

II.

A "RITUALIST'S" REPLY.

To the Editor: I am indebted to you for the privilege of replying in the St. George's Church PARISH VISITOR to the article which appeared recently under the above heading as a supplement to the February number of your magazine, and I shall endeavor to do so if possible within the limited space which you have allotted to me.

I should like to say at the outset that when High Churchmen use the word "Mass" they mean by it simply the service for the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer. The most ultra Ritualist means nothing more than this, and ignorance of that fact no doubt accounts largely for the suspicion and prejudice which the use of the word excites in the minds of some of our people. The name Mass, which has the advantages of being short, expressive and *English*, has been surrendered for years (like other good things—the title "Catholic" for instance) to the Romanists, but this has been done, not by authority, but by private usage, and we are endeavoring in the same way to restore it to its proper place in the phraseology of our church. There is nothing in it which necessarily implies either "medievalism" or Romanism, or which should render it "repulsive." It is found in Christian writings from an early date; it was used in England, not, be it remembered, to denote the Roman rite, but the Eucharistic service of