

Let us pray for the whole state
of Christ's Church militant here
upon earth.

Sanctus.

Then shall follow this exhortation at certain
times when the Curate shall see
the people negligent to come to the
holy Communion.

Canon Missae. [Incense].*

WE be come together at this
time, dearly beloved brethren, to
feed at the Lord's Supper.

* This was not, however, a general
use, nor is it *ordered* by
old rubrics.

¶ And sometime shall be said this also, at
the discretion of the Curate.

* Fraction of Host. Agnus Dei.

DEARLY beloved, forasmuch
as our duty is to render to
Almighty God our heavenly
Father most hearty thanks.

* Priest's Communion.

Then shall the Priest say this exhortation.

The time of the communion shall be immediately
after that the Priest himself hath received
the sacrament, without the varying of any
other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until
other order shall be provided), but as
heretofore usually the Priest hath done
with the sacrament of the body, to prepare,
bless and consecrate so much as will
serve the people so it shall continue
still after the same manner and form,

DEARLY beloved in the Lord:
ye that mind to come to the holy
Communion of the body and
blood of our Saviour.

* This was not, however, a general
use, nor is it *ordered* by
old rubrics.

Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy Communion, shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and Clerks.

Then shall the minister take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy Communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose: And putting the wine into the Chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup, prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean water: And setting both the bread and wine upon the Altar: Then the Priest shall say.

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

¶ Here shall follow the proper preface, according to the time (if there be any specially appointed,) or else immediately shall follow.

Therefore with angels, &c.

¶ Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts: heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Osannah in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Glory to Thee, O Lord, in the highest.

This the Clerks shall also sing.

¶ When the Clerks have done singing, then shall the Priest, or Deacon, turn him to the people, and say,

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's church.

¶ Then the Priest, turning him to the Altar, shall say or sing, plainly and distinctly, this prayer following

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, Who in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread,

save that he shall bless and consecrate the biggest chalice or some fair and convenient cup or cups full of wine with some water put unto it; and that day, not drink it up all himself, but taking one only sup or draught, leave the rest upon the altar covered, and turn to them that are disposed to be partakers of the Communion, and shall thus exhort them as followeth.

DEARLY beloved in the Lord,
ye coming to this holy

Then shall the Priest say to them which
be ready to take the Sacrament.

IF any man here be an open blas-
phemer

¶ Here shall follow the proper Preface,
according to the time, if there be any
specially appointed: or else immedi-
ately shall follow: Therefore with An-
gels, &c.

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of
hosts: heaven and earth are full
of Thy glory: glory be to. Thee,
O Lord most high.

[We do not presume to come.]

[Then the Priest standing up shall say, as
followeth,

Almighty God, our heavenly
Father.]

Here the Priest shall pause a while, to see
if any man will withdraw himself: and
if he perceive any so to do, then let
him commune with him privily at con-
venient leisure, and see whether he can
with good exhortation bring him to
grace: and after a little pause, the
Priest shall say.

You that do truly and earnestly
repent you

Then shall a general Confession be made
in the name of all those that are
minded to receive the holy Commu-
nion, either by one of them, or else by
one of the Ministers, or by the Priest
himself, all kneeling humbly upon
their knees.

ALMIGHTY God, Father of
our Lord Jesus Christ,

¶ Then shall the Priest stand up, and,
turning him to the people, say thus.

OUR Blessed Lord, Who hath
left power

¶ Then shall the Priest stand up, and,
turning him to the people, say thus.

HEAR what Comfortable
Words our Saviour

¶ Then shall the Priest kneel down and
say, in the name of all them that shall
receive the Communion, this prayer
following.

Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands.

Likewise after supper he took the cup,

Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands.

for many, for the remission of sins: Do this as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people.

Then shall the Priest say,

The peace of the Lord be alway with you.

Here the Priest shall turn him toward those that come to the holy Communion, and shall say,

You that do truly and earnestly repent you

Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humble upon their knees.

ALMIGHTY GOD, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ

Then shall the Priest stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus:

ALMIGHTY GOD, our heavenly Father.

Then shall the Priest also say,

Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith.

Then shall the Priest, turning him to God's board, kneel down, and say in the name of all them, that shall receive the Communion, this prayer following.

[Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the Holy Communion.

You that do truly and earnestly repent you

¶ Then shall this general Confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees.

ALMIGHTY God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ]

Then shall the Priest or the Bishop (being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus.

ALMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father.

Then shall the Priest also say,

Hear what comfortable words

¶ After the which, the Priest shall proceed, saying.

Lift up your hearts.

Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at God's board, say in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion, this prayer following,

WE do not presume to come to
this Thy Table

Then shall the Priest rise, the people still reverently kneeling, and the Priest shall deliver the Communion, first to the Ministers, if any be there present, that they may be ready to help the Priest, and after to the other. And when he doth deliver the sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words following.

THE body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.

And the Priest delivering the Sacrament of the blood, and giving everyone to drink once and no more, shall say.

THE blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul to everlasting life.

If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he follow with the Chalice, and as the Priest ministereth the bread, so shall he for more expedition minister the Wine, in form before written.

[I Then shall the Priest . . .] let the people depart.]

WE do not presume to come to
this thy table.

¶ Then shall the Prieste firste receiue the Communion in both kindes himselfe, and next deliuer it to other Ministers, if any be there presente (that they may bee ready to helpe the chiefe Minister,) and after to the people.

¶ And when he deliuereth the Sacrament of the body of Christe, he shall say to euery one these woordes,

The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geuen for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe.

And the Minister deliuering the Sacrament of the bloud, and geuing euery one to drinke once and no more, shall say,

The bloud of our Lorde Jesus Christe which was shed for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe.

If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he folow with the Chalice: and as the Priest ministereth the Sacrament of the body, so shall he (for more expedition) minister the Sacrament of the bloud, in fourme before written.

In the Communion tyme the Clarkes shall syng,

ii. O lambe of god, that takeste away the sinnes of the worlde: haue mercie upon us.

O lambe of god, that takeste away the synnes of the worlde : graunt us thy peace.

Beginning so soone as the Prieste doeth receyue the holy Communion, and when the Communion is ended, then shall the Clarkes syng the post Communion.

¶ Sentences of holy Scripture, to be sayd or song euery daye one, after the holy Communion, called the post Communion.

Then the Priest shall give thanks to God, in the name of all them that have communicated, turning him first to the people, and saying,

WE do not presume to come to
this thy table.]

¶ Then shall the minister first receive the
Communion in both kinds himself, and
next deliver it to other ministers, if any
be there present (that they may help
the chief minister), and after to the
people in their hands kneeling. And
when he delivereth the bread, he shall
say.

Take and eat this, in remem-
brance that Christ died for thee,
and feed on him in thy heart by
faith, with thanksgiving.

¶ And the minister that delivereth the cup
shall say.

Drink this in remembrance that
Christ's blood was shed for thee,
and be thankful.

Then shall the Priest, turning him to the
people, let the people depart with this
blessing.*

[* This Blessing dismissed the Com-
municants from the Altar, but *not* from
the Church, since the Post-Communion
and dismissal *followed*.]

The peace of God, which pas-
seth all understanding, keep your
hearts and minds, in the know-
ledge and love of God, and in
His Son Jesus Christ our Lord,

To the which the people shall answer. -

Amen.

¶ Then shall the Priest say the Lord's
prayer, the people repeating after him
every petition,

¶ After shall be said as followeth.

O LORD and heavenly Father,
we, thy humble servants.

¶ Or This.

ALMIGHTY and everliving God
.

¶ Then shall be said or sung

Note, that the Bread that shall be consec-
rated shall be such as heretofore hath been ac-
customed. And every of the said consecrated
Breads shall be broken in two pieces, at the
least, or more by the discretion of the Minister,
and so distributed. And men must not think less
to be received in part, than in the whole, but in
each of them the whole body of our Saviour
Jesu Christ.

The Lord be with you.
The Answer. And with thy spirit.
The Priest. Let us pray.
Almighty and everlasting God.

Then the Priest turning him to the people,
shall let them depart with this blessing:

The peace of GOD (which pas-
seth all understanding) keep your
hearts and minds in the know-
ledge and love of GOD, and of
his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: -
And the blessing of God
Almighty, the Father, the Son,
and the Holy, Ghost, be amongst
you and remain with you alway.

Then the people shall answer;

Amen.

Where there are no clerks, there the Priest
shall say all things appointed here for
them to sing.

When the holy Communion is celebrate
on the workday, or in private houses:
Then may be omitted, the Gloria in ex-
celsis, the Creed, the Homily, and the
exhortation, beginning,

Dearly beloved, &c.

¶ Collects to be said after the Offertory, when
there is no Communion, every such day
one.

For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dis-
sension, it is meet that the bread prepared
for the Communion be made, through all
this realm, after one sort and fashion; that is
to say, unleavened, and round, as it was
afore, but without all manner of print, and
something more larger and thicker than it
was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers
pieces: and every one shall be divided in
two pieces, at the least, or more, by the dis-
cretion of the minister, and so distributed.
And men must not think less to be received
in part than in the whole, but in each of
them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu
Christ.

¶ Upon Wednesdays and Fridays, the English
Litany shall be said or sung in all places,
after such form as is appointed by the king's
majesty's Injunctions: Or as is or shall be
otherwise appointed by his highness. And
though there be none to communicate with

Glory be to God on high. . . .

Then the Priest or the Bishop, if he be
present, shall let them depart with this
blessing.

THE peace of God, which pas-
seth all understanding, keep your
hearts and minds in the know-
ledge and love of God, and of his
Son Jesu Christ our Lord: and
the blessing of God almighty, the
Father, the Son, and the Holy
Ghost, be amongst you, and re-
main, with you always. Amen.

Collects to be said after the Offertory, when
there is no Communion, every such day one.
And the same may be said also as often as
occasion shall serve, after the Collects,
either of Morning and Evening prayer,
Communion, or Litany, by the discretion of
the minister.

¶ And to take away the superstition, which any
person hath, or might have in the bread and
wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such,
as is usual to be eaten at the table with other
meats, but the best and purest wheat bread,
that conveniently may be gotten. And if any
of the bread or wine remain, the Curate shall
have it to his own use.

the Priest, yet these days (after the Litany ended) the Priest 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. And then shall add one or two of the Collects aforewritten, as occasion shall serve, by his discretion. And then turning him to the people shall let them depart with the accustomed blessing.

Note, that if it doth so chance, that the wine hallowed and consecrate doth not suffice or be enough for them that do take the Communion, the Priest, after the first Cup or Chalice be emptied, may go again to the altar, and reverently, and devoutly, prepare, and consecrate another, and so the third, or more, likewise beginning at these words, *Simili modo postquam cœnatum est*, and ending at these words, *qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum* and without any levation or lifting up.

And the same order shall be used all other days, whensoever the people be customably assembled to pray in the church, and none disposed to communicate with the Priest.

Likewise in Chapels annexed, and all other places, there shall be no celebration of the Lord's supper, except there be some to communicate with the Priest. And in such Chapels annexed where the people hath not been accustomed, to pay any holy bread, there they must either make some charitable provision for the bearing of the charges of the Communion, or else (for receiving of the same) resort to their parish Church.

