



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Title	Westminster directory, its origin and significance
Author	McNally, Frederick Walker
Qualification	PhD
Year	1958

Thesis scanned from best copy available: may contain faint or blurred text, and/or cropped or missing pages.

Digitisation notes:

- Page numbers 188 & 288 are missing from original
- Page number 320 is used twice

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Frederick Walker McNally.
 Degree Doctor of Philosophy Date _____
 Title of Thesis The Westminster Directory, Its Origin and Significance.

The Directory for the Public Worship of God, composed in 1644-45 by the English Parliamentary commission known as the Westminster Assembly of Divines, to be the standard of liturgical uniformity for the national churches of England and Scotland, was the product of a complex of political factors, traditional worship usages, and a rigid theological system.

It was the liturgical manifesto of the revolutionary party in the political-ecclesiastical eruption which took place in both kingdoms during the reign of Charles I. The worship principles evolved by the revolutionaries, while informed positively by Calvinistic practice and teaching, were negatively influenced by the "Catholic" principles represented by the autocratic forces against which they were in revolt. The Directory thus partook of the inevitable excesses of a revolutionary ideology.

The influence had upon the Directory by the book's liturgical predecessors in the two nations and by the usages of the two churches are probably greater than was realized by its composers who presumed to be working from first principles with no regard for traditions. A careful textual study reveals that both the Genevan-Scottish Book of Common Order and the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, in differing ways, helped determine the structure and content of this service book, as did the unwritten traditions of English Puritanism and, more especially, of Scottish Presbyterianism. In the main, the influence of the Genevan-Scottish order can be seen in the general approach to the public worship taken in the Directory and in its theological content. And the influence of the Prayer Book is discernible in certain structural details. But literal dependence on either book is very limited.

A theological position which maintained the verbal infallibility and exclusive authority of the Bible and the total depravity of man and his tradition, was the third major contributing factor in the shaping of the Directory. This largely accounts for the Word-centred nature and penitential character of its services and for its express repudiation of the "traditions of men".

The influence of the Directory upon subsequent worship usages is negligible; the book failed to gain acceptance in England, and while it had formal sanction in Scotland, was little used over the following two centuries in which directorial authority in worship was regarded with indifference or hostility. However, a movement emerged in the Scottish Church in the mid-nineteenth century which, in seeking recovery and enrichment of the Reformed liturgical tradition, looked to the Directory and the old Book of Common Order as the repositories of Reformed principles and usages of worship. Consequently, the influence of the Directory can be traced in the numerous official and semi-official service books which have been produced by the Scottish Presbyterian Churches over the past century.

The Directory, while unsuitable for liturgical use in the modern Reformed Church, remains a valuable repository of the major historical principles of Reformed worship.



**THE WESTMINSTER DIRECTORY,
ITS ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE**

by

Frederick Walker McNally

B.A., B.D.

Being a thesis submitted to the Faculty
of Divinity in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy, the University of Edinburgh.

1958.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge his gratitude to the following persons for their contribution to the preparation of this thesis: the librarians and assistants of the New College (Edinburgh) Library, the Scottish National Library, the General Assembly Library of the Church of Scotland, and the Reading and Manuscript Rooms of the British Museum, for their assistance and courtesy; the Reverend Principal J.H.S. Burleigh and the Reverend Doctor J.A. Lamb, the writer's academic supervisors for their corrections, suggestions and encouragement; Mr. R.E. Maddison of Heston, Middlesex, for guidance to sources of information on one specific problem; the Reverend and Mrs. J.G. Gammie for suggestions and proof reading; and Mrs. Patricia Brown, the typist.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	The Rationale, Nature and Scope of this Investigation	1
II	The Historical Setting of the Directory	36
III	The Holy Scriptures: Read, Preached and Sung	104
IV	Prayers for Public Worship	177
V	The Sacrament of Baptism	227
VI	The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper	265
VII	Occasional Services	332
VIII	Days, Places & Congregational Behaviour	369
IX	Summary and Evaluation	406
	Appendix A	437
	Appendix B	441
	Bibliography	444

ABBREVIATIONS

Acts - Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

BCO - Book of Common Order

BCP - Book of Common Prayer

Bks. Disc. - Calderwood (ed.) The First and Second Books of Discipline

B.U.K. - Peterkin (ed.) The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland

Commons Journals - The Journals of the House of Commons

DFPW - Directory and Forms for Public Worship

FP - Forme of Prayers

Journal of Proceedings - The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines

Lee'57 - Prayers for Public Worship (by Dr. Lee)

Lee'58 - Prayers for Social and Public Worship (by Dr. Lee)

Lee'63 - A Presbyterian Prayer-Book and Psalm Book (by Dr. Lee)

Lee'64 - The Order of Public Worship (by Dr. Lee)

Lords Journals - The Journals of the House of Lords

MIDD - Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers, "Middleburgh edition"

Minutes - Mitchell and Struthers, Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Divines

NDPW - A New Directory for the Public Worship of God

Notes - Gillespie, Notes of the Debates and Proceedings of the Westminster Divines

PFS - Presbyterian Forms of Service

PS&F - Prayers for Social and Family Worship

Rec. Kirk. - Peterkin (ed.) Records of the Kirk of Scotland

SPS - A Supply of Prayer for the Ships of this Kingdom

WALD - Booke of the Forme of Common Prayer, "Waldgrave edition"

CHAPTER I

The Rationale, Nature and Scope of this Investigation.

1. The Rationale

(a) A Unique State Liturgy.

The official publication in London in March 1644-5 of A Directory for the Publique Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland was a significant event in western liturgical history (1). It signalled the triumphal climax of a long struggle on the part of large sections of the English and Scottish churches for the establishment of what they conceived to be a mode of worship compatible with the Word of God as against one which was, to them, burdensome at best, and repugnant to Scripture at worst. And it was the first positive achievement in the endeavour to replace the overthrown crown-supported Episcopacy with democratic Presbytery, being thus a landmark in

1. The first Scottish edition was published in Edinburgh later the same year entitled "A Directory for the Publike Worship of God throughout the Three Kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland. With an Act of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, for establishing and observing this present Directory, together with an Act of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland approving and establishing the same."
See Liturgical Bibliography.

the wider ecclesiastical-political struggle. For these reasons alone, its publication was a noteworthy occurrence.

And from quite another perspective -- that from which, in this work, we are particularly concerned to view the Directory -- its appearance and authorization was unique. However much the concept of a "directory" for worship might be taken for granted among modern Protestant churchmen throughout the English-speaking world, the publication of this first authorized Directory was an innovation in liturgical history. It is probably true that during the years preceding its appearance, there were in both nations Christian congregations whose worship was not unlike that which it prescribes. But with the Directory, this very "unliturgical" worship was given ecclesiastical and state sanction, and established as the standard for nation-wide uniformity. It was composed by a commission of the English Parliament, an assembly representative of a large body of the English Church, in consultation with delegates from the Scottish Church. It was devised as the official and exclusive liturgical authority for the churches of the three British kingdoms, and in two was legally established as such.

There was nothing epoch-making in the imposition of a state liturgy. But that any state should impose this kind of liturgy -- if, indeed, the Directory qualifies as a liturgy -- was unprecedented. Both of the Directory's liturgical predecessors were established by government to the exclusion of all other (1). But while the Book of Common Order of the Scottish Church bore something of the character of a directory, it was, nevertheless, a book of public prayers. This, the Directory was not. And the nature of the Book of Common Prayer, its English predecessor, was even more remote from that of the Directory.

C.W. Baird has classified Protestant liturgical usages into four fairly distinguishable groups (2). His categories may conveniently be applied here for the purpose of seeing the Directory in the context of dominant Protestant worship patterns, for they embrace a wide variety of practice from "highest" to "lowest" (3). There is at the high extreme

1. The Book of Common Order never received explicit authorization by the Scots Estates. It was, however, established in 1562 by the General Assembly of the state Church and this was all the authority it needed.

2. Eutaxia or the Presbyterian Liturgies, p.8-10.

3. "High" and "low", commonly accepted descriptive terms, are used here for convenience only. No value judgment is necessarily implied in their application.

what Baird calls the "Imposed Ritual". This is a service book prescribed by church or state or both for the use of minister and people alike. It is "responsive" in character, that is, it involves the congregation, as well as the clergyman, in the ritual and ceremonial action. A minimum of local deviation is allowed. The Lutheran and Anglican liturgies are representative of this class.

