

Take from my head the thorn-wreath brown!  
 No mortal grief deserves that crown.  
 O supreme Love, chief misery,  
 The sharp regalia are for THEE  
 Whose days eternally go on.

For us, whatever's undergone,  
 Thou knowest, willest what is done.  
 Grief may be joy misunderstood;  
 Only the Good discerns the good.  
 I trust Thee while my days go on.

Whatever's lost, it first was won:  
 We will not struggle nor impugn.  
 Perhaps the cup was broken here,  
 That Heaven's new wine might show more clear.  
 I praise Thee while my days go on.

I praise Thee while my days go on;  
 I love Thee while my days go on:  
 Through dark and dearth, through fire and frost,  
 With emptied arms, and treasure lost,  
 I thank Thee while my days go on.

And having in Thy life-depth thrown  
 Being and suffering (which are one),  
 As a child drops his pebble small  
 Down some deep well, and hears it fall  
 Smiling—so I. THY DAYS GO ON.

CHARLES D. BELL, D.D.



#### ART. IV.—MEANING OF THE WORD “OBLATIONS” IN OUR BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

A REPLY TO CANON SIMMONS.

**I**N a criticism of a paper on “Alms and Oblations,” which was printed in *THE CHURCHMAN* at the beginning of last year, Canon Simmons remarked, a few months afterwards,<sup>1</sup> that while we have often voted together in Convocation at York, we have sometimes voted against one another, but always with mutual goodwill and regard. This is quite true: and it is pleasant to be sure that no difference of opinion regarding the subject now under consideration, or any other subject, is likely to disturb this feeling. If such an impossible thing were to happen, it would be my fault, not his.

<sup>1</sup> See *THE CHURCHMAN* for January and June, 1882. Each paper was afterwards reprinted and published separately with corrections (Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row).

Before I proceed to examine his criticism, two remarks of a general kind may be made. The first is this: that certain parts of my argument have—perhaps through lack of space—not been noticed by him. Hence they retain whatever force they had before the paper was written, and they will here be briefly reiterated. And the second general remark is this: that Canon Simmons really concedes a very large part of that for which I contended. Hence I claim him as, upon the whole, upon my side.

My contention is that in our Prayer Book of 1662 the phrase "alms and oblations" is a collective phrase, which cannot properly be divided; that the whole must be used if any part of it is used; that the direction upon the subject is clear, and that we have no right to disobey it. And further, I contended that, the "oblations" being collected along with the "alms" from the congregation that may then be in the church, together brought to the priest, and by him presented—and this whether there be an actual Communion or not—the word "oblations" cannot refer in whole or in part to the Bread and Wine. And these views I endeavoured to confirm by various arguments, verbal and historical. Let me add here, once for all, that there is satisfactory evidence that this question was not settled at random in 1662, but after much debate and careful consideration.<sup>1</sup>

Now, to take the second of these two general remarks first, Canon Simmons agrees with me in thinking that the two parts of this collective phrase must be used together. He holds, indeed, that the word "oblations" is inclusive of the Bread and Wine when there is a Communion, as well as of the "other devotions" which, at the Offertory, may be collected along with what are more distinctively regarded as "alms;" but he holds that the phrase is indivisible. If there be no Communion, yet he contends that there may be "oblations" as well as "alms," and that the rule which is given to us ought to be observed. If there be a Communion, then he thinks that the word "oblations" comprises in its meaning not only these gifts of the congregation which are co-ordinated with the "alms," but also the unconsecrated Bread and Wine. Now this is a very large concession. As regards usage, it yields all that I contended for. In practice there is no difference between us. But it must be added, that in making this concession Canon Simmons rejects a prevalent theory, and condemns a custom which is very widely spread among our Clergy—many of whom, with-

---

<sup>1</sup> That the word "offer" was proposed for the act of placing the Bread and Wine on the Holy Table, and was ultimately rejected, is certain. See the note in Cardwell's "History of Conferences," p. 390.

out any authority, in reading the prayer for the Church Militant, when there is an Offertory but no Communion, say only "alms," whereas they are directed to say "alms and oblations"—and this, even on occasions when the offerings of the people have no reference whatever to the relief of the sick and the poor. I certainly think that a change in this practice should be made, and Canon Simmons evidently thinks the same. To those who hold a different opinion his argument must be unwelcome.