And forsomuche as the Pastours and Curates within thys realme shal continually fynd at theyr costes and charges in theyr cures, sufficient Breade and Wyne for the holy Communion (as oft as they Parishioners shalbe disposed for theyr spiritual comfort to receyue the same) it is therefore ordred, that in recompence of suche costes and charges, the Parishioners of euerye Parishes shall offer euery Sunday, at the tyme of the Offertory, the iuste valour and price of the holy lofe (with all suche money, and other thinges as were wont to be offered with the same) to the use of theyr Pastours and Curates, and that in suche ordre and course, as they were wont to fynde and pay the sayd holy lofe.

Also, that the receiuing of the Sacrament of the blessed body and blond of Christ, may be most agreeable to the institution therof, and to the usage of the primitiue Church: In all Cathedrall and Collegiate Churches, there shal alwaies some Communicate with the Prieste that ministreth. And that the same may bee also obserued euery where abrode in the country: Some one at the least of that house in euery Parishes to whome by course after the ordinaunce herein made, it apperteyneth to offer for the charges of the Communion, or some other whom they shall prouide to offer for them, shall receiue the holy Communion with the Prieste: the whiche may be the better doen, for that they knowe before, when theyr course commeth, and maie therefore dispose theselues to the worthie receiuyng of the Sacramente. And with hym or them who doeth so offre the charges of the Communion; all other, who be then Godly disposed thereunto, shall lykewyse receiue the Communion. And by this meanes the Minister hauyng alwaies some to communicate with him, maie accordingly solempnise so high and holy misteries, with all the suffrages and due ordre appoynted for the same. And the Priest on the weke daie shall forbear to celebrate the Communion, excepte he haue some that will communicate with hym.

Furthermore, euery man and woman to be bound to heare and be at the diuine seruice, in the Parishes churches where they be resident, and there with deuout prayer, or God-

¶ Upon the holy days, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the Homily, concluding with the general prayer, for the whole state of Christ's church militant here in earth: and one or more of these Collects before rehearsed, as occasion shall serve.

¶ And there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a good number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion.

¶ And if there be not above twenty persons in the Parish, of discretion to receive the Communion: yet there shall be no Communion, except four, or three at the least communicate with the Priest. And in Cathedral and Collegiate churches, where be many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the minister every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.

¶ The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate, and the churchwardens, at the charges of the Parish, and the Parish shall be discharged of such sums of money, or other duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of their houses every Sunday.

¶ And note, that every Parishioner shall communicate, at the least three times in the year: of which, Easter to be one: and shall also receive the Sacraments, and other rites, according to the order in this book appointed. And yearly at Easter, every Parishioner shall reckon with his Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his, or their deputy or deputies, and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties, accustomedly due, then and at that time to be paid.

Although no order can be so perfectly devised but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part: And yet because brotherly charity willet, that so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away: therefore we willing to do the same. Whereas it is ordained in the book of common prayer, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion: which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the holy Communion might else ensue: lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being

lye silence and meditacion, to occupie themselves. There to paie their duties, to communicate once in the yeare at the least, and there to receyue, and take all other Sacramentes and rites, in this booke appoynted. And whosoever willyngly upon no iust cause, doeth absent themselues, or doeth ungodly in the Parishe church occupie theselues: upon proffe thereof, by the Ecclesiasticall lawes of the Realme to bee excommunicate, or suffre other punishment, as shall to the Ecclesiasticall iudge (accordyng to his discrecion) seme conuenient.

And although it be read in ancient writers, that the people, many years past, received at the

Priest's hands the Sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, add no commandment of Christ to the contrary: Yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversly abused it to superstition and wickedness: lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the whole Realm, it is thought conuenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths, at the Priest's hand.

of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven, and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time.

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THE RUBRICS

IV

THE LITURGIES OF EDWARD VI., AND SPECIALLY

IN THE BOOK OF 1549.

Prima facie a Rubric is a direction to the minister or to those ministered to, describing, limiting, and illustrating the form of ministry to which it is appended, and nothing more.

But the Rubrics of the English Prayer Book, especially in its earlier editions, are largely inspired with another and totally different intention. They form, indeed, valuable evidence of the *animus* of those who inserted them, their silence being often as eloquent as their utterance, and their absence as significant as their presence, and for the following reason: they are explanatory of *changes* from former established usages, and specially changes by way of simplification and diminution. So far as their statements go, the Rubrics may be perhaps most conveniently divided into three classes –

- (a) Those which proscribe (explicitly);
- (b) Those which prescribe (explicitly);
- (c) Those which describe (explicitly).

But beyond this, as will be seen, they both proscribe and prescribe implicitly, and by their silence leave an inference as strong, or stronger, than any statement.

First, with regard to the descriptive Rubrics. They are mostly very short, somewhat vague, and, so far as they are counted directions for the performance of Divine Service, imperfect. This, however, is by no means the case with all of them. There are certain descriptive Rubrics as full or fuller than any to be found in the Modern Roman Missal. Such are of only one sort, *viz.*, those that describe objects, usages, or ceremonies of Divine Service of a *contentious* or *disciplinary* nature. These will be noticed shortly.

The short and meagre Rubrics of direction and description are such as these –

For Mattins,

The Priest being in the Quire shall begin.

At the Lord's Supper,

The Priest standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar, shall say.

At Baptisms,

The God Fathers must be ready at the Church Door.

At Marriages,

The persons to be married shall come into the body of the Church.

At Visitation of the Sick,

The Priest entering into the Sick Person's house shall say.

At a Churching,

The woman shall kneel nigh unto the quire door, and the Priest standing by her

At a Funeral,

The Priest meeting the Corpse at the Church style

At the Communion,

The Priest shall go into the Pulpit.

In the case of nearly every Service it is supposed to be a sufficient direction to the officiant to tell him where he is to begin the Service, and to leave him thenceforward to move and stand after “the accustomed manner.”

And this is the more clear from the consideration of the first rubric of the Lord’s Supper. It was needful to describe the position at the Lord’s prayer and collect since they were *not* the beginning of the Latin Mass.

Or at Mattins, being in the choir, he is to begin with the Lord’s Prayer directly and simply without “invocation.”

When, however, a Rubric is lengthy and descriptive, it is because it has to describe something neither wholly old nor entirely new, but greatly altered from its original form. In this regard the 1549 Rubric as to the Bread is specially noteworthy.

It is to be unleavened, round, without device, thicker than before, and larger in diameter, to be divided into two or three, and so given

The fulness of this description is with obvious intention.

The Rubric of the 1548 Order of Communion simply said that the bread was to be *such as heretofore*, but broken *every one in two pieces at the least*.

The former Rubric was defensive as against those who would abolish the old bread, but to emphasize the Communion and to minimize the Priest’s individual oblation, not his Host only, but each of the people’s breads was to be broken.

The 1549 Rubric goes further, and doing away with the *Print*, and making *all* the wafers *large*, reduces the Communion of the Faithful to a more uniform level.

It is needless to do more than refer to the shortness of the rubric on this matter in the Book of 1552:

To take away the superstition . . . , it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table . . .

No “description” beyond this is needed.

The Rubrics descriptive of the preliminary conditions and regulations for Communion, as the final rubrics as to celebration, number of recipients, &c., are full and ample. They need not, however, be here discussed in detail. It is enough to point out that they evidence the necessity felt by the framers thereof to be very explicit in describing the new usages and obligations, and, equally “inevitable” to those who should wish to revert to older customs.

That such a desire was felt, and strongly felt, is shown by the demands of the Devonshire rioters ¹ who demanded fiercely that, except at Easter, no one should be *allowed* to communicate at Mass!

The final Rubric in the preliminary group is specially noticeable.

The “vesture appointed” is at first sight simply the old vesture of the Celebrant; but a slight examination will show that this is not the case. Had it been so the Rubric might and would have ended here, but “he shall put upon him a *white albe plain*.” (a) The

Rubric forbids the use of coloured albs, or those made of silk or velvet or cloth of gold; and (b) it shall be *plain* – *i.e.*, without apparels of embroidery or precious stuff.² Moreover, “He shall have a vestment *or* cope.” This might be interpreted as an indifferent alternative, but a glance at one of the final Rubrics dispels this view. “On Wednesdays and Fridays . . . the Priest shall put upon him a plain albe or surplice, *with a cope*, and say all things . . .” Here there can be little doubt, if any, of the meaning of the Rubric and its fulness.

The details of the “plain albe” and the alternative use of “a cope” with albe or surplice, when there is no consecration, describe changes from the old order; and without such special direction the new use would have been obscure.

The nature of the cope or vestment as to colour or texture is left undecided. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the old vestments retained were in use. Nor, I think, can it be reasonably argued that the “vestment” did not include its full suit of stole and maniple, just as the albe would naturally include the amice, and, especially, the *girdle*.³

Notice again the lengthy Rubrics at the offertory. *Not* elaborate *ritual* directions, but such as are called for by the New Order.

The “Offertory” Sentences, the collection, the placing of the communicants, the moving out of the chancel of other worshippers, and the placing on the Altar of the fair and convenient cup, etc.; all these details need description, and receive it.

Notice, lastly, the Rubrics as to the distribution of the Sacrament; the reception by the assistants, their subsequent ministry in distribution, and the words of administration. All these are full and particular.⁴ Descriptive in the best sense of the word, and for the reason above stated, they are descriptive of new usages, and therefore necessary.

If the Rubrics of Direction are examined in so far as they prescribe or proscribe any ceremonial act (or *omit* to do so), a general and consistent principle will be found to inspire them.

Their fulness or meagreness, their absence or presence, are not to be attributed either to carelessness or caprice, but simply owe their form and presence to the operation of the principle alluded to, and this is that Rubrics were inserted in the Service *only* where they were deemed necessary.

And this is specially to be borne in mind with regard to the vesture of the Priest and his assistants. Had there been no change, it is safe to say there had been no Rubric. The Altar was vested and “clothed” as afore; the ornaments, save the Hanging Pyx [where that existed],⁵ the position and use of them, all remained unaffected by the translation of the Mass into English; therefore nothing was here needed. Whatever had been altered up to this point had been altered by foregoing injunctions.

If we now examine the Rubrics in order we shall be able to see the working of this principle.

(1)

The Lord’s Prayer is to be said with the Collect for Purity, in the place and after the manner of the old “Preparation” before the steps of the Altar. There is no Psalm *Judica*, no Confiteor,⁶ but simply this short prelude, to be said (privately, I believe) by the Priest.

It would seem from the previous Rubric that the Introit, *when sung*, was being gone through by the choir meanwhile.

(2)

When there was no choir the Priest would say (in the accustomed manner) a Psalm “appointed for the Introit” after his preparation, which Psalm ended, the Priest shall say the Kyrie.

Here the wording is luminous to a degree: (a) It is a *whole* Psalm (not a verse or two), (b) it is *appointed for* the Introit, (c) directly the Psalm is finished, the Kyrie is to follow.

The significance of this is seen by turning to the Introits themselves. After the Introit for the First Sunday in Advent is written:

“And so *must every Introit be ended.*”

Not simply must the Gloria follow the Psalm, but the Introit must *end* here, without repetition of the verses. Hence it is directed that the “Psalm is ended.”

The Kyrie is said or sung without further note or direction.

No place, or position, or posture is mentioned for either Introit or Kyrie.

No one needed any direction, both Priests and Clerks had all their lives been familiar with the use of their Church.

(3)

The Priest intones the Gloria in Excelsis “standing at God’s Board,” and then leaves it to the Clerks to finish.

Here, I think, we may see a reason for the *fulness* of the rubric [which might be taken as contradicting the principle already enunciated].

It was necessary to settle how many words of the *English Translation* should be accounted as the Intonation. In all other respects the Gloria might have been left described as in our present book “either sung or said.”