Secondly, there is what Baird terms the "Discretionary" liturgy. This, like the first, is a printed form of service, but for the minister's use only, and is therefore not a responsive service. Much of it is optional. While it is an authorized liturgy, it is intended (says Baird) for the minister's guidance as to the matter and manner of worship, permitting individual and local variations at the minister's discretion. Baird cites the liturgies of the Reformed churches on the continent and the sixteenth century Scottish order as belonging to this group.

The author designates his third type as "Rubrical". In this instance, too, a service book is authorized, but it is a book of "directions without examples". It indicates the subjects of prayer but not in the form of prayer and affords the minister considerable latitude in the

composition of the service. He places the 1645 Directory in this category.

The fourth mode, that which stands at the opposite extreme to the Imposed Ritual, or occupies the lowest position, is that circumstance in which no liturgy whatever is established and no service book used. In this instance, "Entire Freedom" (to use Baird's designation) is permitted the local congregation or the individual minister, as to both the form and the content of public worship. This, according to Baird, describes the practice of the seventeenth century Puritan Independents of England and, it might be added, their progeny until the twentieth.

This four-fold classification is over-simple. Compromises of two or more of these types are conceivable. But it serves adequately in a discussion of the broad worship traditions of Protestantism, as they concern us in this introduction.

It will be observed that the Directory for the Public Worship of God falls into the third position "down" in this liturgical scale. It permits the maximum freedom compatible with an authorized service book. Permitting any more freedom than this would preclude entirely the

possibility of such a book's existence, especially one whose avowed intent was to ensure a measure of uniformity in the worship of three national churches. Never before had a state authorized a service book which was so low in liturgical character as this. The Directory stands at the cross-roads of an established liturgy and no liturgy at all, and it may be, and has been, described as either.(1). It was, in fact, a compromise.

(b) A Document of Compromise

In the parliamentary commission, commonly known as the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the body which devised the book, there were three discernible groups which more or less represented respectively the "Imposed Ritual" and the "Discretionary" traditions and the relatively new "Entire Freedom" concept. There were no "high Anglicans" in the Assembly, they, being royalists, abstained from a council which had not the king's

1. Henry Hammond, in A View of the New Directory, 1645, denied its liturgical status, claiming its design was the "abolishing both of (the Prayer Book) and all other liturgy". (Works, I., p. 382). G.W. Sprott refers to "the semi-liturgical Westminster Directory". (The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland, 1863, p.4). And Robert Lee insisted that "it was, in fact, a liturgy". (Story, R.H., The Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., I, 1870, p. 349).

authorization. But conservative Puritans there were, who, for one reason or another, would have favoured a service book resembling more the old English liturgy than did the Directory. A.F. Mitchell, an authority on the Westminster Assembly, and far from Anglican in bias, observes that

even inside the Puritan circle, there were not a few who would have preferred to amend rather than to 'lay aside the former liturgy,' and many more of the wisest and best, who, though their own leanings may have been in favour of a more thorough reform, knew how hard it would be to persuade a large part of the nation and of the ministry to accept it, and felt how greatly it would add to the difficulty of the task of preserving unbroken the religious unity of the nation, to proscribe that to which so many were attached by hallowed associations and tender memories. (1)

This is further attested by the events which followed on the Restoration when several of the prominent figures of the Assembly participated in the Savoy Conference (2) as representatives of the Puritan wing of the Church of England. At this meeting the Puritan group submitted a lengthy list of proposed amendments to the Prayer Book indicating, thereby, their willingness to use that liturgy as amended; and, further, proffered

1. The Westminster Assembly, Its History & Standards, p. 237.

2. Among them, Tuckney, Calamy, Spurstow, Wallis, Case, Reynolds, Newcomen, and Lightfoot.

"Baxter's Liturgy" (1), a compromise order between the Book of Common Prayer and the Directory. Even allowing for a radically changed situation when now at Savoy the opponents with whom they must compromise were high Anglicans rather than, as, at Westminster, radical Independents, this is an interesting indication of their attitude to the Prayer Book. However, the records of the Westminster Assembly, it must be said, provide little explicit evidence of what might be called "a prayer book party" (2); they indicate only the existence of a conservative mind.

A more clearly defined group in the Assembly was the handful of Independents -- the twelve "dissenting brethren". As would be expected, the influence of this faction (an influence out of all proportion to its numbers) was diametrically opposed

1. Otherwise known as the Savoy Liturgy. Hall, P., Reliquiae Liturgicae, 1847, IV. See Liturgical Bibliography.

2. Of the proposed superaddition to the Assembly of one John Durie, Robert Baillie warns, "... if he should come to us with the least tincture of Episcopacie, or liturgick learning, he would not be welcome to any I know". (Letters and Journals, II, p.166). And in another place he remarks, there is, "no man here to speak a word either for bishops, or liturgie, or any ceremonie". (Ibid, p.192). On the other hand Lightfoot reports that in the Assembly's debate on the Preface to the Directory, he himself maintained that it would be "dangerous to hint anything against a set form of prayer: and this held us a very long strong debate". His point was sustained in the voting. (Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, Jan.1, 1643 to Dec.1, 1644. p.323).

to that of the above mentioned wing. Horton Davies, in his Worship of the English Puritans, argues that the English Presbyterians -- at least down to the time of Savoy -- were, on the whole, in favour of liturgical worship in the Reformed tradition and that, therefore, their acquiescence at Westminster in a mere directory is proof of the persuasive power of the Independents.

The association of Cartwright and other Presbyterian leaders with the Waldgrave (1584/5) and Middleburgh (1586, 1587, 1602) liturgies shows conclusively the preference of the moderate Puritans for a liturgical, rather than a charismatic, type of worship. This in itself, while not excluding, but severely restricting free prayers, would tend to suggest that the Parliamentary Directory of 1644 was a compromise urged on the Presbyterians by the Independents. The natural development of English Presbyterianism was towards a prescribed form of prayers, with alternatives and occasional opportunity for extemporary prayers. That the next prayer-book issued by the Presbyterians (the Directory) was a manual rather than a liturgy is conclusive proof that they were persuaded by the Independents ... to move in the direction of unprescribed prayer. (1)

1. pp. 126-7. Among the concessions won by the Independents from the English and Scottish Presbyterians, according to Davies: the opening prayer of approach, the permission to expound the scripture (i.e. to "lecture"), the lengthy list of petitions in the main prayer, the Lord's Prayer merely recommended and not prescribed, and the exclusion of the creed from Baptism. (Ibid, pp.130-5) One might also credit them (along with certain others) with the bias of the Preface).

This is perhaps stated too strongly; yet there can be little doubt but that this singularly militant group was highly influential in the proceedings of the Assembly and that their influence on the Assembly's service book was in the direction of their own free mode of worship.(1).

The third discernible group was even smaller. This was the delegation - six in number (actually sitting at any one time) - from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. The four clerical members of this commission (2), all of whom sat on the nine-man sub-committee originally responsible for drafting the Directory, wielded an influence disproportionate to their numbers (but roughly in proportion to the value of the Scottish army to the Parliamentary cause in the English civil war). In the shaping of the Directory they could be said to have aligned themselves with neither of

L. Baillie reports that at the first meeting of the sub-committee for the Directory, leading Independent Thomas Goodwin "assayed to turn all upside down, to reason against all directories, and our very first grounds..." (Letters & Journals, II p.123). Again, at the very climax of the work, in the Assembly's debate on the Preface, "the Independents brought us to so doubtful a disputation, that we were in a very great fear...that their opposition to the whole Directorie should be as great as to the (Church) Government...." (Ibid, p. 242).