The point of debate, then, between Canon Simmons and myself is simply this—whether the word "oblations" is, when there is a Communion, inclusive both of gifts collected from the congregation at the Offertory and also of the Bread and Wine made ready for the Eucharistic Sacrament. I ventured in a note to say that this inclusive theory is the worst of all. Perhaps this was an ill-chosen expression; and if it was, I apologize for it. I knew that some persons held this theory; but I thought they were very few. That which I have been accustomed to meet with in antagonism to my own opinion is the view that the word "oblations" refers to the Bread and Wine only, *exclusive* of gifts at the Offertory—though how this was to be reconciled with obedience to the rule of the Prayer Book I never could understand. However, in writing that note I did not intend to impute moral blame to anyone; I only meant that I thought this view the *most illogical* of all. The opinion against which I was contending was clear enough. It seemed to me simply a direct contradiction of the rule, whereas this seemed to me utterly confused and confusing. The word "oblations," on this theory, is to be taken in two different senses, according to the occasion, without any indication being given that it was expected to do double duty, and to transform itself from time to time; this, too, when it would have been extremely easy to have provided for *two* oblations—one, of the gifts co-ordinated with the "alms," to be used always when there is an Offertory—and the other, of the Bread and Wine, to be used only when there is a Communion.<sup>1</sup> But let us see more precisely how the case stands.

The Bread and Wine are "provided" beforehand, as a matter of preliminary arrangement for the service; the "oblations" are the gift of the worshippers in the course of the service. The Bread and Wine are supplied by the parishioners, many of whom, it is quite certain, will not be present in the church; the "oblations" come specially and exclusively from those who are actually present. The Bread and Wine are secured as the result of a legal order; the "oblations" are, in

<sup>1</sup> This was virtually done in the Scotch Book of 1637.

the strictest sense, voluntary. In the case of the Bread and Wine the priest places on the table as much as he shall think sufficient; that which determines the amount of the "oblations" is the spontaneous devotion of the congregation. The Bread and Wine are "placed" on the table at a separate time, in reference to the coming Communion; the "oblations" are reverently brought and humbly presented along with the alms, and this, too, whether there be a Communion or not. The Bread and Wine are laid on the Table by the priest's hands quite irrespectively of any action by the worshippers; the "oblations" are presented by them, through him, as an act of worship. The latter are in the "basin," the former not. That which remains of the unconsecrated Bread and Wine is to be had by the curate to his own use; that which is collected at the Offertory is applied to pious and charitable uses.<sup>1</sup> Surely it is very surprising that the common word "oblations" should be inclusive of such incongruities. An argument to this effect seems to me like the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which rested partly on iron and partly on clay. Such an argument cannot stand before even the slightest logical attack. Canon Simmons says that I have found fault with the Bishops and Revisers of 1662 for confusion and want of care in this matter; but really I have done no such thing. I think that their work was very carefully and thoroughly done, and that the result is perfectly consistent and clear. I find fault with Canon Simmons for having placed those good Bishops, and those painstaking Revisers, in an absurd position.

Now, to pass to the second of the above-mentioned general remarks, and without following any very precise order, I may say that my friendly critic has omitted from his criticism some things on which I laid considerable stress; and in other cases—perhaps because of some defect in my mode of writing—has not precisely caught my meaning.

Among the things omitted are the relation of the "alms," at our present Offertory, to the "poor man's box" of earlier days;<sup>2</sup> and the relation of the "oblations" to the "offering days," when such gifts were made to the Clergy. There is in this case, so to speak, a distinct genealogical connection, which is of high importance in the argument. These two old customs lead on straight, each by a separate path, but harmoniously, to our present rubric, in which the gifts of these two classes are

<sup>1</sup> See the rubrics at the end of the service, which were introduced into the Prayer Book at the same time as the Offertory Rubric and the directions attached to the Prayer for the Church Militant.

<sup>2</sup> The "poor man's box" is described in the 84th of the Canons of 1604. Specimens of such boxes are still to be found in various parts of the country.

brought together and made a sacred offering—an act of worship during the time of prayer and praise. I claim for our Revisers a most religious purpose and signal success in bringing about this concurrence; and if this view is correct, it has evidently much to do with the meaning which they attached, and which we are bound to attach, to the word "oblations" in our Book of Common Prayer.

Probably, as I have said, they took, in this matter, a hint from the Scotch Book of 1637, in which, for the first time, gifts of this kind were made an act of worship. My friend treads very lightly over the part of my argument which is connected with this circumstance, just as a man might reasonably move as quickly as possible over hot pieces of iron likely to burn his feet. I will, therefore, repeat some part of what I quoted from this book before: "While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the Offertory, the Deacon or (if no such be present) one of the Churchwardens shall receive the *devotions* of the people then present, in a basin provided for the purpose; and when all have *offered*, he shall reverently bring the said basin, *with the oblations therein*, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the Holy Table." Here it is evident that the "oblations" are synonymous with the "devotions" of the people; that they are collected from the congregation then present and from them only; that they are received and presented in the basin provided for the purpose, and that they are absolutely exclusive of the Bread and Wine.

