

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance. Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue. We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts. Back numbers will be sent only on application. Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

Church Observer.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—Bill of Rights, 1688. MONTREAL, 22ND OCTOBER, 1868.

SARUM RULE.

An article which appeared in a recent number of the Church Observer on Sarum use, has proved, it seems, distasteful to the Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Brome Woods, "where"—to quote the exact words of the Church Advocate, and the correct description as supplied by himself, of what occurred at a recent important service in that church—"the altar was vested in white according to Sarum rule." We are not surprised that we have failed to please men whose tastes manifest themselves in the introduction of such novelties into the simple and beautiful services prescribed in our prayer book for the Reformed Protestant Church of England. We print the Rev. Incumbent's letter in another column, and shall here deal with its arguments and objections *seriatim*.

Mr. Fyles starts with an objection to the name "ritualist." The prayer book names and prescribes rites; every priest of the church is, of necessity, a ritualist, &c. Mr. Fyles is well aware that this is a mere cavilling about a name which has been employed for years in English periodical literature to express a party zealous for the revival of obsolete rites and ceremonies in the church. It is no word of our coining, but adopted and used by men of his own party. We have lying on our table a pamphlet forwarded to us by post, entitled "Ritualists and Evangelicalism," printed by John Lovell, Montreal, in which the author contrasts the devout and becoming ceremonial &c., of the "ritualists," with "the efforts of the Evangelicals to lower the dignity of the sacraments." We do not object to the term Evangelical, even though it be applied in contempt. We believe the prayer book, with its included articles, to be thoroughly Evangelical; and, with all its other articles, we heartily and unreservedly accept the twentieth Article, which says: "The church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies," but adds thereto the all-important qualification, "it is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's written word."

Quoting from memory, we spoke of the "altar" of the church at Brome Woods being "vested according to Sarum use;" we shall discuss the question in the exact terms supplied by Mr. Fyles immediately. Meanwhile we note, in passing, his very becoming and gentlemanly comment, that by this form of reference our remarks were "founded on falsehood." Having thus acquitted himself as a clergyman and a gentleman, he then proceeds to make this disingenuous—or, if we were to follow the example he sets us, we should say "false"—quotation from our article: "It has been said by a recent writer, '... with all its imperfections, the English prayer book is a noble work.' Taken in its context, no reader could possibly believe that this was the point we referred to. We then said:—

"We cannot believe that the plain, honest sense of Protestant, and, above all, Christian England, is to be deceived and betrayed by the substitution of superstitious rites, gaudy dresses and elaborate ceremonial for the beautiful, becoming simplicity of the reformed worship as set forth in our prayer book. It has been well said by a recent writer:—'So long as the service of God is a reasonable offering, it will be hard to persuade the great body of English Protestants that return to the rites and notions embodied in the Sarum Missal is desirable. The nation has progressed so far within the last eight hundred years that it can never go back to medieval opinions either in politics or religion; and an ecclesiastical machinery, minute as the Levitical one, will not be sanctioned by men trained to think in the school of St. Paul's writing. With all its imperfections, the English prayer book is a noble work beside every old Latin missal.'"

Our own remarks spoke solely of "the beautiful, becoming simplicity of the reformed worship as set forth in our prayer book." Our quotation showed how marvellous was the contrast it presented, in the estimation of others, to the Sarum or any other Romish missal. We should not be surprised at some designing Jesuit attempting so to misrepresent our plain meaning; we are surprised and pained to find a clergyman of our own church doing so.

Let us now consider the significance of the Brome Woods proceedings, taking the statement of them as furnished by the In-

cumbent himself: "The altar was vested in white according to Sarum rule."

1. We object to the word altar as alike unscriptural and directly contrary to the Book of Common Prayer. "We have an altar," says St. Paul, "whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle;" and they who in our own day are aiming at a revival of the old Romish altar, of wood or stone, with all its unscriptural and much of its anti-scriptural ceremonial, are indeed endangering, if not forfeiting, their right to that altar, with its one glorious and perfect sacrifice, once for all offered for us, by their serving "the tabernacle." The prayer book is very explicit in its rejection of the word altar, which is the invariable term in the Sarum missal; and substituting for it the word "table," or when in use, "the Lord's table." It is no fixed altar, but a wooden table, which is to "stand in the body of the church or in the chancel, where morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said;" and in full accordance with this, our Provincial Synod at its late meeting, unanimously rejected the word "altar" in dealing with the question of so-called "altar lights," and forbade the use of "lights on the Lord's table."