2. Alexander Henderson, Robert Baillie, Samuel Rutherford, and George Gillespie.

the above mentioned parties. With the Independents, two of them, at least, favoured free prayer. (1). But their sharpest controversies were with the Independents on such crucial matters as the use of the creed in Baptism (2), the administration of the Lord's Supper (3), sermons at funerals (4), and a marriage service (5). Dr. Thomas Leishman (6) contends that the four clerical commissioners from Scotland were themselves divided, Henderson and Baillie being relatively conservative, Gillespie and Rutherford having more sympathy with the radical Puritans. In so far as this was true, the Scots at Westminster reflected the confused situation at home where the controversy raged between conservatives

1. Rutherford wrote in a letter, "Anent read prayers I could never see precept, promise, or practice for them in God's word. Our Church never allowed them (sic)... The Word of God maketh reading and praying two different worships. In reading God speaketh to us, and in praying we speak to God... I think it were well if they were out of the service of God. The saints never used them, and God never commended them, and a promise to hear any prayers except the pouring out of the soul to God we can never read". Quoted by Edgar, in Old Church Life in Scotland, I., p.83.
2. They favoured it. Baillie, op. cit., p.258; Lightfoot, op. cit., pp.315-6.
3. Particularly with respect preparation, fancying, and the manner of participation. Baillie, op. cit., pp.195,204; Lightfoot, op. cit., p.289.
4. Scots opposed to them, most English in favour. Baillie, op. cit., p. 245; Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 340.
5. Scots favoured one. Baillie, op. cit., p.243.
6. In his annotated edition of the Directory in the Church Service Society series, 1901, p.xv.

who held at least a measure of respect for the old Knoxian order, and the west country radicals who, in matters of worship though not of Church government, found kindred spirits in the English left wing Puritans. Baird makes much of the liturgical "sacrifice" suffered by the Church of Scotland at Westminster in the cause of union and harmony with the English Church (1). But the temper of the Church was such that the new Directory would be a burden to few. That there was dissatisfaction with the Book of Common Order is evident in that after 1638 the General Assembly was persistently vexed by "novation" controversies, and as early as 1641 resolved to draw up a new directory for worship -- a project committed to Henderson and only abandoned because of the impending action at Westminster (2). On the

1. "Along with her ancient Confession of Faith, the Books of Discipline, and Catechism, she gave up the Book of Common Order which had hitherto been the directory of her worship". Baird, op. cit. p. 129.

2. Henderson, in a letter to Baillie dated 20th April, 1642, expressed at once his reverence for the old Scots liturgy, his recognition of a felt need for a new directory, and his reason for not fulfilling the charge laid upon him. He wrote in part, "I confesse I found it a work farr surpassing my strength; nor could I take upon me either to determine some poynts contraverted, or to sett downe other formes of prayer than we have in our Psalme Book, penned by our great and divine Reformers ... I cannot think it expedient that anie such thing ... should be agreed upon and authorized by our Kirk till we see what the Lord will do in England and Ireland, where I still wait for a reformation and uniformitie with us; but.. we are not to conceave that they will embrace our Forme; but a new Forme must be set down for us all, and in my opinion some men set apairt some time for that work." Baillie, Letters & Journals, II, p.2.

other hand, that some resistance would meet the Directory in Scotland and some compromise be necessary was anticipated by the Assembly of Divines, and their delicate letter to the General Assembly which accompanied the new service book (1) reveals their appreciation of Scots conservatism-- an appreciation which they could only have acquired through months of debate with the commissioners at Westminster. Then of the Scots commission to the Assembly it might safely be said that they represented the "Discretionary" liturgical view of the Reformed-Scottish tradition.

But while it is claimed that the Westminster Directory represents a compromise between at least three contending parties, it is imperative that equal emphasis be given to the fact that there was a broad basis of understanding informing the document's composition. Among the parties, there was a certain background of common conflict with

1. The letter reads in part: "Albeit we have not expressed in the Directory every minute particular which is or might be either laid aside or retained among us, as comely and useful practice, yet we trust that none will be so tenacious of old customes not expressly forbidden, or so averse from good examples although new, in matters of lesser consequence, as to insist upon the liberty of retaining the one or refusing the other, because not specified in the Directory, but be studious to please others rather than themselves". Acts, p. 114.

Episcopacy and a shared repugnance toward many features of Episcopacy's prayer book. Further, there was a common liturgical heritage in the Genevan Forme of Prayer (the English version of Calvin's service book) which was adapted in England by the early Puritans and in Scotland by John Knox (1). Above all, there was a common theological understanding about the exclusive authority of the Bible in all matters pertaining to the doctrine, government and worship of the Church. This was by no means a guarantee of unanimity, as the painful debates and unresolved conflicts in the Assembly -- especially over government -- made abundantly clear. But all shared the conviction that "the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under an visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in holy scripture"(2). In spite of the

1. Early known Puritan editions: the Waldgrave, 1584/5, and the Middleburgh, 1586, 1587, 1602. The Scots version, variously known the Book of Common Order, The Psalm Book, Knox's Service Book, had its first edition in 1562, and numerous thereafter. For accounts of these adaptations, see Maxwell, W.D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book, especially pp. 8, 15, 16, 75; Hall, op. cit., pp. ix-xiii; Baird op. cit., p. 136-7.

2. The Westminster Confession of Faith, XXI, 1.

fact that it led to numerous wrangles over conflicting proof-texts, this generally accepted doctrinal basis both necessitated the repudiation of the Book of Common Prayer by all parties, and made possible the composition of the Directory.

Mitchell writes

The Divines... were far more at one with respect to the worship than with respect to the government of the Church. Whatever may have been their theoretical views of the lawfulness of strictly imposed forms or of liturgies leaving room for free prayer, all were prepared in the interests of peace and Christian union 'to lay aside the former liturgy,' with the many burdensome rites and ceremonies that had previously been imposed, and in place of a 'formed' liturgy, to content themselves with a simple Directory as a guide and help to the minister in the various acts of public worship. And so though there were occasionally keen debates about certain matters of detail...the work of preparing the Directory went on more rapidly and far more smoothly than that of adjusting the 'Propositions concerning Church Government and Ordination,' and elaborating the practical Directory for church government and ordination of ministers. (1)

The historical and theological factors suggested above go a long way to explain this relative unanimity.

(c) The Intent of the Directory

The actual intent of the Directory, with

1. op. cit. 213-4

respect to how scrupulously its prescriptives were to be adhered to, is a question to which there is no clear-cut answer. And little wonder. The Divines disagreed among themselves as to how seriously the Directory's rubrics were to be taken in the actual practice of the churches. Many things were simply left unsaid because no agreement could be arrived at. To be sure, an examination of the book reveals that the rubrics are predominantly prescriptive rather than permissive. (1). Yet the force of these prescriptions is considerably mitigated, if not entirely annulled, by the book's Preface. The rubrical intent of the whole Directory hinges on this Preface (except where the Preface might be overridden by law), and its wording is such as to leave the directive authority of the book in

1. If one classifies the Directory's specifically rubrical instructions (i.e. excluding such general instructions as those pertaining to the Lord's Day, the conditions of marriage, and for observing fast days, etc.) under three heads, prescriptive, recommended and permitted, it will be discovered that they number approximately 75, 10, and 10, respectively, though some ambiguities make an accurate account difficult. However, as to prayer content it is clearly stated at the head of eight of the ~~books of~~ eleven prayers that the minister shall pray to "this effect" or "this purpose" and doubtless the same was understood for the other three. Where exhortations are prescribed nothing is said as to how scrupulously the material provided is to be followed.

considerable doubt. The words and clauses of the Preface were wrought out of heated and critical debate among all parties in the Assembly, and it is little wonder if the final result is neutral. Baillie reports that the whole Directory project came almost to disaster in this debate, though by this time (November, 1644) the great bulk of the book had passed through the Assembly. He speaks of "one party purposing by the preface to turn the Directorie into a straight Liturgie; the other to make it so loose and free that it shall serve for little use: but God helped us get these rocks eschewed...."(1). This highly dexterous feat of navigation secured the Directory's passage through the Assembly, but at a high price; it was a case of containment by ambiguity.

An examination of this preface is in order. At its outset, it leaves us in little doubt as to the Assembly's convictions about the short-comings and abuses of the Book of Common Prayer and the intention to overthrow that liturgy. After some respectful, and perhaps perfunctory, words about "our wise and pious ancestors" who compiled the

1. Letters and Journals, II, p. 242. And George Gillespie writes: "Sure I am the Directory had never past the Assembly of Divines, if it had not been for the qualifications of the Preface". (ibid. p. 506).