This is the positive part of the argument; and it is strongly confirmed by the rubric which we find at the close of the service for the distribution of the monetary oblations thus collected. But there is a negative part of the argument, which, to my apprehension, weighs very strongly against the view of Canon Simmons. It is this. In the Scotch Prayer Book there is a *separate oblation of the Bread and Wine*, which does not appear in our Prayer Book. This Scotch Book, which conveyed in one respect a most important suggestion readily adopted, was in another respect not allowed to influence the work of 1662. It surely cannot be contended that because the placing of the Bread and Wine on the Table is *not* allowed to be called an "offering," therefore this idea with regard to them is to be included in the "oblations" presented in the basin.

The case of Bishop Cosin's service for the consecration of his chapel is likewise one in regard to which my main point has been missed. In this service there are virtually three oblations. First, the Bishop "offers" his act of consecration; then the Bread and Wine for the Communion; then his own

"alms and oblations." With the first of these acts we have nothing to do, for it had reference to the special circumstances of the moment; the third strictly corresponds with what we find in our present Prayer Book; the very phrase "alms and oblations" is that with which we are so familiar. It cannot be supposed that the word "oblations" at this point (and we find it at no other) includes the Bread and Wine; for there is an intermediate "offering" of the Bread and Wine, which would make that inclusion unmeaning. How it was that Bishop Cosin used here the word "offer," which was not accepted at the Revision, we must leave undecided; but the very fact that he did use it, renders it impossible to include the elements within the meaning of the phrase "Alms and Oblations," which is used separately, and after the offering of the Bread and Wine has taken place. Mere antiquarian and chronological questions are of no account here, as I said in my former argument.<sup>1</sup> The usage of words in this service seems to me clearly against the view of Canon Simmons.

In the earlier paper I laid some stress upon the remarkable difference in character which we observe in our Prayer Book between the rubric which precedes the "placing" of the Bread and Wine for Communion, and the "reverent bringing" and "humble presenting" of the oblations contributed by the congregation in the service; and to my comments on this subject Canon Simmons replies with care and energy. But he misses my main point. He appeals to me as to whether I think that the simplicity of the word "place" is any real objection to the view that it might be used to describe a solemn oblation; and he further points out that in strict ecclesiastical precedent this word has been so used, and may very properly be so used. To make this appeal the more forcible he refers to the strong simplicity of the Old Testament in regard to the Shewbread, "Thou shalt set upon the Table the Shewbread before Me always," which is an exact reflection of what we find alike in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate.

Now I am altogether in accord with Canon Simmons both as to the adequacy of the word "place" for the purpose in question, and in his preference for simplicity of language in sacred things. It is often a cause of serious regret to me that a fanciful deviation from such simplicity is very common in our day. The multiplication of adjectives is supposed to add to

---

<sup>1</sup> Either this service was used before 1662 or after 1662. If before, it cannot be an illustration of new rubrics introduced at that date. If after, it is clear that Bishop Cosin did not regard the phrase "alms and oblations" as adequately inclusive of the Bread and Wine; otherwise he need not have introduced the word "offer" in reference to them.

the claim which Divine things have upon our reverence. I may bring forward as an illustration the fashion of using the word "holy" on all sorts of occasions. This is not the manner of the Bible and the Prayer Book. As to the perfect fitness and sufficiency of the word "place" in the instance before us, this is well shown by the language used in the Bible in reference to the Shewbread, and the language of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in reference to the Eucharist. But this does not really touch the argument. The point which I urged was this: that while our Revisers, according to the fashion of their day, employed very full and emphatic language to describe the reverence they wished to associate with the presentation of money offerings, they deviated and started aside from such language when they spoke of the placing of the elements for Communion. Canon Simmons speaks rather severely of "the sententious expletives of the Laudian period." Why then, if this kind of language was carefully adopted in the one case, was it carefully avoided in the other? This could not have been accident. It is the *contrast* which constitutes here the point of the argument.