2. We object to the "vesting of altars" or of Communion tables, according to Sarum or any other "rule." By "vesting," as Mr. Fyles very well knows, is meant the revival of that symbolical ceremonial of the Romish church, whereby each saint's day and holiday has its appropriate colour of white, red, blue, purple, &c. The rule of the prayer book is explicit: "The table at the Communion time, having a fair white linen cloth upon it." This is the only cover authorized. Custom has sanctioned the covering of the table, pulpit and reading desk with some decent cloth, to which no one objects. But it is a quibble about words to call this vesting. The Sarum rule of vesting prescribes something of a very different kind, suitable to a church with its daily offering of the Mass, so pointedly condemned in the rubric at the end of the Communion office, as well as in the Articles—suitable to a church that has its prayers to the Virgin, to the saints, to many mediators; and not, as in our more scriptural liturgy, to the one mediator between God and man; or, as our fifteenth Article expresses it—"the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of Himself once made should take away the sins of the world." We therefore object to the "vesting of altars," just as much as if it had happened to be one on which the Sarum rule—which the Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Brome Woods, follows—prescribes blue, purple, or any other symbolical colour. The changing of the cover of the communion table, according to the calendar, with diverse colours adapted to different days, is not only unauthorized by the "Book of Common Prayer," but directly contrary to its rubrics and preface.

3. We object to vesting "according to Sarum rule," which is just another name for Popish rule. The prayer book is most explicit on this point: "The following Salisbury (i. e. Sarum) use," as well as various other anti-reformation uses, is expressly forbidden in the preface. That portion of the preface devoted to the subject of ceremonies is also most clear. Certain ceremonies having "at length turned to vanity and superstition," and others having been from the first unprofitable and tending to obscure the glory of God, have been "cut away, and clean rejected." Some are retained, but "they be neither dark nor dumb ceremonies, but are so set forth that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve." But the preface adds an infallible guide on the whole subject of ceremonial gestures, postures, symbolic candles, or any of those other matters on which, according to the Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Brome Woods, "in the absence of a prayer book rule, we have to look elsewhere for guidance." If the Rev. Incumbent "in the absence of prayer book rule" on any question of clerical or Christian duty, turns to the Bible, he will be acting in obedience to the requirements in the twentieth article of his prayer book. Here, however, it is not necessary; for the preface "of ceremonies" says: "Christ's gospel is not a ceremonial law, as much of Moses' law was; but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure of shadows, but in the freedom of the spirit; being content only with those ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification whereby he might be edified."

We will only add, once more, that our "Book of Common Prayer" sets forth a form of worship, rites and ceremonies, beautiful in their becoming simplicity for a Reformed Protestant Evangelical Church such as ours is; and, as such, it is a noble work beside every old Latin missal.

RIGHTS OF CORRESPONDENTS.

We insert in another column a letter from the Rev. T. W. Fyles, Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Brome Woods. But in doing so, it must not be supposed that we are admitting the right of such a correspondent

to any space in our columns. On the contrary, a writer who so entirely forgets what is due to himself as a clergyman and a gentleman, as to write in the style he does, has forfeited every claim on our courtesy. The letter speaks for itself, with its choice phrases: "founded on falsehood," "the sneer on your editorial countenance," "grandiloquent piece of clap-trap," &c. We have printed it without abbreviation, in order to shew forth the fallacies and errors which it defends; but it is not without reluctance that we give the publicity of our columns to a letter from a clergyman of the Church of England in Canada, defending such erroneous views by such feeble and inconsequential arguments, and in a style so little to be expected from an educated gentleman.