Prayer Book to replace the "vain, erroneous, superstitious and idolatrous" worship of Rome, the Preface contends that "long and sad experience hath made it manifest, that the Liturgy used in the Church of England (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it) hath proved an offence...". Among the offences mentioned are its "urging the reading of all prayers", which was "a great means... to make and increase and idle and unedifying ministry, which contented itself with set forms made to their hands by others, without putting forth themselves to exercise the free gift of prayer, with which our Lord Jesus Christ pleaseth to furnish all His servants whom He calleth to that office"; its "many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies"; and the inferior position it gives to the preaching of the Word, in some instances the "justling of it (preaching) out as unnecessary, or at best, as far inferior to the reading of Common Prayer". It further asserts that the Prayer Book is unacceptable to the Reformed churches abroad, and that at home it has the effect of "disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people, who could not yield unto (its ceremonies)" thereby "depriving them of the ordinances of God which they could not enjoy without conforming" to the liturgy,

and that "it hath been (and ever would be, if continued) a matter of endless strife in the Church... especially in these latter times, wherein God vouchsafeth to his people more and better means for the discovery of error and superstition, and for attaining of knowledge in the mysteries of godliness, and the gifts of preaching and prayer". Therefore, "not from any love of novelty, or intention to disparage our first Reformers,.... but that we may in some measure answer the gracious providence of God, which at this time calleth upon us for further reformation... and withal give some public testimony of our endeavours for uniformity in Divine Worship, which we have promised in our Solemn League and Covenant, we have... resolved to lay aside the former Liturgy.... and have agreed upon the following Directory.....".

This much is the burden of the first five paragraphs of the Preface. However presumptuous and bigoted some of its sweeping statements might appear, (1) it could not be described, up to this point, as ambiguous. There would appear to have been general unanimity among the Divines in

1. Henry Hammond, the Anglican Divine, in A View of the New Directory, makes a penetrating, if at times prejudiced and unfair, analysis of the Preface, clause by clause, and exposes the grossness of some of its claims.

this castigation and throwing down of the old liturgy. The clause relating to "uniformity" and the Covenant is a somewhat softened version of that originally proposed (1) -- an amendment instigated by the sensitive Independents who, apparently, were inclined to a liberal interpretation of the covenanted pledge "to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms, to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in ... Directory of Worship....." (2). Presumably Gillespie would have appended to the Preface a stern warning to those who would retain the old liturgy and customs. On a loose paper produced by Wodrow and which, he assures us, is in Gillespie's handwriting, there is the following paragraph which would appear to belong to the Preface and was possibly contended for by him in committee or in the Assembly itself:

Concerning other customs or rites in the worship of God, formerly received in any of the Kingdoms, which, though not condemned in this Directory, have been, or apparently will be, occasions of divisions and offences, as it is far from our intention that those or the like

1. The original was to this effect, "that in reference to our Covenant, which tieth to uniformity as much as may be, we hold out this Directory."

Lightfoot, op. cit., p.2.

2. The Solemn League and Covenant of 1643.

3. ~~Hetherington, W.M., (ed.), Notes of the Debates & Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, by Mr. George Gillespie, p. 108.~~

unnecessary burdens should be laid upon any, or any compelled thereto, so we judge it most expedient, that the practice and use of them be not continued, as well for the nearer uniformity betwixt the Churches of both Kingdoms, as for their greater peace and harmony within themselves, and their edifying one another in love. Wherein we would be so understood as not having the least thought to discredit or blame our worthy Reformers, or others who have since practised them. Only we hold forth that we have learned from the rules of Christ and his Apostles, that even those of the learned and godly, who satisfy their own judgments concerning the lawfulness of those customs, shall henceforth do well to abstain for the law of love, and for the bond of peace.(1)

Certain of the moderate Puritans (among them Burgess, Calamy, Seaman, Reynolds, and Palmer) were for a more honourable laying aside of the former liturgy in the interests of Anglican feelings. But the Scots "thought the honour of their own country (after the attempted imposition of the Scottish Prayer Book upon the Kirk and the revolutionary events which that attempt precipitated) required it should be more strongly condemned than their friends were willing to allow, and Gillespie was so cruel as to tell them that Scotland would not be satisfied with less, and that its ceremonies were not, like those of the law, to be buried with honour, 'but with the

1. Hetherington, W. M., (ed.), Notes of the Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines by Mr. George Gillespie. p. 108.

burial of the uncircumcised'." (1).

If the first five paragraphs of the Preface are forthright and passed with relative ease through the Assembly, the final one -- the crucial paragraph for interpreting the intent of the Directory -- is, as already observed, ambiguous, and had a stormy and treacherous passage. Because of its critical nature, it is quoted here in full:

Wherein our care hath been to hold forth such things as are of Divine institution in every Ordinance; and other things we have endeavoured to set forth according to the rules of Christian prudence, agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God; our meaning therein being only, that the general heads, the sense and scope of the Prayers, and other parts of Publick Worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the Churches in those things that contain the substance of the Service and Worship of God; and the Ministers may be hereby directed, in their administrations, to keep like soundness in Doctrine and Prayer, and may, if need be, have some help and furniture, and yet so as they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them; but that each one, by meditation, by taking heed to himself, and the flock of God committed to him, and by wise observing the ways of Divine Providence, may be careful to furnish his heart and tongue with further or other materials of Prayer and Exhortation, as shall be needful upon all occasions.

An early draft presented to the Assembly, had in place of the clause, "our meaning therein.... and

1. Mitchell, op. cit. p. 226.

worship of God," this double-negative statement:
 "Our meaning in the Directory is not that the ministers should not turn the materials of it into an ordinary form of prayer and exhortation". (1)
 This, unless there has been an error in the Lightfoot transcription, would have constituted a remarkable concession to the moderates. (2). The Independents, on the other hand, would have replaced the words (in the same clause), "contain the substance of the service and worship of God," with simply, "concern the service and worship of God," (3) which would considerably weaken such force as the paragraph has.

As it stands, the paragraph seems to be saying that the Directory contains the substance of worship on which all three churches "may" agree, and that the materials therein might (4) guide the minister as to "soundness in doctrine and prayer", and might actually be used by him ("if need be") as "help and furniture", provided he does not become

1. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 322.

2. The materials were in fact turned into "an ordinary form of prayer" within half a year of this debate in A Supply of Prayer. See Appendix.

3. Mitchell, op. cit. p. 227.

4. Note that even here the permissive "may" ("may hereby be directed") is used rather than a prescriptive "will", or even a suggestive "ought".

slothful and fail to exercise the "gifts of Christ" in him.

A literal interpretation of this single paragraph renders all the rubrical imperatives in the book merely permissive or suggestive, reduces the Directory to an optional guide book with no real directive force, and signals the victory of the Independents who viewed any directory for worship as an encroachment upon the activity of the Holy Spirit in the public worship of God. On the face of it, it appears that Baillie's "rock" was not "eschewed" as successfully as he complacently assumed in his public letter.

There remain to be considered, however, the legal ordinances, civil and ecclesiastical, which established the Directory in the kingdoms of England and Scotland. The "Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for the establishing and putting in execution of the Directory for the publique Worship of God", which appears at the beginning of the English edition, is considerably more imperative in its language than the Preface composed by that Parliament's Assembly of Divines. (1). This

1. Albeit the Preface, like the rest of the book, had the concurrence of both houses. The progress of the Directory through Parliament can be followed in the Journals of the Houses of Commons, Vol III, pp. 702, 705, 709-10, 713, 715-6, 722, 724; vol IV, pp. 2, 3, 6, 9-10, 71, 73; and the Journals of the House of Lords, vol VII, pp. 71, 116, 119, 121-2, 124-5, 128, 255, 264-8, 271-3.

ordinance, after declaring all previous laws relating to the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer repealed, reads:

And that the said book of Common-Prayer, shall not remain, or be from henceforth used in any Church, Chapell, or place of Publique Worship, within the Kingdom of England, or Dominion of Wales; and that the Directory for Publique Worship herein set forth, shall be henceforth used, pursued and observed, according to the true intent and meaning of this Ordinance, in all Exercises of the Publique Worship of God, in every Congregation, Church, Chapell, and place of Publique Worship within this Kingdom of England, and Dominion of Wales; Which Directory for the Publique Worship of God, with the Preface thereof, followeth.