Among the new materials which Canon Simmons has brought into this discussion may be included his strong language regarding the wide possible usage of the meaning of the term "oblations," and the fact that this word has often been used in respect of the Bread and Wine at Communion. But really there is no difference between my critic and myself in reference to either of these points. Our own Communion Service, even in the declaratory part of the Prayer of Consecration, employs this term in the very highest and most awful sense of all; while I fully admit that it may most properly be used for the very smallest part of any of the poor service which we render to God. Nor, again, can there be any doubt as to the application of this word in various ages to the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist. Not only can instances be adduced, as by Canon Simmons, from Anglo-Saxon and Mediaeval times, but we find the same usage at this day in the Scotch and American Prayer Books. But the question before us is not what the word *might* mean under various supposable circumstances, out what it *does* mean in this particular part of our Communion Office. This must be determined by the help of historical comments: and especially I invite attention again to what my friend does not notice—viz., that, in regard to matters of this kind, there was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a well understood and customary manner of using this word "oblation." To enforce this point I have brought forward the authority of Sir Robert Phillimore, which must be admitted to be weighty authority. I quoted the poet Herrick,

who, in describing the furniture of his "Fairy Temple," not only names the "free oblation," but the very "basin" which stands upon the board "to receive it." I might similarly have cited George Herbert :<sup>1</sup>

Yet thy favour  
May give savour  
To this my poor oblation,  
And it raise  
To be Thy praise  
And be my salvation.

But, in truth, illustrations of this fact could be produced in abundance ;<sup>2</sup> and what I simply urge is this, that in a case of this kind the predominant and customary ecclesiastical usage of words would probably be followed.

The Abbey Dore Service, which has been adduced by Canon Simmons in favour of his argument, I confidently claim as on my side. I have referred elsewhere to this service, and in connection with another subject ;<sup>3</sup> and I have shown that it is really of no argumentative value for the purposes on account of which it is sometimes cited. The service was drawn up for a Church-consecration, in 1635, when Wren had just been made Bishop, and therefore can be of no weight at all in illustration of the new rubrics in the Prayer Book of 1662. It may, however, be of value in exemplifying the use of words. After the invitation to "such as desire to communicate," that "they come up to *the holy Oblation or Offering*," then the Bishop "*offers*, and lays upon the Table his Act of Consecration," after which the Chaplain "reacheth the Bread for the Communion, which standeth ready at the south side of the chancel, and the Wine after it, and delivers them to the Bishop, who *offereth* them also. Lastly, the Priest setting the basin, or the paten of the chalice, the Bishop *offereth* for himself and so returneth to his seat again. The Priest treatably proceeds to read other of the Sentences, especially those that are for the *Oblations*, and not for the Alms. All this while, the Chaplain standeth before the Table, and receiveth the *oblations* of all that *offer*, which that

<sup>1</sup> "The Temple"—an Offering.

<sup>2</sup> In Canon Bateman's "Clerical Reminiscences" mention is made of the *oblations* in his church having been given for some time to the priest of his parish, because of his poverty, during the reign of Philip and Mary. A friend informs me that in the parish of Solihull there is an ancient MS. book, written by Henry Greswold, a learned Rector of that parish (1660—1781), a note to this effect—"Oblations, called after Qu. Elizabeth's days Charity Money."

<sup>3</sup> "Before the Table": An Inquiry into the true meaning of the Consecration Rubric in the Communion Service of the Church of England, Appendix, p. 171.



they might do with due reverence and submission, he causeth at the beginning a cushion or pessel to be laid before him, on which they kneel when they offer." Then follows the prayer, in which the Almighty is besought mercifully to accept the *oblations*. Now could there be a stronger and more emphatic proof of the customary and recognised use of this term at that period? This use, too, is precisely reflected in the Prayer Book of 1662. It is quite true, as Canon Simmons urges, that in the Abbey Dore Service the Bishop "offers" the Bread and Wine, and that this was an oblation; but this act is not reflected in our present Prayer Book; and in the service before us the actual word "oblations," is clearly exclusive of the Bread and Wine. It is worth while to add, and it is very interesting to observe, that we have here that distinction of Offertory Sentences, as applicable to alms and oblations respectively, which is conspicuous in Bishop Wren's subsequent liturgical notes, and to which I referred in my previous essay.

The same general conclusion is easily reached on an examination of the Coronation Service, which likewise Canon Simmons adduces, though really it makes against him. Whenever, indeed, this service is brought forward to help an argument in reference to our Prayer Book, I always suspect that the argument is felt to be weak: for this service was never sanctioned by Convocation; the basis on which it rests is thoroughly Erastian.<sup>1</sup> But even if this service were a part of our Book of Common Prayer it would not serve the purpose for which it is here quoted. The argument is stated thus: The Queen "offers Bread and Wine for the Communion;" then she offers her "*second oblation*," consisting of a purse of gold; then follows a prayer for the acceptance of the "oblations:" the word "oblations" is in the plural: hence it includes the Bread and Wine. But, in fact, if the service is carefully examined, it will be found that the "*first oblation*" is strictly defined, and is something quite different. It consists of a pall and a wedge of gold; and it seems to me that, by the very structure of the service, the word "oblations" is made expressly to exclude the Bread and Wine.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus when the word "altar" is under discussion, and discomfort is felt because of the fact, from which there is no power of extrication, that this word has been most carefully removed from our Prayer Book, the Coronation Service is often quoted. But is not this really an appeal to the State against the Church?