(4)

The Rubrics to the Collects are significant.

The first Rubric speaks of the *Collect* for the day with *one of these two*.

Here is introduced a new rule. The Collects at the Communion are not to be three or five (an uneven number in any case), but normally *two only*. If this be doubted look at the Rubric for Good Friday, and there it is directed that

¶ After the “*Two Collects of the Communion,*” shall be said these two collects following.

Otherwise we may be sure it would have been thought enough to say, “Then shall follow the Collects, first of the day, and after for the King,” or words to that effect.

The second Rubric (or direction), “Priest: Let us pray,” placed before the Collect for the King, is, however, still more noteworthy, *because it is omitted* in some editions [e.g. Grafton’s of Mar. VIII.]. Omitted (without the slightest doubt) as being unnecessary, since the second Collect of the Mass naturally *had* the *oremus*, though not the *dominos vobiscum*.

The absence of any rubrical prescription for the *termination* of the Collects is most important. The Collect for First Sunday in Advent ends fully and “in the accus-

tomed manner,” but in no other single case is the Collect fully completed. That for Easter Day has *Amen*, and that for Whitsun Day has the complete ending (less *Amen*), and all others are more or less incomplete; they end, for instance, abruptly, “through Jesus Christ”; or “who livest and reignest, *etc.*”; and the Collect for Second Sunday after Trinity has an ending which absolutely demands previous knowledge.

“ . . . Thy steadfast love . . . grant this,” *etc.*

(5)

The Rubric to the Epistle shows intention.

The Gospel shall follow *immediately*, that is to say, no Gradual, Sequence, Alleluia, or Tract shall intervene. It might be supposed that the Dominus Vobiscum was to be also omitted, but this, I think, need not be inferred, since the Gospel in the Baptismal service has it, though *not* the *Gloria tibi*.

That omission here is not prohibition may be gathered from the fact that the *Gloria* before the Gospel has survived its omission in Edward’s II. Book, and every successive edition and revision till the present day.

The Response after the Gospel does not appear, but this too has survived in many a parish. The silence of the Rubric in the matter of the Gradual is clearly proscriptive, but in the other cases it is no more than would be expected.

“After the Gospel ended” . . . is certainly a very different prescription than “*immediately* after the Epistle ended.”

No direction is given as the place of the Gospel Minister. Surely this indicates that the varying use of North side of Altar or Rood-loft (or Pulpit) was left undisturbed.

(6)

The Priest shall begin: I believe. Here, as in the case of the *Gloria in excelsis*, there is a reason for marking the English equivalent of the Intonation.

(7)

The succeeding Rubrics need no comment, until we reach the one that directs the placing of the Elements upon the Altar.

The Bread is laid either *on the Corporas or the Paten*. Clearly, according to the number of the communicants: the laying of the One Host “upon the Corporas” would not meet the case, nor perhaps would the Paten suffice; wherefore, as in the case of *the Chalice or some fair and convenient cup (if the Chalice will not serve)* the Rubric is elastic and permissive. It must depend on circumstances in each celebration *how* the Priest is to prepare, and on what vessels he *possesses*.

Note that no directions whatever are given as to whence the bread, wine, or water are to be brought, nor who shall bring them. The new Rubric goes just so far as is needed, but no further. Neither flagon nor cruet nor wafer-canister nor credence are so much as hinted at.

(8)

The Prefaces are introduced with a Rubric of which nothing need be said, but the Rubric before the canon is needed, since the invitation, “Let us pray for the whole state of

Christ's Church," is a new and unaccustomed address, and the turning to the people must be ordered, or it would not occur.⁷

With regard to the marginal directions and [✱] signs, *Here the Priest must take*, etc. I venture to think that they are inserted for a double reason – (a) as a necessary minimum of manual action to the celebrant, to whom, as to others,⁸ “crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures” were left open; but (b) as a note to the worshippers that this was done at the time, especially as the old and venerated elevation was abandoned.

The Order of Communion gives this proscription as a final note – *without any levitation*. This refers to the second or third consecration of the Chalice. The rubric of 1549 gives the same prohibition more fully and inclusively.

(9)

Then shall the Priest say. Does this mean without any further secret prayers? Probably.

(10)

Here occurs the first really important change of Ritual between the Order of Communion and the First Book of 1549.

The turning to the people, the Confession and Absolution, and so forth, *precede* the Priest's Communion instead of following it, as before. This change involves *three directions*.

- (a) ¶ *Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself.*
- (b) *In the Communion time the Clerk shall sing, O Lamb of God*
- (c) ¶ *Where there are no Clerks there the Priest shall say all things appointed for them*

For the *Agnus Dei*, being the prelude to Communion, must, in the translators' opinion, be sung rather for the people than the Priest.

But if there are no singers, what becomes of the *Agnus Dei*? The Priest could not say it in the “Communion time,” since he is saying other words. But he must say it. There is nothing left for him to do but to say it before his *own* Communion and not in its old place after the “Peace of the Lord be always with You.”

This change alone is answerable for the lengthy and detailed prescription, which is perhaps the most definite in the whole Service.

(11)

The rubrics relating to the Confession, Absolution, and so forth are indeed fairly full, though no change had taken place in their use since 1548, but this involves no contradiction of the guiding law of necessity, since they are simply imported bodily and without change from the Order of Communion, in the framing of which the said law did operate.⁹

The one change from this order is the double address to the communicants and the withdrawal of the impenitent in the earlier order.

The first of these addresses is here omitted, because of the earlier caution, inserted now after the Creed.

(12)

¶ *Then shall the Priest give thanks to God in the name of all them . . .*

Here, again, a rubric is necessary to preface an entirely new form of “post-Communion.”

Heretofore the Post-Communion Collect might or might not have reference to the Communion of the Faithful, but in this Service it is this, and this only, that is in mind.

Having briefly commented on the rubrics of the Liturgy of 1549, it may not be necessary to say much more to impress their significance; but a few words may be added by way of summary.

I.

It is indisputable that the Rubrics, whether full or scanty, are not inserted with anything but *intention*. We may approve or not, we may regard or elect to disregard the *animas imponentis*, but it is there.

II.

It is clear that the Rubrics are not intended to be exhaustive or complete, nor are they written for “unlearned or ignorant” men, but to presumably “discreet and learned” ministers who had been all their lives familiar with the performance of Divine Service. Among many other “undirected” actions and positions are –

(a) The movement of the Priest *to* the Altar from his first station humbly afore the midst of it.

(b) His position at the Collect, the Gospel, the Creed, and *every part* of the Service, except (by inference) the centre of the Altar at the Canon (and the Gloria).

(c) His actions are entirely undescribed; save the putting of the bread on the Altar, his touching the oblations, and his signing [*them?*] and his turning to the people.

(d) The position of the Communicants and their posture.

(e) The condition of the Altar and its furnishing.

(f) The consumption of the Elements after Communion, etc., etc.

III.

The incompleteness of the Rubrics, however, and the mere acknowledgment that some previous or independent information is necessary for the performance of service, does not constitute their significance in this regard.

Nor does the note at the end of the chapter on ceremonies touch the root of the question.

We may most confidently conclude that, It is not simply that it was left open to “every man’s devotion” in *all matters* to please himself how he performed his service, though doubtless a good deal might be said in favour of this view.

If the Rubrics of 1548, 1549, and 1552 be placed side by side we cannot evade the conviction. That whether for good or evil, the framers of these rubrics intended to *leave alone* what they approved of, and to *alter* what they objected to.

This principle indeed they have clearly enunciated, but as acts are more convincing than words, we should rather look at the rubrics themselves for light. And this is what we find –

Where the form of the service is changed there is a new rubric;

Where the change is slight the Rubric is short and simple; but in proportion as the change is great in form, or great in “contentious” importance there the Rubric is full and lengthy, or, at least, clear and incisive.

There is no concealment or mystery about the *words* of the service; “plainly and distinctly,” or “with a loud voice,” is enough to do away with this.

There is no “superstitious or ungodly” representation on the bread, nor any elevation or lifting liable to misconception.

There is to be no processional save the Litany, no gradual, nor any offertory sentence or communion of dubious theology. But this being said, what more is there to say?

IV.

It is not conceivable that on June 9th, 1549, any of the acts, gestures, modes of performing of any ceremony in the Lord’s Supper, were rendered illegal, or deemed unseemly which on the previous Sunday were duly, rightly, and orderly performed (according to the order of Communion then in force), *unless specifically condemned or forbidden*.

Bearing in mind that the professed object of the Liturgy of 1549 was to *order and settle* the worship of the English Church, and not merely to “patch up a peace” *ad interim*, we cannot suppose that any usage would remain unforbidden if it was deemed worthy of censure.

That the men who ruled that the wafer should be a trifle “thicker and larger” in circumference should so decree on the “infinitely little,” and at the same time pass over the burning of incense and the use of lights and crucifix in *absolute silence*, if they intended to abolish them, passes human understanding.¹⁰

V.

The silences of Edward VI.’s Second Book are, on the other hand, to be easily explained on historical grounds, which grounds do not exist in the case of the First Book.

The silence as to lights, incense, and gestures (crossing, &c.), does not imply approval, but rather the fact of all such things (or nearly all) having ceased between 1550 and 1552. Such a “Down grade” is, I believe, unprecedented, and never reproduced in any religious or irreligious movement on record. It is amply sufficient to account for the changed *significance* of rubrical silence.

The few prescriptive and proscriptive Rubrics which are new in the 1552 Service are, however, so plain as to leave no doubt of their meaning, and the few eloquent marks of silence are, alas equally plain.

“No vestment, no cope, nothing but a surplice only.” Silence as to incense or lights does not imply approval, but lack of need to speak. “The Table shall have a fair linen cloth.” This, indeed, is needed; otherwise, the Altar being gone and a mean table in the nave substituted, there would likely have been nothing but a bare board left.

Lastly it may be said, if in 1552 silence instead of approval meant omission, why not *now*?

To which the one and sufficient answer is, We are *referred back* for all things to the second year of Edward VI.

As Elizabeth, who could not (if she would) alter the wording of Edward’s II. Book, yet inserted this saving Clause, so, in 1662, even more inevitably was it re-enforced that for all the adornment, the ornamentation of the Service, the year (*called* the second year) 1549 should be the rule and standard.¹¹

ERNEST GELDART.

NOTES

¹ See Southey’s “Book of the Church.”

² See, also, Ordination of Deacons: “Everyone of them shall have upon him a *plain albe*.”

³ This is, however, not to be *absolutely* taken for granted. The frontispiece to Melancthon’s *Formæ Precationum Piarum*, 1563, shows a priest and deacon communicating the Protestants of Wittenberg, and, though the alb of the chief minister is presumably girded, no stole or maniple is worn. On the other hand, too much stress cannot be laid on the evidential value of pictures and prints, or it would be concluded the maniple was often worn on the right arm, for so it is shown in Titian’s *San Sebastian*, and also in Rubens’ *Ignatius Loyola*.

⁴ Note, however, a serious omission. No hint is given as to the *time* of the *fraction* of the people’s breads This is without question an oversight. Even on the assumption that all the breads were broken, in the accustomed manner before the Pax, it should have been stated.

⁵ The Pyx was by no means universal. The “Fardel of Fashions,” a book published in 1555, says: “At the right hand of the high Altar there should be an almorie, either cut in the wall or framed upon it, in the which . . . the Sacrament of the Lord’s Body, the holy oil for the sick. . . always to be locked.”

⁶ N.B. – No Confiteor, because the priest joins in the General Confession *before* his own Communion.