(This ordinance enjoins, further, that a Register for births, baptisms, marriages and burials shall be kept in every parish.) This leaves little doubt about Parliament's intent as to the use of the Directory. It was, opines Mitchell, "probably meant to be pretty strictly enforced, and in fact required to be so to insure the disuse of the Book of Common Prayer".(1). The establishment was further reinforced by a subsequent ordinance "for the speedy dispersing and publishing of the Directory, and for punishing of such as shall not use or shall deprave the said Directory".(2). Had the

-
1. Mitchell, op. cit, p. 221.
 2. Journals of the House of Commons, Vol. IV, p. 187. This Ordinance was passed on 23 Aug., 1645.

political situation in England been stabilized in favour of the government then in power, the Directory would surely have become the liturgy of the Church of England. It is clear that a rigid adherence to it was intended -- a much more rigid adherence than the Directory's own Preface would seem to demand. The calculated phrases of the Preface permitting freedom in use were annulled by the government ordinances enforcing strict adoption.

In Scotland, the significant legislation was enacted by the General Assembly of the Church. The Scots Estates merely ratified the Assembly's action, "do interpone and adde the authority of Parliament to the said act of the Generall Assembly, and do ordain the same to have the strength and force of a Law and Act of Parliament, and execution to passe thereupon for observing the said Directory, according to the said Act of Generall Assembly in all points".(1) The Assembly's Act, after a preamble rehearsing the events which led to the Directory's composition, reaffirming adherence to the Solemn League and Covenant, and stating that the Directory had been thoroughly examined, asserts that

1. From "An Act of Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland, approving and establishing the Directory for Public Worship", the 6th February, 1645; reprinted in first Scottish edition of Directory

the Assembly

Doth unanimously, and without contrary voice, agree to and approve the following Directory, in all the heads thereof, together with the Preface set before it; and doth require, discern, and ordain, that according to the plain tenour and meaning thereof, and the intent of the Preface, it be carefully and uniformly observed and practised by all Ministers and others within this Kingdom, whom it doth concerne; which practice shall be begun, upon Intimation given to the severall Presbyteries, from the Commissioners of this Generall Assembly, who shall also take special care for the timeous printing of the Directory, that a printed copy of it be provided and kept for the use of every Kirk in the Kingdom; Also that each Presbyterie have a printed copy therein for their use, and take special notice for the observation or neglect thereof in every Congregation within its bounds, and make known the same to the Provinciaall and Generall Assembly, as there shall be cause. Provided always that the Clause in the Directory, of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, which mentioneth the Communicants sitting about the Table, or at it, be not interpreted as if in the judgment of this Kirk, it were indifferent and free for any of the Communicants not to come to, and receive at the Table, or as if we did approve the distribution of the Elements by the Ministers to each Communicant, and not by the Communicants among themselves. It is also provided, that this shall be no prejudice to the order and practice of this Kirk in such particulars as are appointed by the Books of Discipline, and Acts of Generall Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory. (1)

1. From the "Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, for the establishing and putting in execution of the Directory for the Publike Worship of God," passed on the 3rd February, 1644/5. Acts. pp. 115-6. It appears in the first Scots edition of the Directory.

There are four points in this passage worthy of note. i. Adherence to the book is to be conditioned by the "plain tenour and meaning thereof, and the intent of the Preface". In effect, the Act permits much more latitude in the book's usage than the English ordinance would allow. While the English Act virtually supersedes and nullifies the Preface, this Act makes a point of submitting the book's enforcement to the terms of the Preface (1). ii. Responsibility for enforcing the Act is laid upon the Presbyteries. In England, where the rule was rigid, there was no ecclesiastical structure to ensure discipline in the matter. In Scotland, where Presbyterian discipline prevailed, the Act, by its own terms, was too nebulous to be enforced effectively. iii. On the other hand, in an instance where the Directory's

1. The significance of this is underscored by Gillespie in a letter from London, 9 May, 1645, when he writes: "I pray you to be carefull that the Act of the Gen. Assembly, approving the Directory, be not so altered as to make it a stricter imposition, and take heed that it containe still an approbation of the Preface set before the Directory, for which I could give many reasons. I only say this, that the more straitly it be imposed, it will breed the more scruples and creat controversies, which wyse men should do well to prevent, lest we crosse the principles of the good old Nonconformists, by too strait imposition of things in their owne nature indifferent, such as many (tho' not all) be in the Directory....." (Baillie, op. cit., p. 506.

rubrics are deliberately ambiguous -- in the Communion order -- the Act clarifies them and thereby implies a required adherence to the same (1).

iv. In sharp contrast to the English ordinance, there is here no "taking away" of the former liturgy. Rather, the old practices are not to be "prejudiced" in any way, except where they are explicitly contravened by the Directory (2).

From one point of view, it might be maintained that the intention of the Scottish Church and State was, according to this act, that the Directory be established, in the interests of uniformity with the English Church, but that no strict adherence to it be required. Mitchell claims that this is in keeping with the spirit of freedom of the Church of

1. These will be noted, of course, in the chapter dealing with the Directory's order for the Lord's Supper.

2. That Gillespie and others were not happy about this toleration of the old order is suggested in the letter quoted in note 2, page 23. He writes further: "There is a draught of the Act about the Directory agreed upon here, and sent doune to your meeting, having no alteration but in words, and the substance being the same, only it is thought clearer, and that it will be found better here (in London). This draught of the Act, in the discerning part of it, doth not only approve the Preface of the Directory, but saith that the preface doth express the intent and meaning of the Directory, and relative to this, it said further, that such rules and practices are to be laid aside as are contrary to the intent of this Directory". (Baillie, op. cit) There is a subtle shift of emphasis here from the protection of all in the old practices that are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory to the proscription of all that is contrary to the intent of the Preface. See also Gillespie quotation, above, page 20.

Scotland "which the tolerant rubrics of the Book of Common Order had done so much to cherish".(1) In England, where the Church was accustomed to an imposed ritual, the Parliament followed that tradition, so far as it could with a merely "rubrical" service book. In Scotland, where the "discretionary" order of John Knox had been the official service book, but which, by this time, was in many quarters virtually ignored, the Assembly and the Estates established the new service book within the easy conditions of its Preface, thus acting within the peculiarly Scottish tradition.

Yet it is evident that the Assembly expected the book, in some aspects at least, to be rigidly observed. The fact that it was at pains to stipulate certain ceremonial details where they were lacking in the Directory, not only in this Act, but in one which accompanied it (2), suggests the seriousness with which the ordering of worship was taken. The distinction between what was

-
1. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 221.
 2. Brought forth in the General Assembly, 1645, as "The Opinion of the Committee for keeping the greater Uniformitie in this Kirk, in the practice and observation of the Directory in some Points of Publick Worship". The report having been presented, the Assembly approved the same "in all articles thereof, and ordains them to be observed in all time hereafter". Acts, pp. 120-1.

scrupulously prescribed by the General Assembly and what was left free, appears to have been the distinction between ceremony and order on the one hand and the content of prayer and exhortation, on the other. In the second act, alluded to above, the Assembly, in effect, added fifteen rubrics to the Directory, thirteen of them having to do with the sacraments. Of the Scottish Church's intent with respect to the Directory, then, it must be concluded that the rubrical instructions concerning ceremony and order, both those in the Directory and those appended by the Assembly's legislation, were to be closely adhered to, and that the clause appealing to the liberating "intent of the Preface" was designed to allow the maximum freedom to the ministers in prayer and exhortation.

(d) The Rationale

Despite the Preface, which goes so far toward negating it, the Westminster Directory remains a document of intense liturgical interest to those born and nurtured in the Reformed Church tradition. If, to the Anglican liturgiologist, it stands merely as a rude interruption in the story of that very remarkable liturgy, the Book of Common Prayer, (a black chapter in which the inconclasts almost succeeded in the demolition of a great

religious monument), to the Reformed churchman, concerned about his heritage of worship, it stands in quite a different light. The Directory represents a via media between two warring principles, both of which are, -- now if not then -- an integral part of that heritage (1). As much, it warrants serious liturgical investigation. Further, as a state-established service book, it is unique and even viewed as an anomaly, it is worthy of examination. Finally, because it was, in fact, the only recognised manual for Presbyterian worship for almost 250 years, it ought to be assessed. To a statement of the nature and scope of this investigation, we now turn.