<sup>2</sup> Maskell's "*Monumenta Ritualia*," (2nd ed., vol. iii, p. 137). It is to be observed that in this service the Archbishop has already prayed that the Bread and Wine may be sanctified to the use to which it is devoted, before the purse is placed in the basin and the special prayer offered for the acceptance of the Queen's *oblations*.

Canon Simmons lays some stress on the fact that both before and after the Restoration there were many in the Church of England who desired to have an express oblation of the elements in the Communion Service. Of this fact there is no doubt. There has always been such a school of thought within the Church of England. Bishop Patrick, whom Canon Simmons adduces, is a notable example. In his "*Mensa Mystica*," and still more in his "*Christian Sacrifice*," he is very clear and emphatic. "The alms," he says, "signifying that which was given for the relief of the poor, the oblation can signify *nothing else* than the bread and wine presented to God." But here it is to be observed that Bishop Patrick's view differs altogether and most seriously from that of Canon Simmons. The former, of course, omitted the word "oblations" in the case of an Offertory without a Communion: the latter contends that on all occasions when there is an Offertory that word must be used. Thus Canon Simmons and I combine in opposing the theory of Bishop Patrick. But, after all, the question is not what was the opinion of individual divines, whether they were bishops or not, but what was the decision of Convocation and Parliament combined? And, moreover, it is easy to furnish counter-testimonies as to the existence of opinion of a contrary kind. I will bring forward only two.

Dean Comber's "*Companion to the Temple*" is a book of recognised value,<sup>1</sup> and certainly the honoured author's place was among the High Churchmen of his day. Now, on an examination of his manner of dealing with the Offertory in his instructions for the meditation of communicants, it does not appear that he contemplated the "oblations" in any other sense than that which is here advocated. On the one hand, he regards this meaning as very large and very rich in devotional suggestions; and on the other, he does not give it any turn whatever towards the Bread and the Wine. Thus he says, "The *oblation of alms*, which is at other times commendable, is at the time of this Sacrament of Love necessary and by no means to be omitted:" he refers to the "liberal offerings of our pious ancestors," to their "noble donations offered at the Holy Table," adding that "these *oblations* sufficed to maintain the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; to provide all necessaries for Divine administration; and to feed and sustain orphans, widows, and all the Christian poor—yea, some of the heathen also likewise." He analyses the Offertory Sentences, laying special stress on the oblations which should be made to the Ministers, in consequence of "the custom of the Priests sharing in the *offerings* at church being laid aside." In a note he

---

<sup>1</sup> The edition from which I quote is the third, dated 1681.

says, "If the congregation be large, and the alms long in gathering, you may profitably read all or most of these sentences to enlarge your hearts and quicken your charity; if *the offering* be short, yet read some of them before it come to your turn; and then prepare *your own oblation*, and the next section will teach you how to present it." In commenting on the words "alms and oblations" in the Prayer for the Church Militant, Comber's words are strictly in harmony with those which have preceded. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions as to what this devout writer includes under the phrase "alms and oblations," and also as to what he excludes from it; and he is invited to consider how large a religious benefit was gained by the change made in our service at this point during Comber's life.

Among those writers who, fifty years later, were highly valued for their useful comments on the Prayer Book, was the Rev. T. Bennett; and from him the following passage may be quoted: "'Tis most highly reasonable, as well as agreeable to ancient practice, that when we come to partake of the Lord's Supper, we should offer unto God according to our ability for the relief of the distressed. And while *the collection of these oblations* is made, the Church has very prudently enjoined that the following sentences should be read, whereby the congregation is encouraged to *offer* freely as a matter of bounty, and not of covetousness. Some of these sentences, I confess, do respect the Clergy, who had in former times, and still have in some few places, a share of the *offerings*. But where that custom is not retained those sentences are never used."<sup>1</sup> Questions of considerable interest arise here as to the relations of the support of the Clergy to the Offertory at different periods; but these questions do not affect the argument here presented for the meaning of the phrase "alms and oblations."

During the months that have elapsed since the beginning of last year—the subject having been from time to time under careful attention—some new facts, new illustrations and new arguments have presented themselves to my mind; and, so far as I see, they are all on my side.