On the general subject of correspondence, we beg to state that, as the Church Observer is avowedly the organ of those who maintain Evangelical and Protestant opinions in the church, we are not prepared to throw open its columns to those who avowedly aim at controverting and overthrowing such opinions. Ritualists, Anglican Catholics, Tractarians, or by whatever other name those who differ from us call themselves or are called by others, have their own organs, on which we do not intrude. We do not expect our articles to be acceptable to them. We believe their revival of Sarum rule, their advocacy of eucharistic vestments, and the teachings of which these are but the outward symbols, are dangerous and destructive to the Church of England and to the pure scriptural faith inherited by us from the martyrs and confessors of the Reformation. We should be unfaithful to our duty, therefore, if we failed to write boldly and undisguisedly against them. But if it be supposed, as some seem to do, that every time such an article proves distasteful to some sensitive ritualist, he has a right to claim the insertion, even of a courteous and candid maintenance of his opinions, to say nothing of the claim to assail us in discourteous and abusive language, we beg to say, once for all, that we acknowledge no such right. We shall insert what we think calculated to promote the great object we have in view—that of maintaining pure evangelical doctrine and worship within our beloved church. If our opinions are unpalatable, those who differ from us must find organs of their own for the publication of their views.

... we shall always be ready to make. It is inevitable in the most carefully conducted paper, that errors will occur. Correspondents, on whose accuracy we think we can depend, will at times make incorrect or exaggerated statements; articles furnished by the most reliable writers may be found to contain errors. We claim no editorial infallibility; and if at any time, with all our care, statements or opinions obtain insertion in our columns, involving error, we shall always be prompt to correct them, or give space to any temperate and courteous reply.

THE "MEMORIAL" MEETING.

On Thursday last, a large and influential meeting for the purpose of considering the propriety of erecting a memorial to the late Bishop Fulford, was held in the rooms of the Diocesan Synod in this city. George Moffatt, Esq., was called to the chair, and F. McKenzie, Esq., acted as secretary. Considerable discussion arose as to what form the memorial should take, when a motion was made by S. Bethune, Esq., seconded by Dr. Smallwood,

"That this meeting, sensible of the loss sustained by the Diocese of Montreal and the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada, in the death of the late Francis Fulford, D. D., Lord Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan, cordially approve and respectfully urge the erection of some suitable monument to the lamented Prelate."

On motion, a committee was appointed to take up subscriptions in the city, for a memorial; and again a lively discussion revived, some being in favour of one thing and some of another. Finally a motion was put by Rev. Canon Loosmore, seconded by Rev. Dr. Balch—

"That a Resolved, with a suitable inscription, in the chancel of the Cathedral in this city, would be the most appropriate memorial to the late Metropolitan."

Finding that this motion was not received unanimously, it was moved by Mr. S. Bethune, seconded by Mr. C. Geddes,—

"That the form of the memorial be not now determined upon, but be left to the decision of a majority of the subscribers present at a meeting to be specially called for that purpose after the subscription lists are closed."

On motion, it was then resolved—

"That the clergy of this Diocese be requested to co-operate with this Committee in continuing the collections which it is understood they have already instituted in their respective parishes and missions."

A vote of thanks having been given to the Chairman, the meeting adjourned.

Mr. TORRINGTON IN BOSTON.—The Boston Saturday Evening Gazette says:—"Among the many really fine performers on the organ who have from distant places made a pilgrimage to the Mecca of organists, appeared on Wednesday last, Mr. F. H. Torrington, who displayed skill, musicianship, and all the combinative faculties sufficient for the mastery of that noble instrument. We congratulate Mr. Torrington upon his highly successful debut before a Boston audience, and hope it will be the prelude to many more performances before the lovers of classic organ music."

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

SARUM USE OR SARUM RULE.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

SIR,—In your issue of the 10th of September, I find that you published my name in connection with what you were pleased to term, "a striking instance of ritualistic development." I thank you. The title of our prayer book is, "The Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the church according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland." Every priest of the United Church of England and Ireland, therefore, of necessity, a ritualist; and the term ritualist is an honourable one. I again thank you for having helped to make it known that this honourable title may be applied to me. I should have hesitated to thank you if I had thought that your remarks were penned in good will to me; for it is commonly reported that the Church Observer has done more to damage the reputation and weaken the influence of its friends, than any other lobby they have taken in hand. But indications were not wanting that your information concerning me was given in no friendly spirit. You withheld from your readers those portions of the original account which told of good accomplished, and difficulties overcome, and gave them such as you seemed to think would furnish food for alarmists, and excite the prejudices of the ill-informed. You included, moreover, with particulars furnished by me, a very great deal of matter that I did not supply. I might have complained that your conduct was disingenuous, but I have preferred to thank you for the service which you ungraciously rendered. In your 34th number, in an article headed "SARUM USE," you allude to the recent consecration of a church in the Diocese of Montreal, where, according to the narrative of the Church Advocate, the "altar was vested according to Sarum use." You then give quotations from the "Sarum missal," interlarding them with comments, and adding: "The specimens we have given will show how dangerous are the lengths which some extreme men have already ventured in Canada, where Sarum use has already been introduced in our midst." Your remarks are very remarkable. Unhappily for your reputation, they are founded upon a falsehood. The Church Advocate did not say "the altar was vested according to Sarum use," but "the altar was vested in white according to Sarum rule."