2. The Nature and Scope of Investigation

The primary concern of this work is liturgical. That is to say, the Directory is investigated as a service book. Attempt is made to relate the structure and content of its services to those of

1. It is as foolish to suggest that the "free-prayer" or non-liturgical tradition is not a part of the genuine Presbyterian heritage, as it is to ignore the Reformed liturgical tradition rooted in Geneva. A heritage is that admixture of customs and practices, preconception and values -- a living organism -- which is received at the hands of our immediate fathers. There can be no appeal to a self-enclosed, static "classical period" as the repository of our "true heritage".

its immediate liturgical predecessors in the churches of Scotland and England and to its modern Scottish Presbyterian successors. Attention is given also to the actual usages of both churches before "Westminster", with a view to tracing any influences these might have had in the shaping of the Directory, and to subsequent practices in the Scottish Church, where the Directory was the official standard of worship, with a view to assessing the possible influences of that book upon the services of the Kirk.

Further, though this does not purport to be a theological work, some comment of a theological nature is inevitable in an examination of the textual matter. "Liturgy is dogma in action" and the dogma to which this particular "liturgy" seeks to give action cannot go entirely ignored. The Westminster Divines were nothing if they were not theologians, and in the composition of the Directory, as in that of the other monumental documents which came forth from their Assembly, theological considerations took precedence over all other. Every sentence of prayer and exhortatory material, every clause of rubrical instruction, was submitted to the terms of the Divines' theological charter: the sole and all-sufficient authority of Scripture over the faith and order of the Church. It is therefore

impossible to approach the Directory in an attitude of theological indifference.

Again, liturgies do not evolve or are not composed in an historical vacuum. Granting the formative influence of past usages and doctrinal tenets, in the shaping of the order, both faith and order are in some measure the products of that wider social and political environment in which the Church exists. The documents of Westminster arose out of a great political, social and ecclesiastical eruption which, in differing ways, shook both the English and Scottish nations. So inextricably bound were Church and State in the seventeenth century, and so much to the fore were liturgical contentions in the long struggle which issued in the eruption, that a broad historical survey is necessary if the Directory for Worship is to be understood. It is at least in part the product of its revolutionary times. Before entering upon a study of the text, therefore, a chapter is devoted to its historical background.

Procedure in the investigation of the text itself varies from one section to another. Some sections of the Directory, as for instance those on the sacraments, lend themselves more readily to comparative study than others; some not at all. No consistent method of analysis is possible with such a wide

variety of material. Accordingly, the approach taken to each section is largely determined by the nature of the section itself. Accordingly, too, some sections have been taken out of the sequence in which they appear in the Directory and grouped into chapters with others with which they have a natural affinity. Quotations are from (the) Thomas Leishman's edition, 1901.

CHAPTER II

The Historical Setting of the Directory.

1. The Scope and Focus of this Account

The Westminster Directory is a document of the times. The purpose of this chapter is to see it against its background in the Westminster Assembly, and more especially, to see both the Assembly and the Directory in the context of the religious and political movements and events which occasioned the calling of the Assembly and contributed to this liturgical document's peculiar character. From one point of view this account could almost exclusively be an English story -- at least until the eleventh hour when the aid of the Scots became essential to the success of the English revolutionary cause. Until that hour, the struggle of Puritan churchmen and the parliamentary party against the house of Stuart and entrenched episcopacy was waged on English soil, in English terms, by Englishmen. The parallel struggle in Scotland against the same royal house and related ecclesiastical forces was to the Englishman remote and foreign, a struggle of which he was but dimly aware. Yet, however inevitable might have been the revolution in a isolated England -- even, if for the moment, we assume its

success without the support of the Scots arms -- it was the great Scottish eruption of 1638 which initiated the chain-reactions culminating in the overthrow of the hierarchial structure of the English Church, the abolition of its liturgy, and the dethronement of the monarch, by the English Puritan-parliamentary forces.(1). If, previous to this date, they were indifferent the English democrats were startled by the events of that year in Edinburgh and Glasgow into a consciousness of Scottish resistance to the Stuart autocracy and from it derived inestimable moral support in their own struggle. The National Covenant and the Glasgow Assembly fired English imaginations and, henceforth, the further manifestations of the Scottish rebellion -- especially the stripping from the crown most of its constitutional powers by the Scots parliament, not to mention the armed rising -- were watched closely from England. "It is impossible to

1. "The opening of the Assembly of 1638 may fairly vie with the Long Parliament as a momentous historical event. It was earlier in time. Had it not been, perhaps the Long Parliament also might not have been. At that juncture, so far as England alone was concerned the looker-on would have said that the Court would prevail, and that without a struggle ... This General Assembly takes precedence in history as the first meeting of a body existing by constitutional sanction yet giving defiance to the Court." Burton, J.H., The History of Scotland, VI., p. 223; cf. Haller, W., Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, p. 5.

avoid the conclusion," writes Burton, "that these acts of the Scots Estates were in the minds of the commoners of England when they superceded the regal executive and ruled through the authority of Parliament." (1)

Nevertheless, down to the late 1630's, the English Puritan cause must be said to have had its own peculiar history, and even through and after the Scottish intervention, the revolution in England, including that phase of it with which we are especially concerned, the Assembly of Divines, was mainly an English affair. Because of this, attention must be given to the evolution of the Puritan movement in England. On the other hand, because this very Assembly was destined to become a milestone -- indeed, a touchstone -- in the Scottish story (as it was never in the English), its context in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland must be given equal consideration.

The main delimiting factor in the following account will be the conscious perspective from which the history is considered -- namely, our concern about modes of worship. Therefore, in this discussion of the movements and events in both kingdoms giving rise to the Assembly's convocation

1. op. cit. p. 330.

the focal point of attention will be the controversies over the Church's worship. As it happens, this treatment does not distort the history as much as might be supposed, for the battle in both nations was fought largely on the ground of the liturgy. But even in these liturgical controversies, only the broad outlines will be reviewed here. Some detailed references to the liturgies and worship usages of the period are made in subsequent chapters.

2. Toward the Crisis: in England

Even before the restoration of Protestantism in England with the accession of Elizabeth I to the throne, it was evident that within the community of English Protestants there existed a tension between two definable groups: those who were generally satisfied with the reformation achieved during the reign of Edward VI and those who looked to further reform; those who regarded either of the Edwardine Prayer Books as an acceptable liturgy and those who favoured a more radical stripping from the liturgy of all that they conceived to be superstitious, misleading, or unscriptural. The cleavage appeared as early as 1555 in the community of Marian exiles in Frankfort-on-Main. It was destined to widen tragically on English soil, deepening over the subsequent century as the points at issue became

more numerous and more sharply defined.

The Frankfort story has been told many times (1) and needs no reiteration here. Sufficient it is to observe that the conflict was between the advocates of Calvin's Genevan liturgy and those of the 1552 English Prayer Book. When the exiles returned home, the more conservative of the two parties had its triumph in the Elizabethan Settlement. A revised version of the Book of Common Prayer (1559) was established by an Act of Uniformity. But the "settlement" was in name only, and "uniformity" was not realized. The advocates of a "purer" mode of worship for the national Church were not to be quelled, in either their agitation or their practice, by legal ordinances. In 1562, for instance, six articles were submitted to the Lower House of Convocation, which articles are representative of the feelings and scruples of the more radical group. They called for the abolition of all feast days except Sundays, of the use of organs in worship, of the signing of the cross in Baptism, of compulsory kneeling at Communion, of the wearing of any vestment except the surplice, and of the practice of clergy facing away from the people during any part of worship. Such opinions

1. As for example, in Maxwell, W.D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556, pp. 3-9.

were not those of a negligible minority. Their adoption in the Lower House was defeated by a majority of but one vote (1). And in the Commons, as early as 1571, an attempt (the first of a series) was made to order a revision of the Prayer Book. The House was unable to proceed, lacking the permission of the Queen, who claimed supremacy over the Church and who would brook no parliamentary intrusion into ecclesiastical affairs. (2).

Nor in practice did the Puritans heed the Act of Uniformity. An episcopal inquiry instigated in 1565 by a troubled monarch, into the worship usages of the Church revealed a great diversity in practice. W.H. Frere has summed up the findings of the investigation: (3).

1. Brightman, F.E., and Mackenzie, K.D., in chapter, "The History of the Book of Common Prayer to 1662" in Clarke, W.K.L., and Harris, Chas., Liturgy & Worship, p. 184.

2. "The indignant house ... was only restrained with difficulty from entering into a conflict with the Crown." Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625), p. 161. The following year, there was submitted to Parliament an admonition calling for the removal of homilies, and Communion rite, and private sacraments, and the establishment of a lay-eldership and the practice of sitting at Communion. While, of course, Elizabeth would not permit Parliament to consider it, the admonition was, says Frere, widely read and had great propoganda value. ibid., pp. 178-9.