With regard to one part of the rubric which directs the "placing" of the Bread and Wine, I must confess that my original view has been to a considerable degree modified. This is the meaning of the word "*then*." I had argued that this word indicates, not only that the Bread and Wine are to

---

<sup>1</sup> "Paraphrase with Annotations upon the Book of Common Prayer," p. 164.

be placed on the Table by the hand of the Priest, about which there can be no doubt, but that this must be done during that particular part of the service which intervenes between the saying of the Nicene Creed and the saying of the Prayer for the Church Militant. On comparing, however, this rubric with the corresponding rubric in the Baptismal Services, I more than doubt whether the view is correct. In the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants it is ordered thus: "And the Priest coming to the Font (which is *then* to be filled with pure water) and standing there, shall say;" and it is said previously in the same rubric, "and *then* the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the people with the children must be ready at the Font." Here the word "*then*" appears undoubtedly to refer to the preceding phrase, "*when there are children to be baptized,*" and not to contain any direction as to the particular moment at which the Font is to be "filled with water."<sup>1</sup> Hence, reasoning by analogy, and remembering that at the last revision many rules of this kind were added, for instruction in manual acts, and in order to secure due order in the services, it seems natural to infer that in the rubric before us, the word "*then*" simply refers to the preceding phrase, "*when there is a Communion,*" or, as it is given in Durel's Latin Version, "*Quoties Sacra Communio celebrabitur.*" This view of the matter was first set before me by a learned friend in Cambridge; and, the more I have reflected upon it, the more it has commended itself to my conviction. And this opinion is strongly corroborated by two remarkable facts, namely, that alike in the Greek Version of 1664 and the Welsh Version of 1665, to both of which further allusion will be made presently, there is no word that corresponds to the English word "*then.*"<sup>2</sup> If this reasoning is sound, then a new argument of very great force is furnished for removing the Bread and Wine at the Communion altogether out of the range of what is included in the term "oblations."<sup>3</sup> The placing of Bread and Wine on the Table, like the filling of the Font with water, is no part of

<sup>1</sup> Compare also a rubric after the Service for the Communion of the Sick, "*When the sick person is visited, and receiveth the Holy Communion all at one time, then the Priest,*" etc.; and another preceding the Service for the Private Baptism of Infants, "*But when need shall compel them to do so, then Baptism shall be administered on this fashion.*"

<sup>2</sup> The same impression is conveyed to me by the form of rubric in Durel's French Version: "*Et quand on fera la Sainte Cène, alors le Ministre mettra sur la Table autant de Pain et de Vin qu'il jugera être nécessaire.*"

<sup>3</sup> If this aspect of the matter is correct, it will account for the simple and even meagre language of the rubric for placing the Bread and Wine, as compared with the rubric which follows.

the Sacramental Service at all, but merely a preparatory act for reverence and convenience.<sup>1</sup>

The mention which has just been made of Durel's Latin Prayer Book leads us upon new ground where it is incumbent upon us to pause for a moment, for the purpose of observing its direct bearing upon the subject under consideration. And for general reasons it is desirable to make pointed mention of this version; for a historical and critical account of this Latin Prayer Book of Charles II. has lately been published.<sup>2</sup> It will be convenient first to state briefly the value and authority of this book, and then to exhibit the light which it throws upon the meaning of the word "oblations."

A remark made by the Rev. J. H. Blunt regarding this book is quite enough to arrest our attention: "Dean Durel's Latin Version is a most excellent one, whether it is viewed as to scholarship, theology, or loyalty to the Church of England."<sup>3</sup> Such a comment, coming from such a quarter, suffices to show that Durel was no Puritan. In fact, he was one of the "High Churchmen" of his day, and a well-known writer against those who tended towards Puritanism. The chief facts of his life, and the chief circumstances of the publication of the Latin Prayer Book, may be thus briefly summarised from the recently-published commentary.

John Durel was born in Jersey, and in 1640 became a member of Merton College, Oxford. His reputation in regard to the University and the Church is clearly made known by Anthony à Wood, who says that "his fame was so well known to the Academicians, especially for the great pains he had taken in the Church, that they could hardly propose anything to him in which they would not be willing to prevent him;" and that he was one "who dared with an unshaken and undaunted resolution to stand up and maintain the honour and dignity of the English Church when she was in her worst and deplorable condition." When a congregation at the Savoy was established by the King, "wherein divine service should be performed in French according to the book established by law," Durel preached the opening sermon. In 1663 he became Chaplain to Charles II.; and in 1677 he was made Dean of Windsor, in which office he remained till his death in 1683. As to his Latin Prayer Book, it is to be observed, in the first place, that provision is expressly

<sup>1</sup> Obviously this affects the question of the necessity of any shelf or table for the elements before they are placed on the Holy Table.

<sup>2</sup> "The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II.; or, an Account of the Liturgia of Dean Durel," by Charles Marshall, M.A., Chaplain to the Lord Mayor of London, 1849—1850; and W. W. Marshall, B.A., late Scholar of Hertford College. Oxford: James Thornton.