⁷ Note also the necessity of the words “Plainly and distinctly.”

⁸ See Chapter of Ceremonies.

⁹ Rather, perhaps, we may conclude that the rubric of 1549 is the *original*, since the whole Service was in preparation *before* the 1548 order of Communion was imposed, though it was not ripe for *publication*.

¹⁰ Surely the Rubric as to the “placing the bread and wine upon the altar,” for instance, would have continued *without any censuring or washing of the hands*, or some such words.

¹¹ That the II. Year refers to the I. Book may be gathered from the following facts:—

(a) The Article of Elizabeth’s reign not only refers to “the II. Year of Edward VI.” as the Ornaments Rubric of her Prayer Book does, but also mentions “the Rites of *that Book*.”

(b) It has been objected that the Rubric of 1559 could not have so misrepresented the date 1549 (which is *really* the III. Year), because the interval of time was so short that such forgetfulness was impossible. But if we turn to the Act of Uniformity, Edward VI., 5 and 6, attached to the II. Book, we find the Previous Act therein referred to, *not* as Edward VI., 2 and 3, but, exactly in the same terms, it is described as of the II. Year. “The like foresaid book, entitled, the Book of Common Prayer . . . as by the Act of Parliament made in the *Second Year* of the King’s Majesty’s reign”

(c) In the Rubric of Elizabeth, in the XXXVI. Article, and in the II. Act of Uniformity (as in the Rubric of 1662), we are referred to the II. Year of Edward VI., and in two instances of the three the I. Book and the II. Year are undoubtedly taken as equivalent.

APPENDIX E.

TWO CASES ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE PERMANENCE OF ACCUSTOMED US- AGES IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

I. The changing of the Christian name at Confirmation is a usage of the English Church which has persisted, though there is no mention of it in the Book of Common Prayer.

A constitution of Archbishop Peckham provided in 1281 as follows: –

Attendat etiam sacerdotes ne lasciva nomina quæ scilicet mox prolata sonent in lasciviam imponi permittant parvulis baptizatis sexus precipue feminini; si contrarium fiat per confirmantes episcopos corrigatur.

Lyndwood, *Provinciale* iii. 24. Gibson, *Codex* i. 363 (XVIII., vi.)

See also *Pupilla Oculi* vii.

The permanence of this is thus attested by Lord Coke: –

“If a man be baptized by the name of Thomas, and after at his confirmation by the byshop he is named John, he may purchase by the name of his confirmation. And this was the case of Sir Francis Gowdye, chief justice of the Court of Common Pleas, whose name of baptism was Thomas and his name of confirmation Francis: and that name of Francis by the advice of all the judges in Anno 36 H. 8 he did bear, and after used in all his purchases and grants.”

I. *Inst.* p. 3 (London, 1670).

Dr. Burn¹ contended that the alteration in the Service by which the Bishop no longer pronounces the candidate's name at Confirmation had invalidated this Canon and that therefore Lord Coke's argument was not defensible. But it was acted on in 1707 by the Bishop of Lincoln acting under the advice of legal authorities based upon Coke's dictum, as Bishop White Kennett has recorded. See Maskell, *Monuments* I. Dissertation on the Occasional Offices, §5 (1st ed., pp. ccxvi.-ccxix.; 2nd ed., cclx.-cclxiv.).

Moreover, later instances have occurred down to the present time. Phillimore quotes a case in 1886 from *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, ii., p. 77, in the diocese of Liverpool. See *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 518 (ed. 1895).

The view that there was only liberty to alter undesirable names was taken by Bishop Scambler in Elizabeth's reign, evidently on a strict interpretation of the constitution above mentioned, as the following letter shows

“After my humble comendacons unto yo^r honor premised These are to signifie unto you That whereas yo^r honor and S^r *Ambrose Cave* wrote unto me concerninge the changing of a name at the confirmacon I have lerned that I may not change usuall, or comon names, but onlie strange and not comon; and further if the name be changed at *Confirmacon* it taketh effect but from the *Confirmacon*. And thus wishing yo^r honor prosperous heatht† I committ you to God, who ever preserve you. ffrom Peterborough this xxvth of Maie 1563.

Yo^r honors to commaund,

EDMUNDE PETRIBURG.”

Brit. Mus. MS. Lans. 6, f. 127 (Burghley Papers, 1562-3).

The custom has thus been perpetuated, though it is not provided for in the Prayer Book, and Scambler’s letter is an interesting example of the attitude of an Elizabethan Bishop to the old ecclesiastical law.

II. The dress of a woman at her churching gives an example of a custom, not expressly laid down in the Prayer Book, being not only tolerated but enforced by ecclesiastical and civil courts alike.

“In the reign of King James I. an order was made by the Chancellor of Norwich² that every woman who came to be churched should come covered with a white veil. A woman refusing to conform was excommunicated for contempt and prayed a prohibition alleging that such Order was not warranted by any Custom or Canon of the Church of England. The judges desired the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury who convened divers Bishops to consult thereupon; and they certifying that it was the ancient usage of the Church of England for women who came to be churched to come veiled, a prohibition was denied.”

Gibson *Codex* i. 373 (XVIII. xii.) quoting Palmer 296. Burn l.c. i. 318.

The case as reported by Sir Gefrey Palmer is as follows: –

Les Reports de Sir Gefrey Palmer, p. 296 (London, 1678). Eliz. Shipden’s case *vers*. Dr. Redman, Chancellor de Norwich.

Le Chancellor de Norwich fait un Ordinance et ceo publish en Norwich que chescun feme que vient al Eglise d’estre Churched apres *Childe bearing* solonque le Ley d’Eglise de Anglitterre viendra coverd ove an *white vayle*; Et le dit *Eliz. Shepden* estean admonish de ceo refuse luy conformer: sur que contempt fuit excommunicate; Et un certificate fait de ceo al Chancery; sur quoi un breve de *excommunicato capiendo* fuit d’estre agard vers lay et pro ceo prebenter et d’estre assayled el pria un Prohibition per motion de *Serjeant Otto* in *B. R.* alledging que est un novel Ley nient allowed per ascun Custome on Canon on auter Ley de Eglise de Anglitterre; et dit que est prerogative de cest Court mayntainer freedome de Subjects del forreigne innovations et concluder chescun court deins lour bounds; Mes il offer al Court que si soet ascun Custom ou Ley d’Eglise d’Anglitterre que ceo command que sa Clyent ceo wil obey; Mes quia fuit novel case que ferra un president les Judges desire d’aver le resolution de *Archevesque de Canterbury*; et in convene tous les Evesques que fueront al *London*; et il meme et 6 auter Evesques resolve & certify que fuit le ancient Custome de Eglise de *Angleterre*, que femes viendront vailed al Eglise d’estre churched; et cest resolution fuit declared per *Leo C. Justice* in Court; Et sur ceo le Prohibition denyed d’estre granted.

There is thus a tradition in favour of the veil so strong that though it finds no place in the Prayer Book, it has been enforced by ecclesiastical and civil courts. The veil is not now generally worn, but if it were thought desirable to revive the custom, it is difficult to see that anyone would be justified in objecting on the ground that no provision is

made for the veil in the rubric, though it only specifies that the woman shall be “decently apparelled.”

W. H. FRERE.

NOTES

¹ *Eccl. Law*, ii. xo (London, 1842).

² Other cases of insistence upon the veil in 1613 and 1636 are quoted in Hale’s *Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Causes*, pp. 237, 2259. (London, 1847.)

APPENDIX F.

Assuming the censer to be an ornament in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., and so to be retained in use, there remains a question as to the time and manner of such use. The rubric speaks of the ornaments of the *Ministers* “at all times of their ministration.” These words are not grammatically connected with the “ornaments of the *Church*” among which we must include the censer; but it can hardly be doubted that any limitation which they imply ought to be extended to these equally with the ornaments of the Minister. The language of the rubric is loosely constructed, owing to the combination, effected in 1662, of the wording of the proviso to the Act of 1559 and that of the rubric of the same year. Reading it as a whole, it is clear that all ornaments alike are to be used at certain “times of ministration.” But this imposes a limitation: Ornaments are to be used in connection with ministration; they are adjuncts to ministration. But the ministration referred to must be such ministration as is ordered in the Book of Common Prayer, for none other is contemplated. Therefore, if there be no ministration ordered as an adjunct to which a certain ornament is to be used, then there is no use at all for such ornament. Even if it were among the ornaments generally referred to by the rubric, it is not specifically included in the order for their retention and use, but is rather excluded.

On this ground the use of the censer has been objected to. There is no provision for its use in the rites of the Book of Common Prayer; there is no ministration to which it can serve as an adjunct. The use of it, therefore, involves an *additional ceremony*, over and above those ordered by the prescript rite; such additional ceremony is, to say the least, of doubtful lawfulness in itself, and certainly cannot be defended as implied by the Ornaments Rubric.

I contend, in reply, that the use of the censer after the ancient manner, is not an *additional ceremony*, but is an adjunct to a ceremony ordered by the Book of Common Prayer. It is indeed, pretty obvious that a censer might be used in such a way as to involve an additional ceremony; it might be used out of all reasonable connection with the order of Divine worship as prescribed, in such a way as to interrupt and obscure what is there contained. Such cases would undoubtedly call for the intervention of authority; but the correction of this evil, should it arise, will call, I submit, not for the prohibition of the censer, but for the regulation of its use. I am concerned to show that there are ministrations provided in the Book of Common prayer which invite the use of the censer as a ceremonial adjunct.

It is, I think, an accepted principle that in the great change produced by the reformation of the English service books all things were intended to be done after the former manner, except where they were, expressly or by implication, altered. The occasional reference to “custom” in the Prayer Book of 1549 points to this, and so does the omission of several most necessary directions. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Bishop of Lincoln’s case, decided for the use of the mixed chalice on this principle. It follows that when a ministration or ceremony, ordered in the unreformed service books, reappears in the reformed rite, even if the details vary, we must regard it as the same ceremony continuously existing. Now in the unreformed services there were certain ceremonies to which the use of Incense after a certain manner was an ordinary adjunct. The precise meaning of the word *ceremony*, as used in this connection, has been much debated;

more than one use appears to be legitimate; I would explain that I use it here in the sense of *something which is to be done by the Minister as an integral part of the prescript order*. The censuring was not a ceremony of this kind. It was never regarded as an integral part of any service. The service could be performed, and in practice would seem to have been most frequently performed, without it. Nor, even when performed, was it an action regarded in itself. It was in relation to something else, which actually was an integral part of the service. Thus the censuring was not a ceremony apart, but was a ceremonial adjunct to certain of the prescribed ceremonies.

I note some of these. Incense was used at the Altar, during the ancient Office of *Lauds*, while *Benedictus* was sung. It was used in the same manner at *Evensong*, while *Magnificat* was sung. Do these “times of ministration” still remain? I submit that the Divine Service ordered in the Book of Common Prayer is intended to be, and actually is, a continuation in a modified form of the older *Servitium Divinum*, commonly known to us now as the *Breviary Offices*. The Preface to the Prayer Book “Concerning the Service of the Church” speaks plainly in this sense. If this be so the English *Evensong* must be taken as equivalent to the old Latin *Vesperae*, name and thing, and the saying or singing of *Magnificat* in one is the same “time of ministration” as in the other. We have nothing now so precisely corresponding to the ancient Office of *Lauds*, but if we remember that before the reformation of the Services the *Nocturns* of the Breviary with *Lauds* and *Prime* were commonly said in parish churches all together, that this service as a whole was popularly known as *Mattins*, and that this same popular name continued in use for the reformed Morning Service, the conclusion is inevitable that *Benedictus*, as occurring in our rite, is the same “ministration” as the *Benedictus* of the ancient *Lauds*. These “times of ministration” therefore survive, and I submit that the occasional use of Incense at these times, not as an integral ceremony, but as a ceremonial adjunct of what is prescribed to be done, is covered by the Ornaments Rubric.