3. ibid., p. 115. See also, Brightman and Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 184.

The service is said sometimes in the chancel, sometimes in the nave; sometimes eastward, and sometimes westward; sometimes with a surplice, sometimes without. There is a great variety as to the position of the Table; at communion the cope is not uniformly worn as well as the surplice, and sometimes neither is used. Similar variety is shown as to use of chalice or communion cup, of unleavened or leavened bread; as to kneeling, standing, or sitting to receive. The divergencies in baptism and in external apparel are also here set forth, and it is noted that, "while some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermeddle psalms in metre".

Clearly, things were neither settled nor uniform in the liturgical practices of the Church of England.

In polity too, there was, in some quarters, a peculiar divergence from what was ostensibly an episcopal system. In the early 1570's there were at least two discernible "presbyteries" within the Church. One of these was at Northampton where a classis (of ministers only) was erected which had disciplinary powers within its bounds. It resembled the Genevan model in discipline, preaching services, and sacramental practice. Matins and Evensong were preserved, but the afternoon sermon-centred services were the focal point of church life. Though it defied the law of the land, the Northampton venture could hardly have been considered seditious, for it had the blessing of the diocesan bishop and, therefore the tacit toleration of the hierarchy (1).

1. Frere, in op. cit. pp.168-70, gives a summary of The Order and Dealings of the Church at Northampton.

Perhaps more significant were the Wandsworth (London area) classes. Though their founding followed by approximately a year the Northampton classis, Fuller (1) claims the experiment as "the first born of all presbyteries in England" and the model for all who sought the evolutionary reform of the English Church (2). Here, again, great liberties were taken with the established liturgy. Writes Henson, "it was argued that 'those ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer, which being taken from popery are in controversy ought to be omitted, if it may be done without danger of being put from the ministry, but if there be imminent danger of being deprived, then let the matter be communicated to the classis in which that church is, to be determined by them'." (3).

Enough is cited here to indicate the essential external features of the early Puritan movement. Throughout the Elizabethan era it had a more or less steady growth. In its agitation for the elimination of the ceremonies of the Prayer Book and the reduction of its rites, in its simplified preaching-centred services, and in its allegiance with the

-
1. Quoted in Henson, op. cit., p. 88.
 2. "Secundum usum Wandsworth (was) as much honoured by some as secundum usum Sarum by others". Fuller in *ibid.*
 3. *ibid.*, pp. 89-90

House of Commons, it already distinctly foreshadowed the shape of the great rising of the 1640's. That the movement must one day come to a climax seems to have been almost inevitable. Whether that point was to be reached by evolution or revolution would depend largely on the nature and forces of the resistance it might meet.

The decisive event for the future course of the struggle was the falling of the English throne to the Scottish house of Stuart. As is well known, James I (and after him, Charles I) allied himself with the conservative Anglican party, conceiving episcopacy to be the only church polity consistent with monarchy -- and with his exalted view of monarchy in particular. This implies the existence of such a party before his arrival in England. As already suggested, throughout Elizabeth's reign, party alignments were becoming more distinct, and by the last decade of the century, the episcopal wing of the Church was crystallising its ecclesiastical and theological position. Indeed, Frere, ascribes to a more articulate right-wing party, a weakening of the Puritan movement. Speaking of the years 1588 to 1603, he writes;

For the first five years the conflict with puritanism was open and violent; then the stringent discipline of Whitgift and the resolute hostility of the queen told; and

upon the last ten years of the reign there rested a comparative calm. This was partly due to vigorous repression; but still more to the quiet working of the new leaven of a different churchmanship, more convinced but less cocksure, -- more firmly and intelligently attached to the faith and discipline of the Church, but more ready to acknowledge her shortcomings and abuses. (1).

And Godfrey Davies numbers the influence of this catholic movement among the factors in what he views as "a very definite set-back" suffered by the Puritans during the 1590's. He outlines the three operative factors in this decline thus:

In the first place, a new school of theology had arisen... (of men) who no longer thought of Luther and Calvin as the last court of appeal..... They supplied a learned and reasoned basis for the theological position of the Church of England.... In the second place, puritanism with its ~~its~~ strict and inquisitorial morality, was opposed to the spirit of the age that produced William Shakespeare. Thirdly, the official view then prevalent, that church and state were one society in a two-fold aspect and that to assail the former inevitably involved the latter, was not yet repugnant to the class in political power. At that time, the theory of divine right of kings was accepted, and the most damaging accusation brought against the opponents of Anglicanism was that they were attempting to introduce a popular and democratic form of government both in church and state. (2).

Whether or not Puritanism had lost as much ground as

-
1. op. cit. p. 257.
 2. Davies, G. The Early Stuarts, 1603, pp. 66-7.

indicated here, the Stuart regime, which began in 1603, was to test (and, indirectly, contribute to) the real strength of the Puritan-parliamentary alliance.

Whatever support from James the left-wing party in the Church had a right to hope for, they lost no time in placing their claims before him. He was confronted with the famous Millenary Petition in April, 1603, before he as much as arrived in London. The Petition was mainly concerned with matters of worship. It included an appeal for the abrogation of the cross in Baptism, the interrogatories addressed to infants, confirmation, Baptism by women, and the ring in marriage. It desired surplice and cope to be optional, examination of communicants before the sacrament, and abridgement of the liturgy, the use of canonical scripture exclusively, and respect for the Lord's Day.

The King's reaction to suggestions of this nature was manifest within a year, when, at the Hampton Court Conference -- a meeting promised in response to the Petition -- even the more moderate demands of the Puritans were flatly rejected. There were, to be sure, very minor rubrical changes in the Prayer Book of a somewhat Puritan nature (especially

in the Baptismal order), but little else was yielded. The articles put forth by the Puritan divines at Hampton Court (1) were fewer in number than those of the Petition, but of the same character (2). The real answer came in the Canons of 1604 which enjoined the use of the (revised) Book of Common Prayer, Mass vestments for celebration in the cathedral and collegiate churches, the surplice for all rites in other churches, affirmed that "the King's supremacy over the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical is to be maintained"; and proscribed private conventicles at which the Prayer Book was profaned.

Davies draws out the political implications of these events of 1603 and 1604:

Probably the sentiments of the majority in parliament were voiced in the puritan appeal, presented to the king on his first entrance into England....At the resultant Hampton Court conference, James' determination not to accede to the moderate demands for relaxation of ceremonial, and his declaration that he would make puritans conform were fatal obstacles to a good understanding with parliament... The commons had hoped that the relinquishment of a few ceremonies of slight importance would secure a perpetual uniformity, but James... meant to achieve unity by a rigid enforcement of the law (3).

-
1. Reynolds, Sparks, Knewtubs and Chaderton were the four Puritans.
 2. See Mitchell, A.F., The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 481.
 3. op. cit. pp. 6-7; cf. Frere, op. cit., p. 323.

But while the political aspects of the controversy loomed large, the ecclesiastical and theological by no means receded. On both sides there was a maturing and refining of doctrinal tenets. Oxford felt the emergence of a fresh theological current in the rise of Arminianism, and, with it, a more "catholic" ecclesiology with its highly sacramental view of the Church and holy orders, emphasis on the historic episcopate, and a revived concern for ritual and ceremonial. On the other side, the Puritans were concentrating on not only purity of worship, but purity of polity (which implied at this time, presbyterianism), on personal piety and morality, and on defending what it conceived to be the Reformed theology against its new assailant, Arminianism.

The printing presses emitted pamphlets, tracts, and volumes, so that all who would and could might join the fray. But it was the pulpits of the land that constituted the real forum for the great debate. Here the Puritan party was at the greater advantage, for it had more preachers who preached more sermons -- preaching being an essential element in Puritan religion. What proportion of the populace was concerned with the controversies is difficult to say. Whatever it was, it was too

large for the pleasure of the King, and in 1622 he issued directives limiting the subject matter permitted the common preacher and lecturer (1). The prohibitive subjects reveal the points of contention in the debate. It was ordered

that no preacher of what title soever under the degree of bishop, or dean at the least do from henceforth presume to preach in any popular auditory the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of God's grace; but leave these themes to be handled by learned men, and that moderately and modestly, by way of use and application rather than by way of positive doctrine, as being fitter for the schools and universities than for simple auditories (2).