<sup>3</sup> "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," p. 586, Appendix.

made for such a version in the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. Steps were taken in Convocation for the fulfilling of this intention, first by committing the task to Pearson, afterwards Bishop of Chester, and Earle, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, and then to Dolben, Dean of Westminster. But the work was actually done by Durel. Great pains were devoted to the task by him, and considerable time; and two very important elements for enabling us to come to a right decision regarding the value and authority of the book are, first, his dedication to the King; and, secondly, the fact that the sheets before publication were submitted to Archbishop Sancroft.

We may now proceed to inquire how the Offertory Rubric appears in this authoritative translation. The best course to be adopted is simply to quote it. "Dum ista recitantur, Diaconi, Æditui, aliive ad hoc idonei, quibus illud muneris demandatum est, Eleemosynam in pauperum usus erogatam colligent, ut et alias populi *oblaciones* in pios usus in Amulâ<sup>1</sup> seu lance idoneâ a Parochianis in hunc usum comparatâ, eamque ad Presbyterum reverenter afferent, ab illo autem gestu modesto ac humili super sacrâ Mensâ collocabitur." Here we see at once the view of Durel at this critical time of our Church history, and the view of those eminent Churchmen by whom he was surrounded. The other "devotions" of the people of our customary Prayer Book is here rendered by the word "*oblaciones*;" and it is evident that it must have the same meaning here which it has immediately afterwards in the Prayer for the Church Militant, where the phrase is "*eleemosynam atque oblaciones*." And let it be remembered that Durel was Chaplain to the King, and that then strong views regarding the Royal Supremacy were mixed up with public Church-opinion. Let it be remembered, further, that this Latin Prayer Book had the sanction of Sancroft, who himself (as I remarked in my earlier paper) asked, in his Visitation Articles of 1686: "When the Holy Communion is administered amongst you, are the *alms and oblaciones* of devout persons duly collected and received? Are they constantly disposed of to *pious and charitable uses* by the consent of the Minister and Churchwardens: or, if they disagree, by the appointment of the ordinary?"

In writing a few years ago on another subject I had occasion to refer to the French version of the Book of Common Prayer,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "*Amulæ dicuntur quibus offertur devotio sive oblatio*" is the definition in Ducange. A phrase used in early times was, "*amula offertoria*." Durel was probably well acquainted with the old ecclesiastical vocabulary for such subjects.

<sup>2</sup> "The Position of the Priest during Consecration in the English Communion Service," pp. 37, 67.

which French version was likewise executed by Durel. This work was done with less care and perfection than the other. It appeared, however, under the sanction of a royal ordinance, and with the imprimatur of Dr. Stradling, Chaplain to the Bishop of London—Stradling having been one of those who were appointed to affix their signatures to the Sealed Books. Hence its testimony is of some value. He employs "nos aumosnes et nos oblations" in the prayer, as synonymous with "aumosne," used generically in the margin—thus clearly regarding the word "oblations" as denoting an offering of money, and as excluding the "Bread and Wine." The phrase "alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people" in the preceding rubric is rendered by him "les aumosnes pour les povres et les autres charitez du peuple."

The Act of Uniformity of Charles II. prescribed likewise the preparation of a Welsh Prayer Book: and this Welsh Book may similarly be put in evidence with the same result. I will not presume to quote any words from this book. I believe that all Welsh scholars will tell us that the term for "oblations" is simply the plural of the term for "offertory." Hence it denotes a monetary payment. This is illustrated by a curious custom in some of the older parishes of the Principality, where "offerings" in money are given to the clergyman at funerals, the very same word being employed in this case as in the other.<sup>1</sup>

A slight reference must be made to one other contemporary version, which, though not having the same official authority as the Latin and Welsh Books, approached very near to such authority. This is the Greek translation by Duport, who, after having been Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, was made Dean of Peterborough. The book is dedicated to Archbishop Sheldon. It is enough to say that Duport includes the specific term *προσφορά* (or oblations) in the generic term *ἐλεημοσύνη* (or alms). If there is no *ἐλεημοσύνη*, the word *προσφορά* is to be omitted. It is evident then that *προσφορά* did not, in his opinion, refer partially or wholly to the Bread and Wine.<sup>2</sup>

In bringing this reply to a conclusion, it seems to me important to remark on the simultaneous introduction (in 1662) of several rubrics bearing upon this point. In writing before, I observed that one circumstance in favour of the view which I advocated was that it exhibited all things in the Prayer

<sup>1</sup> I cite this illustrative fact from Mr. Marshall's book.