Among your observations is this:—"It has been well said by a recent writer:—'... with all its imperfections, the English prayer book is a noble work.' I can hardly lay myself open, then, to a charge of heterodoxy from you, if I allow that the English prayer book has imperfections. Let us call it an imperfect thing that it does not supply a rule for the application of colour in the decoration of churches. Colour—decoration of churches!—I may see the sneer on your editorial countenance. Nevertheless there are proprieties in the application of colour. I should not shock your sense of propriety if I said that the vestments of four-and-twenty candles and cloths of incense, the kind of dumb show followed, in which the ringing of a little bell, as in Roman Catholic churches, announces the elevation of the Host and, at length, having gone through the performance to the admiration of the spectators, "the long file of acolytes, ministers, choir, and clergy retire into the sacristy, in solemn and processional order, while the congregation, as they depart, are supplied, in the most approved Catholic fashion, with holy water at the door."

What next? and next? There is one question we cannot refrain from asking very distinctly. Has the Bishop nothing to say to such practices? Is it not his business to take notice of such infractions of the rubric. He may not be able to prevent Mr. Purchas from dressing himself in barbaric gilt and tawdry embroidery, but he can, compel him to read the Ten Commandments, and to see that the prayers are all alike read by ordained ministers. A clergyman the other day preached at Brighton in a Baptist Church. Only a very few days elapsed before the Bishop served him with an inhibition. Now, the question is more and more loudly asked why a similar vigour cannot be shown in expressing disapprobation of Ritualistic outrages. If the Bishops cannot do everything that might be wished, there is all the more reason they should do what they can. Most of them acknowledge that Ritualism has become offensive, dangerous and mischievous, but we look in vain for that firm repression which is exerted against other offenders. There is one Bishop, for example, who publicly declares that he will suspend any clergyman who administers the Holy Communion in the evening, though this is a practice common in many other dioceses, perfectly conformable to the institution and extremely convenient to the poor and middle classes. Yet the same Bishop is never without an excuse for the misguided men who are betrayed into Ritualistic excesses, and offers anything but discouragement to clergymen who transform the Communion into a Sacrifice, and inculcate a doctrine which the simple cannot distinguish from Transubstantiation. If we saw the Bishops making a resolute fight against this superstitious and dishonest nonsense, we should feel some confidence in the issue, we should know that the general body of the institution was sound, and we should believe that the disease of the moment would be thrown off. Instead of this we behold them apparently shrinking from an open contest, and displaying much greater reluctance to deal firmly with the Ritualists than to try the patience of English Churchmen.

This connivance has, however, now been practised much too long, and the time is at hand when, if the Bishops will do nothing effectual, the public will take the matter into their own hands and deal with it very promptly. Whatever may be the precise legal limits to lighted candles and gay dresses, there is a shadow of doubt with respect to the general character of Ritualism, nor any excuse for extending the slightest tenderness towards the movement. Let the reader simply observe the peculiar features as seen in the flexions and confusions, crossings and of banners and crosses and processions, and in the multiplication of obsolete ceremonies. In a word, the movement bears on its face the character of a revival of old superstitions.

The Rev. Arthur Baker, vicar of Addington, Bucks, England, who elicited from Mr. Disraeli, some time since, an explanation of his views on ritualism, is just dead. He died, the Church News tells us, a devout Catholic, surrounded by his relations, and fortified with all the sacraments of the church.

Your obedient servant, T. R. J. Montreal, Oct. 22, 1868.