In the Order of the Mass censuring took place at three several points: at the approach to the Altar, at the reading of the Gospel, and at the Offertory. I rely exclusively on the printed editions of the Sarum Missal, issued at various dates between 1487 and 1534, and again during the reign of Mary, 1554 to 1557. These were published for general use, the reputation of the Church of Salisbury securing their acceptance throughout the kingdom. They represent the ordinary use – subject to local variations of custom – of those parish churches which had the means of carrying out all their directions. The directions for the censuring at the three points that I have mentioned are almost uniform in the various editions, and there can be no doubt that they were commonly followed. But I note in this connection a curious fact. About the year 1537 there was written a detailed explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass. A copy exists in the Cotton Collection at the British Museum (Cleop. E. 5, fol. 259). It is printed in Collier (Vol. v., pp. 110-117, ed. 1845). The object of the writer was clearly to instruct the people, whose minds were disturbed by the influx of new teaching, in the significance of the ceremonies with which they were familiar. The different parts of the rite are taken in detail; their purpose and connection are explained; but in the whole document there is no mention of Incense. It was certainly in common use; it might seem to invite comment more than many of the details which are explained. I think the omission can only be explained by the supposition that the censuring was regarded, according to the distinction which I have drawn, not as an integral part of the ceremonies of the Mass, nor as an independent ceremony apart from the rest, but

purely as an occasional ceremonial adjunct of those ceremonies which are actually described and explained.

The three points at which the censuring occurred, the three ceremonies to which it was an occasional adjunct, hold the same place in the reformed service. I will take them in order.

i. *The approach to the Altar.* This was accompanied, in the old rite, by certain prayers, said privately by the priest and his attendant ministers, while the clerks sang the anthem and psalm known as *Officium*. In the course of these prayers the priest censed the Altar, and was himself censed by the deacon. He afterwards began the more public part of the service by chanting *Gloria in excelsis*, or, on days when that was not said; *Dominus vobiscum*, with the Collect following.

The approach to the Altar is an obvious necessity, and by a natural instinct of reverence it is always done with some degree of solemnity, varying with the place and occasion. In other words it is done ceremonially, or with ceremonial adjuncts. These adjuncts are not additional ceremonies; they are adornments, if I may say so, of the ceremony of approach. This ceremony is not expressly provided for at all in the Book of Common Prayer. The first rubric assumes that the priest is already “standing at the north side of the Table.” But he has inevitably arrived there in a ceremonial manner, and his approach is accompanied by ceremonial acts, of however simple a character. It is a very common practice for him to kneel down and veil his face in private prayer as he approaches. This practice does not appear to be derived from any ancient usage; it is due to an instinct of devotion. It is a ceremonial act, yet it would be abhorrent to common sense to describe it as an *additional ceremony*. It is part of a ceremony necessarily implied in the directions of the Book of Common Prayer. Others again, following more ancient precedents, prefer to stand for a moment bowing themselves down in private prayer as they approach the Altar. I submit that the censuring of the Altar and the priest at this time is essentially of the same character with these acts. It would be idle to contend that it compares with them in point of conspicuousness; but equally with them it is a ceremonial adjunct of a ceremony necessarily performed – the ceremony of approach to the Altar.

ii. *The reading of the Gospel.* It is a peculiar feature of our rite that, if the rubric be strictly and literally taken, the priest is himself directed to read the Gospel. Universal practice, however, as well as Injunctions and Canons, may be taken as sufficient proof that the rubric is not to be so read. The deacon as gospeller is an established minister. He has his “time of ministration,” and consequently his ornaments to use at the time. There is no clearer instance of the interpretation of the rubrics by the principle of continuity. I return to the Sarum Missal, and I find a very brief direction for the censuring at this point. It is found in the rubric for the first Sunday in Advent: “Diaconus antequam accedat ad Evangelium pronuntiandum thurificet medium altaris tantum.” He then took up the text of the Gospels, and with his attendants proceeded to the *pulpitum* to read the Gospel. It is well known that from very early times the reading of the Gospel was done with great solemnity. It was regarded as a ceremony of the first importance. The accompanying details are not separate ceremonies; they are adjuncts, varying in time and place, of the one great unvarying ceremony which they adorned. We retain that ceremony. When a priest is celebrating the Lord’s Supper without any attendant ministers, he performs this ceremony

in what we may call a very unceremonious manner. But where there is a deacon or priest in attendance he performs it, almost invariably, with some degree, however slight, of ceremonial solemnity. He may go to the pulpit or lectern, or some other suitable place, that he may be the better heard. A fitting part of the solemnity proper to this "time of ministration" I submit to be the use of Incense after the ancient manner.

iii. *The Offertory.* – The Priest is directed, after the sermon ended, to “return to the Lord’s Table and *begin the Offertory.*” I take it that the word *Offertory* is here used for a whole part of the service, or an integral ceremony, which he *begins* by reading one or more of the sentences prescribed. How far shall we suppose this ceremony of the “*Offertory*” to extend? While the sentences are read the alms of the people are collected; they are then brought to the Priest, who presents them and places them upon the Holy Table. He then places upon the Table the Bread and Wine for the Communion, after which done he says the Prayer containing the petition “to accept our alms and oblations.” There is then a marked break in the service, occupied by an address to the people who are about to communicate. This break would seem to be the *end* of the *Offertory*, which the Priest *begins* after the sermon. The *Offertory* is therefore a somewhat complicated ceremony. Did the same ceremony exist in the unreformed Missal, and is this a continuation of that? The *Offertorium* was the name of a verse sung by the clerks; our sentences are the direct representatives of this, as is shown by the transitional use of the Book of 1549, where they are introduced with the rubric “Then shall follow, for the *Offertory* one or more of these sentences of Holy Scripture.” The Sarum Missal contains a long and rather confused rubric directing what is to be done post *Offertorium*. The essence of it consists in this, that the deacon brought to the priest the chalice and paten, with the elements already prepared, the priest placed them on the Altar, and then said the prayer, *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, &c.*; after which he censed the oblations. Other prayers and actions follow, with which I need not concern myself. What I have to submit is that our ceremony of the *Offertory* is in substance identical with this. We have a detail which is not mentioned in the Sarum Missal – the collection of the people’s devotions and their presentation at the Altar; but there is evidence that the collection was not uncommon before the reformation of the services, and therefore this is not a wholly new feature. The other details, the placing of the bread and wine upon the Altar and the prayer for the acceptance of the oblations, remain unchanged. These are the invariable, the integral parts of the ceremony. The accompanying use of Incense, according to the unreformed rite, was an occasional adjunct. It varied from time to time even in the same church. It was sometimes more simple, sometimes more elaborate. At Salisbury on ordinary days the oblations only were censed; but on days when the Creed was sung there followed a most complicated censing of all the assistants. This may be urged as a ground for a considerable simplification of the ancient details; but the censing at the *Offertory* in general I submit to be not a separate or additional ceremony, but an adjunct of the prescribed ceremony, which is covered by the Ornaments Rubric ordering the priest at this particular “time of his ministration” to use the ancient ornaments appropriate thereto. There are other adjuncts used at this time by universal agreement. The rubrics are so scanty here that they cannot be held to exclude all that is not mentioned. No mention is made, for example, of chalice or paten, or of the manner in which the bread and wine are to be placed on the Altar. We are not told how they are to be brought, by whom, or from what place. A credence table is held to be a natural, though it cannot be called a necessary, adjunct to this ceremony. A silk veil is commonly used for covering the sacred vessels. At St. Paul’s Cathedral they are ceremonially brought by one of the assistants from the credence so veiled. This cannot be called an *additional ceremony*. It is part and parcel of that ceremony which the Book of Common Prayer orders without prescribing details. I submit that, however much differing in degree, the use of Incense is identical in kind with such

added details, and has the further justification, which they lack, of being covered by the Ornaments Rubric.

T. A. LACEY.

APPENDIX G.

ON THE EDWARDIAN INVENTORIES OF CHURCH GOODS.

THE principle of confiscation of Church goods for the use of the Crown had been introduced by the suppression of the Monasteries, and the whole story of the Edwardian Inventories of parish goods shows that the purpose of them was not connected with ecclesiastical reform, but was intended to prevent private embezzlement and keep the goods for the use of the King.

At the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. an inventory was ordered to be made “of all manner goodes plate juells vestyments bells and other ornaments within every paryshe,” such goods being directed to “be safely kept and appoynced to the charge of such persons as shulde kepe the same safely and be ready to aunswere to the same at all times.”¹

Notwithstanding this, much private embezzlement went on, and in February, 1549-50, a new set of commissions was issued ordering fresh inventories and repeating the prohibition of sale and alienation.²

About a year later the mask was thrown off, and on 3rd March 1550-1, “it was decreed that forasmuche as the Kinges Majestie had neede presently of a masse of mooney, therfore Commissions shulde be, addressed into all shires of Englande to take into the Kinges handes suche church plate as remaineth, to be employed unto his highnes use.”³ This act of robbery and sacrilege was not, however, carried into effect at once, and it was not until 29th January, 1551-2, that the Privy Council directed the issue of letters to the *custos rotulorum* of every shire, “to delyver unto the Commissioners named in the same lettres such inventories as were before delyvered to theyre custody by other the Kinges Majesties Commissioners, of the plate, jewells, bells and other thinges belonging to the parishe churches within the same shieres.”⁴ The form of letter thus addressed to the Commissioners for Bedfordshire is entered, but without date, on the Patent Roll for 6 Edward VI., and followed by the names of the commissioners for each county.