<sup>2</sup> Put into English, the directions, attached to the Prayer for the Church Militant in Durel's French and Duport's Greek versions, stand thus: "If there be no alms then shall the words, 'of receiving our alms and oblations,' be omitted." If, then, there is a Communion, and if "oblations," includes the "Bread and Wine," we are compelled to speak of the Bread and Wine as "alms."

Book which relate to this subject as consistent with one another, whereas on any other view there is confusion and the appearance of carelessness and haste. The present observation is to the same effect, though in another form. Let all the new rubrics which can be brought to bear upon this point be examined, and it will be seen how carefully they have been arranged with one end in view, and how completely they meet the case.<sup>1</sup>

I have written with no doctrinal intention. I have no animosity against the notion of an oblation of the unconsecrated elements for the Eucharist. If there were such an oblation in the Prayer Book I should very readily accept it; but since it is not in the Prayer Book, and since the evidence is clear that in the Revision of 1662 the matter was very carefully considered, I think I am bound in loyalty to believe that there are very good reasons for its exclusion. Still less do I dream of bringing any accusation of false doctrine, any accusation of Rome-ward tendencies, or the like, against those who see in the word "oblations" as used in our Book of Common Prayer, either an exclusive reference to the unconsecrated Bread and Wine, or comprehension of them on occasion with offerings in money. I certainly think that both these views are wrong; but I have attempted to argue the case on its merits. Suspicions and recriminations entangle a discussion of this kind, and hinder the truth from being clearly seen.

In conclusion, I may repeat what I said before, that this aspect of oblation in our Eucharistic Service is in harmony with what we are taught in Holy Scripture. Nothing is there said of any offering of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist after the manner of the Hebrew sacrifices. The blessing of the Holy Communion is there represented as a gift from God, of

---

<sup>1</sup> In one part of his essay (p. 8) Canon Simmons says that I have given an incorrect account of the Durham book, the Bodleian book, the Photozincographic Facsimile, to which I had occasion to refer. I so fully recognise that his knowledge of such subjects is superior to my own, that I do not for a moment question his verdict. Since, however, this point does not affect the argument, I will not dwell upon it further. I am tempted, however, to allude to another remark which he makes in reference to these books. I had expressed a wish that, for the sake of minute comparison in details, the Durham book and the Bodleian book might be brought side by side. This, Canon Simmons says, has been done by Mr. Parker. That Mr. Parker has carefully examined both books, as I have, admits of no question. But if he has brought the Durham book to Oxford, or the Oxford book to Durham, he has succeeded, where I have failed. I hope I may be allowed to add an expression of regret that Mr. Parker, in his comparative view of our successive Prayer Books, has arranged all later books like satellites round that of 1549, as though that were of present authority; whereas, like the rest, it has been superseded by the book of 1662.



which we are the recipients.<sup>1</sup> Canon Simmons, near the end of his paper, speaks of the bringing back of "the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Apostles' time, with its visible and vocal oblation." But what does he mean by "the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Apostles' time?" The evidence of any such thing must be sought in the times of the Apostles—or, in other words, in the New Testament. The sacrifice of our goods, of our charity, of ourselves, is there made very conspicuous and very imperative. It is impossible, too, that the Lord's Supper should not be accompanied by our praise and thanksgiving. But nowhere in the New Testament is the Eucharist represented as a sacrifice. Here, however, we are on the confines of serious doctrinal questions; and this paper has been regarded throughout as not involving any such questions. I thank Canon Simmons for his courtesy; and I set a high value on the large agreement of opinion which subsists between him and myself. If he and I were to argue together in our Northern Convocation in favour of the literal observance of the rule laid down in our Prayer Book regarding the indivisible phrase "alms and oblations," I believe it would be very difficult for any member of either the Upper or the Lower House to refute us.<sup>2</sup>

J. S. HOWSON.



#### ART. V.—THOUGHTS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE. (PART III.)

THE proposal of Government to introduce an Affirmation Bill, for the scarcely disguised purpose of admitting into the House of Commons one who unblushingly proclaims his disbelief in the existence of a God, is a climax to the instances already given of atheistic tendencies telling upon a nation in its legislative capacity. Even though the Bill be rejected, the bare proposal of such a measure by Government is unmistak-

<sup>1</sup> See "The Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice," by Mr. Tomlinson, a book which deserves to be widely known and carefully studied.

<sup>2</sup> I have been asked what the exact line is which I draw between "alms" and "oblations." To this I answer that though the literal original meaning of the two words is plain enough, no absolute line can be drawn between them in their liturgical use. In fact, the terms, when thus employed, overlap one another. Oblations may be of various kinds; and alms, when offered to God, become oblations. One great advantage of the collective phrase, "alms *and* oblations" is that it includes all things that may be fitly collected at the offertory, whether according to strict definition they be "alms *or* oblations."