More Ritualism in England

A fresh Ritualistic extravaganza is reported from Brighton. The occasion was again a harvest festival, and the proceedings, though less ridiculous than those of Haydock, were similarly wild. The chapel seems to have been converted into a Floral Hall very pretty, and as unlike a church as possible. A procession formed one of the principal parts of the "function," but, as there were no fields it had to be content with displaying itself in its hop-gardens and orchards into which the church was converted. Here, however, were to be seen in all their glory the little boys in scarlet tunics under white surplices, and the singing men with blue hoods, and the acolytes with lighted candles, the thurifer, the cross-bearer, the "lectors," the "cantors," the deacon, sub-deacon, and "Officiating Priest." With cross and banner, and amid the fumes of incense, they paraded the aisles, singing, no doubt to good music, a most meaningless and clumsy hymn. The service was not only adorned with the usual "post-ros and impostures," but almost seems to betray a set design to flout the Prayer-book and insult the State. Except from mere wantonness, one does not see the purpose of pronouncing the Absolution sitting instead of standing, and in omitting the reading of the Commandments. But the disloyalty would be outrageous, if it were not silly, when the "Officiating Priest" expresses his indifference to the "State Prayer" of the Liturgy by deliberately turning his back on them, leaving them to be read by an unordained member of the choir, while he retires to his sacristy, and an acolyte, or two, read the "Gloria" for the congregation. The service consisted of four-and-twenty candles and cloths of incense, the sermon is preached, and speedily dismissed; a kind of dumb show follows, in which the ringing of a little bell, as in Roman Catholic churches, announces the elevation of the Host and, at length, having gone through the performance to the admiration of the spectators, "the long file of acolytes, ministers, choir, and clergy retire into the sacristy, in solemn and processional order, while the congregation, as they depart, are supplied, in the most approved Catholic fashion, with holy water at the door."

What next? and next? There is one question we cannot refrain from asking very distinctly. Has the Bishop nothing to say to such practices? Is it not his business to take notice of such infractions of the rubric. He may not be able to prevent Mr. Purchas from dressing himself in barbaric gilt and tawdry embroidery, but he can, compel him to read the Ten Commandments, and to see that the prayers are all alike read by ordained ministers. A clergyman the other day preached at Brighton in a Baptist Church. Only a very few days elapsed before the Bishop served him with an inhibition. Now, the question is more and more loudly asked why a similar vigour cannot be shown in expressing disapprobation of Ritualistic outrages. If the Bishops cannot do everything that might be wished, there is all the more reason they should do what they can. Most of them acknowledge that Ritualism has become offensive, dangerous and mischievous, but we look in vain for that firm repression which is exerted against other offenders. There is one Bishop, for example, who publicly declares that he will suspend any clergyman who administers the Holy Communion in the evening, though this is a practice common in many other dioceses, perfectly conformable to the institution and extremely convenient to the poor and middle classes. Yet the same Bishop is never without an excuse for the misguided men who are betrayed into Ritualistic excesses, and offers anything but discouragement to clergymen who transform the Communion into a Sacrifice, and inculcate a doctrine which the simple cannot distinguish from Transubstantiation. If we saw the Bishops making a resolute fight against this superstitious and dishonest nonsense, we should feel some confidence in the issue, we should know that the general body of the institution was sound, and we should believe that the disease of the moment would be thrown off. Instead of this we behold them apparently shrinking from an open contest, and displaying much greater reluctance to deal firmly with the Ritualists than to try the patience of English Churchmen.

This connivance has, however, now been practised much too long, and the time is at hand when, if the Bishops will do nothing effectual, the public will take the matter into their own hands and deal with it very promptly. Whatever may be the precise legal limits to lighted candles and gay dresses, there is a shadow of doubt with respect to the general character of Ritualism, nor any excuse for extending the slightest tenderness towards the movement. Let the reader simply observe the peculiar features as seen in the flexions and confusions, crossings and of banners and crosses and processions, and in the multiplication of obsolete ceremonies. In a word, the movement bears on its face the character of a revival of old superstitions.

The Rev. Arthur Baker, vicar of Addington, Bucks, England, who elicited from Mr. Disraeli, some time since, an explanation of his views on ritualism, is just dead. He died, the Church News tells us, a devout Catholic, surrounded by his relations, and fortified with all the sacraments of the church.

MEMORIAL TO LATE BISHOP FULFORD.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

SIR,—I am pleased to notice the remarks on the subject of the memorial to the late Metropolitan, over the signatures of several writers in the secular press of late, especially as they suggest a scheme that has occupied my mind for some time past. One writer proposes making the memorial an open school for all Protestants, where they might receive a thorough education; but I would go still further, and say that the subscription lists should be open to all Protestants and that a suitable building should be erected, to be called by an appropriate name, for the purposes referred to; let it be