The commission repeats the usual tale of the embezzlement or removal of “somme part” of the church goods “in somme places,” and directs the taking of a new set of inventories to be compared with those previously made. “For the defaults and wants yf any shalle eyther of the said plate juelles belles vestyments or any other ornaments or any part of theym any manner of wyse” the commissioners were to make diligent enquiry and search “to knowe and understond by whose default the same hath bene removed embesiled aliened or dimynshed,” and were empowered to imprison any persons who wilfully and stubbornly refused to obey their orders. The commissioners had no directions to seize the goods.⁵

Within a few days of the close of the sixth year of the King’s reign the final stage of this sacrilegious robbery of the Church goods was reached by the issue of a commission to gather in the spoil. It is directed to the Comptroller of the Household, the Vice-Chamberlain, the Master of the Rolls, and five others, and instructs them (1) to receive all the inventories lately made, and (2) “to collect or cause to be collected and brought togeyther all and singuler redye money plate and Juelles certyfyed by our Commysioners aforesaid to remayne in any church Chapell Guild,” etc. “causing the said ready money to be delyvered by indenture to our use to thandes of our trustie servaunt sir Edmond Peck-

ham knyght and causing the said plate and Juelles to be delyvered lykewise by Indenture to our use to thandes of the maister of our Juell house for the tyme being.” The commission continues: “And to thintent the said Churches and Chapelles may be furnysshedd of convenyent and comely things mete for thadmynstracion of the holy Communion in the same Wee give unto you full power and auctorytye to leave or cause to be leaft out of the said plate for the same purpose and to the same use in everye Chathedrall or Collegiat Church where Chalyces be remaynyng one or two chalyces by your discrecions [*defaced*]. And in every great paryshe where Chalyces be remaynyng one or two chalyces by your discreacion and in every small paryshe or chapell where Chalyces be remaynyng one chalice And we gyve unto you full power and auctory after the honest and comely furnytüre of coverynges for the communion table and surples or surplusses for the mynyster or mynysters in the said churches or chapells by your discrecions to dystribute or cause to be dystributed and geven freely to the poore people in every parysh wheare the same churches and chapells stond and be The resydue of the lynnyn ornaments and ymplements of the said churches and chapells in suche order and sort as may be most to Godes glory and our honor. And we gyve unto you full powe[r] and auctory to sell or cause to be sold to our use all and singuler copes, vestments, Aulter clothes and other other ornaments whatsoever remaynyng or being within any of the said churches or chapells not appoynted by this our Commyssion to be leafe in the said churches or chapells or to be dystributed to the poore as afore ys declared. And also to sell or cause to be sold to our use by weight all parcells or peces of metall except the metall of great bell saunse bell in every of the said churches or chapells. The money comyng of which sales so to be made informe before decayred and all other sommes of money whiche shall come and be brought into our use by vertue of this Commyssion We will ye shall delyver or cause to be delyvered by Indenture to thandes of the said syr Edmond Peckham to our use.” The commissioners were further instructed to direct letters to proper persons in each county authorizing them “to make colleccion to our use of the said ready money plate and Juells and make sale to our use of the said coopes vestments and ornaments of sylke without gold sattyn of bridges dornix worsted Saye and of other thyngs appoynted to be sold as ys before declared and to leave in every church and Chapell such Chalyce or Chalyces and such lynnyn fornyture for the same Churches and Chapelles as ys before appoynted and to dystribute the resydue of the said lynnyn ornaments and ymplements to the poore of everye paryshe in sort before declared, etc.”⁶ The date of this document, with its canting reference to “Godes glory and our honor” and its pretended solicitude for the poor, is 16th January, 1552-3, or within seven months of the death of King Edward.

B.

Of the inventories of the Church goods taken in 1552, in view of their contemplated confiscation by the Crown for the replenishment of the exchequer, complete, returns exist in the Public Record Office for nearly all the counties. Some of these have been published in full, while others are only partly in print.

An analysis of the returns of twelve counties, from easily accessible sources, yields the following results: –

| County. | Number of Churches. | Censers noted in. | Percentage. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Hertfordshire ⁷ | 136 | 28 | 20.6 |
| Berkshire ⁸ | 63 | 28 | 44 |
| Worcestershire ⁹ | 151 | 52 | 34.4 |
| Leicestershire ¹⁰ | 61 | 5 | 8.2 |
| Warwickshire ¹¹ | 184 | 69 | 37.5 |
| Lancashire ¹² | 44 | 19 | 43.2 |
| Essex ¹³ | 125 | 23 | 18.4 |
| Cumberland ¹⁴ | 111 | 17 | 15.3 |
| Derbyshire ¹⁵ | 82 | 20 | 24.3 |
| Yorks. East Riding ¹⁶ | 193 | 48 | 24.8 |
| Kent ¹⁷ | 135 | 41 | 30.4 |
| Surrey ¹⁸ | <u>117</u> | <u>28</u> | <u>23.9</u> |
| | 1,402 | 378 | 27 |

Censers are noted as having been sold in 2 parishes in Warwickshire, 15 in Essex, 2 in Derbyshire, 9 in Kent, and 13 in Surrey, or 41 in all. Thefts of censers are recorded in 15 parishes.

At St. Swithun's, Worcester, the parish had sold a copper censer and ship, but retained a silver censer.

At Rayleigh, Essex, a silver ship and censer had been sold in the second year of King Edward's reign, but a censer and ship of copper had been retained.

At Chelsham, Surrey, a pair of censers had been sold and a pair retained.

In Kent, although there were extensive sales of Church goods, only in nine parishes out of 135 were the censers sold.

But few inventories of the goods and ornaments of the cathedral churches have been preserved for the reign of Edward VI. Such, however, as exist show that censers had been retained in them as in the parish churches. The following are instances:

? 1552, York.

"A pair of censors of gold, 17 oz. A shell of silver for the same censors, 1 oz. . . . A pair of great censors of silver and guilt 100 oz. A pair or great censors, of silver 64 oz. [and four other "pair"].

York Fabric Rolls, Surtees Society, vol. 35, p. 307.

1552, Exeter.

"ij silver censors. A silver shippe with a sponne."

The Ecclesiologist, xxix. 42, 43.

1552, Winchester.

"ij silvar censors . . . j shippe of silvar with a litle silvar sponne."

Archæologia, Vol. xliii., p. 235.

1552, Carlisle.

“one pare of sencers.”

Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archæological Society, viii. 194.

1552, St. Paul's, London.

“ij faire Sensours of silver and gilte w^h high covers w^h vj wyndowes and batilments in the myddes of them wythe iiij chaynes of silver apeece cx unc.

on sensoure of silver and parcell gilte w^h iij libardes heddes on the cover w^h vj wyndowes and pinacles and iiij chaynes of silver thereunto appertaynyng xxxv^{ti} unc.

On little Sensour of Silver and gilte the cover is the forme of an olde churche w^h wyndowes and pinacles w^h v shorte chaynes of Syllver wyer xij unc. iij qu.

a greate large Sensoure all silver w^h manye wyndowes and battilments usedd to sense w^h all in the penticoste weeke in bodie of the chirche of pawles at the procession tyme clviiij unc. iij qu.

on shyppes of silver all whight w^t a sponne in it to take owte frankensence w^t all xviiij unc. di.

The Ecclesiologist, xvii., 198, 199.

And as late as 1563 the cathedral church of Canterbury retained

“ij paire of Sensors of Latten and one shippe of latten and another of copper.”

(MS. Inv. *penes Dec. et Cap. Cantuar.*)

W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE.

NOTES

¹ Rot. Pat. 6 Edward VI., p. 7, m. 12 *in dorso*. Printed in “Seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records” (London, 1846). Appendix II., p. 307.

² “The Inventories of Church Goods for the Counties of York, Durham, and Northumberland.” Surtees Society, Vol. 97. Preface, p. xi.

³ “Acts of the Privy Council of England.” Edited by John Roche Dasent (London, 1890). N. S. iii. (1550-1552), 228.

⁴ *Ibid.* N. S. iii. (1550-1552), 467.

⁵ For the full text of the Commission see “Seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records” (London, 1846), Appendix II. 307.

⁶ For the full text from the Patent Roll of 6 Edward VI. (pt. 7 m. 11 *in dorso*) see “Seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records” (London, 1846), Appendix II, pp. 312-314

⁷ J. E. Cussans, “Inventory of Furniture and Ornaments remaining in all the Parish Churches of Hertfordshire in the last Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth.” Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1873.

⁸ Walter Money, “Parish Church Goods in Berkshire, A.D. 1552.” Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1879:

⁹ “Associated Societies’ Reports,” xi. 310.

- ¹⁰ Ibid, xii. 133.
- ¹¹ "Warwickshire Antiquarian Magazine," 154.
- ¹² "Inventories of Goods in the Churches and Chapels of Lancashire taken in the Year A.D. 1552." Chetham Society, vols. cvii. and cxiii.
- ¹³ "Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society," iv. 215; N.S. i. 6; ii. 167; iii. 38.
- ¹⁴ "Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society," viii. 186.
- ¹⁵ "The Reliquary," xi.
- ¹⁶ Ibid, xii. 196; xiii 49.
- ¹⁷ "Archæologic Cantiana," viii. 74; ix. 266; x. 282; xi. 409; xiv. 290.
- ¹⁸ "Surrey Archaeological Collections," iv. 1-193.

APPENDIX H.

THE POSTREFORMATION USES OF INCENSE

I. The following inventory shows a view of the ornaments which, though rare, was at any rate a loyal view of the provisions of the Act of Uniformity and of the Prayer Book: –

Thys Indentuer made at bodmynn the Sunday next after the ffeast of Seynt mygell the archangell ynn the eyght yere of the Raygne of our Soueraygne Lady Elyzabeth by the grace of god of Englund ffrancie and Ireland quene defender of the ffaythe &c. Betwyne Nycolas Cory mayor of the towne of bodmyn of thone party and Rychard Water and Thomas Cole tanner Wardens of the Church of St. Petherick ynn bodmyn aforesayd of thother party Wyttenesseth that the sayd Rychard Water and Thomas Cole Wardens and ther successors Wardens hath taken and receyved into ther handes and keypyng of the sayd Nicholas Cory mayor and of all the hole paryshe aforesayd to be used and occupied to the honer of god ynn the same church from the day and yere aforesayd fourthward all such goodes and ornamentes as folowth and hath taken uppon them for them and ther successors to yeld a true rekenyng of all the same goodes and ornamentes and delyvery therof to make withut deley to the sayd Nycholas Cory and his successors for the tyme beyng mayor and to all the hole paryshe of bodmynn aforesayd this tyme xij monethes that ys to wete.

fyrst fyve belles with one wich servyth for ye clock to be rung dayly at ffower of the clock ynn the mornyng & at eyght ynn the evenyng a warning bell for printsyes and others

Item, one vestment of grene satyn of bryddes.

Item, one hole sute of blew velut decon subdecon & pistholere
a pere of vestmentes of whyte damaske
one cope of red satyn of bryddes

Item, a vestment of blew velut one whyte cope of satyn.

Item, one whyte vestment of satyn
and more toe copes used on good fryday & a obe of sylck.

Item, one crosse banner of grene sylck

Item, one frunt of yelo grene satyn of bryddes toe cortens wherof one of sylck
a nother frunt of Arres, a nother frunt of sey & a curtens of the same

Item cusshyn of velut for the commuyon tabell and a cusshyng of sylcke for M^r Mayor ys chere and a cloth of cheker work for M^r Mayor ys chere a shype of tyn

vij pere of surpeles with one new for M^r Vycar

iiij^{or} raches

a bybell & of Erasmus

ij pere of candelstyckes, a bason of laten, a lampe before the hye auter

one corperal of red velut & a nother of green
 a corpus cloth one dex cloth toe stoles for sett at the comunion tabell
 a herse cloth of velut and a nother of black bocrom sencer of latten
 toe lent clothes for y^e commyon tabell
 ij polys one of brasse & a nother of yron
 ij new vant clothes [and a nold *cancelled*]
 a sacryng bell a cruat
 iij Jesus cotes ij red wosterd & one of red bocrom
 iij tormenttowers cotes of satyn of bryddes of yolo and blue
 ij cappes of sylck
 ij develes cotes wherof one ys newe [toe sandyers cotes of whyte *can-*
celled]
 a croune of black
 a nother for a ell of a cross and a nold crosse
 one comouyn cup of sylver and one other gylt
 w^{ch} hery Cock used at weddynges andry & toe clottes of led

In [witnes]s herof the partes to thes present Indentuer interchayngabelly have putte [their] seles ye day & yere above w [ritten]

Endorsed. Betwene N Cory Mayor Ric. Wat' & T Cole tanner Wardens. Invent' ornament' eccl'ie.

J. Maclean, *History of the Deanery of Trigg Minor* i. 341. (London, 1868). cp. *Journ. Royal Inst. of Cornwall* vii. 121.

II. In certain rules “for the Clarkes” ordered by the Vestry of St. Michael, Cornhill, London, on Aug. 24th, 1589, to be written in their parchment book “for perpetual memory”: –

“Also they shall provyde ffor ffyre at all such ffeastes as Incense is accustomed to be offered unto Allmightie God with other thinges necessary to the office according to the solempnitie of the ffeaste.”

These and other rules were drawn up *temp.* Henry VII. and Henry VIII., but were gone over by a Committee of the parish in 1589 and ordered to be kept as being “good and availeable.” See Overend *Churchwardens' Accounts*.

III. ELIZABETHAN AND LATER INSTANCES OF INCENSE COLLECTED BY W. H. S^r. JOHN HOPE FROM CHURCHWARDENS' ACCOUNTS.

c. 1550 *York Minster.*

For frankynsense, 7s.

1558-9 *Reading, St. Mary.*

Payed for ffranconsense, ijd.

1560 *Reading, St. Mary.*

Payd for halfe a pound of francunsense, vjd

1567-8 *York Minster.*

For frankynsense, 2d.

1589 *London, St. Michael, Cornhill.*

Paide for ffrankensence to aire the Vault, ijd.

1592 *Westminster, St. Margaret.*

Pd. for perfumes of frankincense, junyper, and packthrede, 1s.

1619 *Bishop Stortfoyd, St. Michael.*

Pd. for Junyper to burne in the churche this year, ijs.

1625 Pd. for pitch and ffrancunsense to burn in the church, vs.

1627 Pd. . . . for juniper and thinges to perfume the church.

Reading, St. Lauyence.

1644 For ffrankincense to sweeten the church, 1s.

1645 To Daniel Browne for making cleane the church twice and for pitch and frankincense, 5s.

1646 Pd. for 1^l of frankincense and of pitch to perfume the church, 8d.

Pd. for 2^{li} of pitch and 2^{li} of frankincense used in the church, 1s. 4d.

1644 *Loughborough.*

Payd . . . for dressinge the church after the Souldiers and for frankincense to sweeten it, 2s. 4d.

1741 *Baynstalle, St. Peter.*

Paid for Tobacco and Frankincense burnt in the Church, 2s. 6d.

1752 Paid for Frankincense, Senemon, and Charcole, 3s.

IV. ADDITIONAL INSTANCES FROM OTHER SOURCES.

(i.) *Churchwardens' Accounts, St. Mary, Cambridge.*

1562 For Frankynsence to perfume the chirche, 1d.

For do. 2d.

1573 Item for Perfumes and Frankincense for
the Church 8d.

Similar entries to these two last frequently occur at this time, and are very important as bearing witness to the fact . . . that the use of Incense for warming and perfuming our Churches was continued for many years subsequent to the Reformation (E. Venables. *On the Church of St. Mary.* Camb. Camden Soc. Trans., p. 271).

He adds in a footnote:

Allhallows, Steyning.

| | | |
|--|----------|------|
| 1563 In the time of y ^e sickness. gennepore (juniper) ffor the cherche | Item for | ijd. |
|--|----------|------|

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1625 The time of God's visitation. Item paid for x ^{ls} of ffrankinsence at 3 ^d p' pound | 00,02 ^s , 06. |
|---|--------------------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1665 Paid two several times for Beniamin (Benzoin) to burn in the Church | 02 ^s , 06. |
|---|-----------------------|

Jesus College Chapel.

1588 Juniper to air the Chapel on St. Mark's Day.

(ii.) *Solihull, Warwickshire.*

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1665 paid to George Bird for mending the altar stone | 1s. 6d. |
| payd for bread and wine and frankin | |
| cense for the first Sacrament | 13s. 2d. |

Warm Antiq. Mag., 34.

(iii.) The Churchwardens' Account Book for the Parish of St. Peter's Mancroft, in the City of Norwich, contains the following entries: –

1629. Item pd for frankensenc and Rosen [and other thing) xxj^d.

1621. Pd for hollver and Ivey, Frannckensenc and packthred
 agaynst Christmas xx^d.

1666. Pd^d Jonathan Parker for burch 000.02.00.

 Pd him more for perfume to burne in the Church 000.01.06.

Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany, Vol. II., part ii. Edited by Walter Rye,
1883.

(iv.) From the Churchwardens' Account Book of St. Margaret's, in the City of Norwich.

1581. Item for perfume when Mrs. Jerningham was beryed, 2d

1589. Item paid for ffrankyng sense, 3d.

Eastern Counties Collectanea.

Edited by John L'Estrange (Norwich, 1872-3).

(v.) In 1574, at St. Margaret's, Fenchurch Street.

Item, Paid for hollye and ivye and ffrankinsense against Chrystmas Day.

Item, Payd for a parfuming pan.

Item, Payd for strauing yearbes agaynst my Lord of London preached the XX^{n^{te}} of
 November, iij^d.

Item, Payd for parfuming of the church that day, vj^d.

V. Incense was recommended by George Herbert.

“The country parson . . . takes order . . . that the Church be swept and kept clean without dust or cobwebs; and at great festivals strewed and stuck with boughs and perfumed with Incense.”

George Herbert – *The Country Parson*, ch. xiii.

This extract explains the foregoing entries in the churchwardens' accounts.

For others see *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 180, 181, 346, and the passage describing the burning of Incense by R. Sherlock the day before Communion where the cleansing of a chancel had raised an insufferable stench, *Ib.* 183.

VI. Incense was used by Bishop Andrewes in his chapel.

In the chapel of Bishop Andrewes there stood on a table outside the sanctuary in front of the altar “a triquetrall censor wherein y^e Clarke putteth frankincense at y^e reading of the first lesson,” with “the Navicula like y^e keele of a boat w^t a halfe cover and a foote, out of which the frankincense is poured.”

Prynne complained of this in the trial of Archbishop Laud, mentioning: – “A censor to burn Incense in at the reading of the First Lesson as in the Popish Masse and Churches. A little Boate out of which the Frankincense is poured, &c. which Doctor Cosen had made use of in Peter house where he burned Incense.”

The inventory of the furniture, together with a plan, was found by Prynne among Laud’s papers, and was quoted to incriminate him. It included “a triquetrall Censor” and “a Laton pan for it.” Laud admitted that he had copied Andrewes.

W. Prynne. *Canterbury’s Doom*, pp. 122-124 (London, 1646).

This points to a use of Incense either at the Gospel or else at the *Magnificat* or *Te Deum*.

VII. Incense was used by Bishop Cosin.

“In Peterhouse Chappel there was a glorious new Altar set up and mounted on steps to which the Master Fellowes Schollers bowed and were enjoyned to bow by Dr. Cosen, the Master who set it up” with “Basons Candlestickes Tapers standing on it and a great Crucifix hanging over it.”

“In S. John’s and Peter House Chappells there were Pictures of the Holy Ghost in forme of a Dove; that in Peter House there was likewise a carved Crosse at the end of every seat, and on the Altar a Pot which they usually called the incense pot.”

W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doom*, pp. 73, 74.

This was probably the Incense ship like those which stood on the Altar in Queen Elizabeth’s Chapel in 1565 and Charles I.’s in 1646.

Hierurgia Anglicana, pp. 4-6, 194.

VIII. THE MANNER OF ALTERING THE COMMUNION TABLE OF THE COLLEGIATE CHURCH OF WOLVERHAMPTON, &c., &c.

On Sunday, Oct. 11, 1635, a new Altar was dedicated at Wolverhampton.

“Assoone as the Preists (for so they would be called to suite the better with their Altar) came to the Church, each of them made a Low Congie [bow] a peece at their very first entring in at the great Church dore and an other Congie a peece at the Ile dore, and after that 3 Congies a peece towards the Altar (before its dedication): and so they went in to the Chancell where a bason of water and a towel was provided for the Preists to wash in, where was incense burnind which perfumed the whole Church.”

“After sermon they went to the *Dedication* or rather as the Preacher stiled it, *Renovation of the Altar*: and in the Bell-house 4 of them putt on the rich broydered

Copes, and every one of them had a Paper in his hand which they termed a *Censer*, and so they went up to the *Altar*, reading as it went†, for they looked often on it.”

A Quenchcoal . . . (London, 1637). Pp.- 197, 198 quoted at length in *Hierurgia Angl.*, 394-397. See also pp. 181, 357. But note that the summary of the above quoted on p. 357 is from “Ladensium aujtokatavkrisi”,” p. 87, H. Burton, *For God and the King*, p. 161 (London, 1636) also gives a summary of the above.

IX. Incense is alleged as part of the indictment of the Church’s ceremonial in *A Parallel or Brief Comparison of the Liturgy with the Mass-book*, R. B. K., 1641.

The following description is given of the reading of the Gospel: –

“When the Deacon hath lifted the text of the Gospel from the Altar, hee gives it to the Subdeacon to carry at his back: two waxe candles are lifted from the Altar by two Acolytes to bee carried burning before him so long as the Gospel is in reading; the cross or crucifix is also on Festival days carried before the Gospel and also a Censer with fire and Incense: the book is crossed and perfumed, and, when the lesson is ended, the Booke by the Deacon is kissed . . . the wax candles are standing on the Altars already: the silver Crucifix is avowed by *Pocklington* to have a meet standing upon the same Altar; the crossings and perfumings¹ and lights are maintained by *Andrewes* as *Canterbury* sets him forth: the kissing of the Booke is now daily practised.”

These puritan complaints must not be relied on: they were probably no more trustworthy than their modern representatives.

X. It was said of the great Chillingworth by a scurrilous adversary at his death, in a book published in 1644: –

“Being *Cancellarius* it was conceived that he should be buried *intra cancellos* and rot under the Altar near the pot of Incense, that the constant perfume of the Incense might excuse the thrift of his executrix.”

Francis Cheynell, *Chillingworthi Novissima*, p. 31. Quoted in P. Des Maizeaux, *Account of the Life and Writings of William Chillingworth*, p. 355 (London, 1725).

XI. Robert Herrick published, in 1648, the following lines in “*Julia’s Churching or Purification*”: –

“ Put on thy holy filletings. . .
Burn first thine Incense, next when as thou seest
The candid stole thrown o’er the pious priest
With reverent curtsies come, and to him bring
Thy free and not decurted offering.”

The Incense here takes its place with the woman's veil and the priest's surplice. Herrick, himself a priest, was drawing a picture from life. Other allusions to Incense, especially in connexion with Christmas and Epiphany, occur not only elsewhere in Herrick, but also in Crashaw's and Beaumont's poems.

XII. Incense was used in 1612 in Trinity College, Dublin, at the funeral of Dr. Luke Challoner, the father-in-law of Archbishop Ussher. See Carr's *Life and Times of James Usher*, p. 102 (London n.d.). And again there, in 1669, at the funeral of John Stearne, Ussher's nephew and Founder and first President of the College of Physicians. See Belcher's *Memoir of J. Stearne* (Dublin, 1865). These instances point to a tradition covering a very crucial era of more than half a century.

XIII. Archbishop Sancroft's Form of Consecration of New Communion Plate is printed at the end of *The Form of Dedication and Consecration of a Church or Chapel*, published by R. Tisdale in 1703: it was used by him at the Church of Coleshill in 1685. It includes the following direction as part of the Consecration of the Ornaments: After the paten, chalices, flagons, alms bason have been provided for there is an appendix which deals with candlesticks and then with a censer, thus: –

¶ *So likewise when a Censer is presented and received, they say:*

While the King sitteth at his Table, my spikenard sendeth forth the smell thereof (Cant. i. 12).

Let my prayer be set forth before Thee as the incense; and let the lifting up of my hands be as the Evening Sacrifice (Psalm cxli. 2).

It seems doubtful how far the Appendix is of the same authority as the rest.

XIV. It was burnt also at the Bishop's coming to St. Nicholas, Durham, in 1683. See Surtees' *History of Durham*, iv. 52; cited in *Hier. Angl.*, i 83.

XV. Evelyn notes that on Easter Day, 1684, "there was perfume burnt before the office began," when the King communicated at Whitehall Chapel, *Ib.* 184.

XVI. Incense was in use in Ely Cathedral down to the latter part of the last century. The principal evidence for this is the following note of Cole the Antiquary: –

Incense in Churches.

I have often heard Mr. Soame Jenyns, who lived at Ely when he was young, say, as also Messrs. Bentham and others say, that it was the constant Practice on the greater Festivals at Ely to burn incense at the Altar in the Cathedral till Dr. Thos. Green one of the Prebendaries and now Dean of Salisbury (1779) a finical man, tho' a very worthy one, and who is always taking snuff up his Nose, objected to it under Pretence that it made his Head to ach. Mr. Dodwell has wrote an ingenious Tract on the Subject and against its primitive institution.

The note is inserted under letter I. in Cole's Alphabetical Collections for an *Athena Cantabrigienses*.

There seems to be no reason for doubting the accuracy of this statement: on the other hand there is another tradition less well authenticated and less probable, which must also be taken into account. It is best found in a letter printed in *The Guardian* of Jan. 6, 1875.

Sir, – The interesting obituary notice of the late Rev. George Gilbert contained in the last number of the *Guardian* reminds me of a letter which I received from that amiable and good man some years ago, and which is, I think, worthy of preservation by admission into your columns. Mr. Gilbert had more than once spoken to me on the subject of the use of *Incense* in Ely Cathedral, and I requested him to put in writing exactly what he knew on the subject. The result was the following letter

Grantham, *3rd April*, 1869.

My dear Mr. Dean, – In regard to the use of Incense in your Cathedral Church, of which we spoke yesterday, I have to observe: That in the month of July, 1840, the Rev. John Metcalfe, Minor Canon of Canterbury, informed me that the use of Incense had been continued at Ely to a late period; that his father, the Rev. W. Metcalfe, Minor Canon of Ely, being troubled with asthmatic tendencies, found great embarrassment in breathing when, discharging the function of Deacon in Ely Cathedral, he had to swing and wave the vessel containing the said Incense, and earnestly requested the Dean and Chapter to discontinue its use; and that the Dean and Chapter did order the discontinuance thereof, to his great comfort. This took place, *I believe*, at the latter end of the eighteenth century. But as the date of Mr. Metcalfe's appointment to the minor canonry at Ely could be easily ascertained, the period to which its use lasted could be at least by approximation fixed. I end this formally by writing that I *affirm* the above statement to be *true*; and I beg you, my dear Mr. Dean, to regard me as yours respectfully, and truly,

GEORGE GILBERT, Prebendary of Lincoln
and Vicar of Syston-by-Grantham.

To the Very Reverend the Dean of Ely.

I have only to add that on receiving Mr. Gilbert's letter I caused an examination to be made in order to ascertain whether the books of the Dean and Chapter contained any entry with reference to the discontinuance of the use of Incense; but nothing was found bearing upon the point.

HARVEY CARLISLE.

Rose Castle, *January 1st*, 1875.

In the next issue the matter was taken up thus, under date January 13th: –

SIR, – I can confirm the statement of the late Rev. G. Gilbert, quoted by the Bishop of Carlisle in your last number, relative to the use of Incense in Ely Cathedral up to

comparatively a recent date. In a MS. journal ² which I have been lately reading, the writer records on July 9th, 1732, that “at y^e 3 great Festivals They cense y^e Cathedral of Ely, burning Frankincense and sweett woods in all parts of it.” His informant was the Bishop of St. Asaph (Tanner), whose guest he was at the time. &c., &c., &c.

WILLIAM WOOD.

January 9th, 1875.

There seems to be some confusion between these two accounts. According to the earlier one the cessation of Incense must be dated before 1779, and according to the later after 1778, when Mr. Metcalfe became Minor Canon ³: these seem to be incompatible. Again; the Dean’s headache is a different cause from the Minor’ Canon’s asthma. It is no doubt possible that each of the ailments led to a protest, but the difficulty of date remains.

What certainly lies behind both is the fact that Incense was burnt in the Cathedral not only up to 1732, as Bishop Tanner recounted, but later also.

“Archdeacon Chapman has found certain parcels of bills and two waste books in our Muniment Room, and from these it appears that the purchase of ¼ lb. of Frankincense took place fairly regularly twice a year, in March and December, from 1708-1747. In 1712 so much as 4½ lbs. was bought in March. From 1799 the bills are preserved in good order, and no further entries of frankincense appear.”

Letter of the Dean of Ely to Lord Halifax, April 1st, 1899.

The Chapter Order book of the period gives no clue either to the use or disuse of the Incense. Under the circumstances the statement that Incense was swung ceremonially by the Deacon at the Altar awaits further confirmation. ⁴

XVII. At the Coronation of George III. William Smith, the King’s Groom of the Vestry, walked in the Procession to the Coronation “in a scarlet dress holding a perfuming pan, burning perfumes.”

Rich, Thomson, *Coronation of George III.*, p. 41 (1820)

He figures in the engraving prefixed to the book, where his long scarlet dress and perfuming pan may be seen.

Similarly in 1685 at the Coronation of James II. there was “George Oldnar Grome of the Vestry in a scarlet Robe with a perfuming pan in his hand burning perfumes all the way from Westminster Hall to the Quire-door in the Church.”

F. Sandford, *History of the Coronation of James II.*, p. 70 (1687).

The engraving of the Procession is here much larger and better. The two Yeomen of the Vestry, after arriving in quire, were occupied with moving the Litany Desk, &c., and “were ordered to attend near the Altar to observe the commands of the Archbishop.”

The interval of time between these two Coronations must be bridged by *An account of the Ceremonies observed in the Coronations of the Kings and Queens of England, viz., James II., William and Mary, Anne, George I., George II.*, published in 1761 in view of George III.’s coronation.

There is no mention in the brief accounts of the ceremonies of William & Mary and of Queen Anne: but an engraving of the procession of the former is included, which shows the Groom of the Vestry as before. In the Order for 1714 the direction of 1685 is repeated, and in 1727 there is no mention of the Groom.

His function evidently was not liturgical, but was analogous to that of the clergy who preceded the Pope on his way to Church in the eighth century, or to that of "The King's Herb woman (Honor Battiscombe)" who, in 1727 and 1761, headed the procession "followed by her six Maids strewing the way with sweet herbs, a basket being carried by every two Maids."

XVIII. In 1857. Incense was used about this date at St. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square, during the incumbency of the Rev. E. Stuart, seven or eight years after the foundation-stone of the Church was laid. The Eucharistic vestments were not begun till Easter, 1864. The Incense was at first only used in processions on festivals.

See the obituary notice in "Church Times" of Feb. 23, 1877.

XIX. There is no need to cite instances in detail of the use of Incense between 1857 and the present day: its use in recent times is a matter of common knowledge. The number of Churches in which it is used in English Dioceses amounted in 1898 to nearly three hundred, of which over sixty were London Churches. This computation takes no account of Churches in India and the Colonies, nor of Anglican Churches in foreign countries, nor of the Scottish and American Churches.

W. H. FRERE.

NOTES

¹ cp. p. 84. "... perfumings. These we have already."

² The journal was that of John Loveday, Esq., of Caversham.

³ Stevenson's Supplement to Bentham's Ely.

⁴ Briefer versions of each story will be found in the *Church Times* of July 15th and 22nd, 1865; 'at the later date the Metcalfe-Greenwood story is given from a slightly different source. The statements of Mackenzie Walcott and others seem only to go back to the same origin.

APPENDIX J.

INCENSE UNDER THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

THERE exist certain *Articles*, drawn up shortly after the Prayer Book came into use, apparently for the instruction of royal and other visitors. Ridley's *Injunctions* given at his Visitation in 1550 were founded on these.

The second *Article* is as follows (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* page 75): –

“2. *Item.* For an uniformity, that no minister do counterfeit the popish Mass, as to kiss the Lord's table; washing his fingers at every time in the Communion; blessing his eyes with the paten, or sudary; or crossing his head with the paten; shifting of the book from one place to another; laying down and licking the chalice of the Communion; holding up his fingers, hands, or thumbs, joined towards his temples; breathing upon the bread or chalice; shewing the sacrament openly before the distribution of the Communion; ringing of sacring bells; or setting any light upon the Lord's board at any time; and finally to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the King's book of Common Prayers, or kneeling, otherwise than is in the said book.”

Here we see a number of *ceremonial acts*, which had been customably done in the unreformed order of the Mass, expressly forbidden, and *censuring is not among them*. It is inconceivable that so conspicuous an act should have been left unmentioned if it were regarded as forbidden, or if there were any fixed intention of eradicating it. In the concluding sentence the word *ceremonies* appears to be used in its stricter sense of a *distinct action*. The “other ceremonies” which are forbidden would be processions, the blessing of the palms, and so forth. Compare the addition in Ridley's *Injunctions* quoted below.

The 9th *Article* is as follows: –

9. *Item.* That no man maintain purgatory, invocation of saints, the sin articles, beadrolls, images, relics, lights, holy bells, holy beads, holy water, palms, ashes, candles, sepulchres, paschal, creeping to the cross, hallowing of the font of the popish manner, oil, chrism, altars, beads, or any other such abuses and superstitions, contrary to the King's Majesty's proceedings.”

In this strange jumble of things, the maintenance of which was forbidden, *Incense* would certainly have been included if there had been any intention of putting it out of use.

In 1550 Ridley held a Visitation of his diocese. Among his *Articles to be enquired of* is the following (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, p. 92): –

“Whether any useth to hallow water, bread, salt, bells, or candles upon Candlemas-day, ashes on Ash Wednesday, palms on Palm-Sunday, the font on Easter-even, fire on paschal, or whether there was any sepulchre on good-friday?”

These would be “other ceremonies than are appointed in the King’s Book of Common Prayers.” Observe the absence of any question about the use of *Incense*. It was more likely to be retained than many of the above things; yet it is not “enquired of” as a thing unlawful.

At the same Visitation Ridley issued Injunctions based on the *Articles* quoted above. The second is almost identical with the second *Article*, with the addition of “*Saying the Agnus before the Communion*” to the acts there forbidden. The final clause, however, has an important variation. It runs thus (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, p. 93): –

“And finally, that the minister, in time of the holy communion, do use only the ceremonies and gestures appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, so that there do not appear in them any Counterfeiting of the popish mass.”

Here Ridley restrains the minister, not merely to the *ceremonies*, but also to the *gestures*, ordered in the Prayer Book, “and none other.” Strictly interpreted this would exclude the use of *Incense*. It is not impossible that Ridley, while shrinking from the express condemnation of *Incense*, intended in this way, by a side wind, to get rid of it. But it is important to notice that his prohibition of *gestures* is directly contrary to a provision of the Prayer Book itself, contained in the “*Certain Notes*” which, were added to the Chapter *Of Ceremonies*, as follows: –

“As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man’s devotion serveth, without blame.”

Conclusion. – That the Reformers, even the more extreme, under the Prayer Book of 1549, carefully avoided any express prohibition of *Incense*, even if they secretly desired to put it out of use.

T. A. LACEY.