Political discussion, too, was prohibited, but it is obvious from this directive that among a significantly large segment of the population the Calvinist-Arminian controversy was a matter of concern and a source of unrest.

At the level of liturgical practice in the Church, the reign was marked by an increasing attention paid by the hierarchy to the ceremonial and ornamentation of worship, while the nonconformists were left to fend as best they could. Following the 1604

1. The King had already attempted to impose a censorship on pulpit discussion of foreign policy after Puritan preachers had inveighed against an alliance with Roman Catholic Spain and supported entry into the continental war in defence of Frederick of Bohemia and the Protestant cause. Frere, *op. cit.*, p.382; Davies, G., *op. cit.*, p. 22.

2. Hole, Charles, A Manual of English Church History, p. 283.

Canons, a number of nonconforming clergy were deprived, though there can be little doubt but that many escaped this penalty who yet took liberties with the Prayer Book. The "afternoon lectureship", which was, in effect, a Puritan pulpit-centred service, became more prevalent. At this service, complains Frere, "the nonconforming or suspect divine preached Calvinism in his cloak, often unlicensed and usually unfettered by any liturgical service. Such a procedure could not escape censure..... In 1622 the king issued directions concerning preachers to every diocesan which contained special rules for afternoon sermons (see above, anent proscribed subjects), and expressed the opinion that preachers would do better to catechize than to preach". And he adds, "Six or seven years later, it was necessary for Charles to be far more explicit in the matter, as the plan had spread until Puritan centres were provided by this means with ministrations according to the views of the party and not according to the mind of the Church of England" (1).

Throughout James' reign, the tension between Court and Parliament was intensified. Parliament insisted on its right to debate "all affairs concerning king and realm and Church", and the

1. Frere, op. cit., p. 382.

monarch persisted in his contention that foreign and ecclesiastical affairs were his province exclusively(1). Charles I inherited from his father a kingdom divided in its body politic and religious. Court and episcopate, in mutual dependence (2), confronted a rising middle class whose political arm was the House of Commons and whose chief religious expression was Puritanism - a view which denied the absolute jurisdiction over Church of King, bishop or tradition, and embraced in theory, at least, presbyterianism as its polity and a mode of worship increasingly divergent from the official liturgy.

Charles inherited too, his father's doctrine of

1. In 1621, for instance, the king endeavoured to bar debate on his middle-of-the-road foreign policy, and particularly the proposed marriage of Charles to the Spanish Infanta Maria. The Commons entered upon its journal a protestation of its privilege of "debate and counsel" in "all affairs of king, realm and Church". "The king sent for the journals and in full council tore out the protestation with his own hands." The House leaders were punished and Parliament dissolved. Montague, F.C., The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Restoration (1603-1660), p.105.

2. Or as G. Davies eloquently states it, "..... James' aphorism, 'no bishop, no king', was literally true. The Stuart system of government would have collapsed ignominiously early in the century but for the support of the hierarchy, and the Jacobean and Caroline bishops would, but for royal favour, have been called to account before the Long Parliament met. Hence a position was created in which the puritan found that any opposition to the church was regarded as sedition at court and any criticism of the monarchy was denounced as blasphemy in the pulpit. Court divines frequently argued that those who were eager to cast mitres and copes under foot were equally anxious to throw down crowns and sceptres." The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660, p. 69.



royal prerogative (1). Parliament was a necessary evil, if necessary at all. Within four years of his accession, he had called and dissolved Parliament three times. His desperate need for supply in executing his unpopular, unwise and confusing foreign military operations enforced his calling Parliament. The bitter controversies with Parliament on matters political, economic and religious which ^bdeviled its sessions, enforced his dissolving it. The third Parliament (sitting in 1628 and again in 1629) is the most significant. It forced Charles' acceptance of its Petition of Rights, a protest against his violation of civil liberties, and it pronounced its categorical adherence to pre-Arminian orthodoxy (2). In the face of such

1. Early in the reign, one Robert Sidthorpe, preached and printed a sermon on Romans 13:5 which Charles embraced as the statement par excellence of the doctrine of monarchical right. It claimed for instance, that "if princes command anything which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either resistance or railing or reviling; and so to yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one". While Archbishop Abbot refused to license the sermon, it had the enthusiastic blessing of the king. Hutton, Wm.H., The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714). p. 27.

2. "We the Commons in Parliament now assembled do claim, profess and avow for truth the sense of the Articles of Religion which were established in Parliament in the reign of our late Queen Elizabeth, which, by the general and concurrent exposition of the writers of our Church have been delivered to us, and we do reject the sense of the Jesuites and Arminians" quoted in Hutton, op. cit., p. 76.

flagrant opposition, the King had no alternative (as he saw it) but to dissolve Parliament and rule without it.

There followed eleven years of "personal rule" in which Charles' chief adviser in ecclesiastical affairs for both kingdoms was William Laud, Bishop of London until 1633, then Archbishop of Canterbury. Since its rise at Oxford during the decade following 1613, Laud had been associated with the movement described above as Arminian, catholic, sacramental and liturgical. His passion was the catholicizing of the churches of England and Scotland. However his motives might be construed or his methods criticized, his single-minded mission was the establishment of the Church on the foundation of the historic episcopate, and the restoration to her worship of what he conceived to be the most ancient and the richest usages of her tradition. Like his monarchy, he sought the implementation of his policies with little regard for the feelings, opinions, or rights of those who would be affected. High-handed procedure was justified by the high ends pursued. Together with the King, and with the support of an influential coterie of bishops (1)

1. Including Neile, Archbishop of York, Juxon, who succeeded Laud to the bishopric of London, and Montague, Bishop of Chicester.

he set about housecleaning the Church of its Puritan impurities, and letting in (where they had disappeared) the altar-wise table, kneeling at Communion, the cross in Baptism, private sacraments, the ring in marriage, the Apocrypha, and the surplice, to name but seven (to the Puritan) demons. The programme began in earnest after Laud's translation to the primacy. The triennial episcopal visitations which followed were designed to inquire into the liturgical usages of all parishes and to exercise appropriate discipline where required. It is of particular relevance to our concern to take note of the points of inquiry. Hutton gives a summation of the "articles to be inquired of within the diocese of London," and states that these are "characteristic of the reforming movement".

Inquiry was made whether before all sermons the minister prayed for the king, queen, and royal family, and all archbishops, bishops, and other ecclesiastical persons. Whether the prescribed form of Divine service was used in reading public prayers and the litany and in administering the Sacraments, whether the people knelt at the administration of the Holy Communion, whether the minister used the sign of the Cross in baptism, whether he preached once every Sunday or read a homily, whether he wore the surplice and hood of his degree, whether he joined in or allowed any 'private conventicles or meetings,' and further as to his residence and due discharge of his duties of visiting the people. Moreover, concerning the church whether there was a 'font of stone standing in the ancient usual place' and 'a convenient and decent

communion table upon a frame with a carpet of silk or some other decent stuff and a fair linen cloth to lay thereon at communion time', whether it was placed in a convenient place 'within the chancel or church as that the minister may be best heard in his prayer and administration and that the greater number may communicate,' and if it was in any way 'abused to profane uses' out of service, further 'have any ancient monuments or glass windows been defaced, or anything else belonging to your church or chapel been at any time purloined'. (1)

It will be observed that most of these points of inquiry reflect the concerns of the meticulous ecclesiastic whose care is the propriety of the outward things of worship, and that many of them were either anathema or irrelevant to the Puritan mind. It is also noteworthy, however, that regular preaching is encouraged, and that latitude as to the position of the table is permitted.

The investigation disclosed the expected wide variety of practice. The Prayer Book was, in some places, faithfully adhered to, in others, scandalously abridged; Communion was administered at the rails or in the pews; afternoon lectureships flourished in some quarters and were non-existent in others; and sectarian groups -- Anabaptists, Separatists, Brownists -- worshipped apart from the Church altogether.

1. ibid. p. 56.

The Laudian reform movement culminated in the Canons of 1640, when the political situation was such that they could serve only to feed the fires of anti-episcopal, anti-Stuart passions (1). The Scottish rising had precipitated the calling of Parliament in 1640. The need of the hour was national unity and a strong army. But feelings among parliamentarians were less patriotic than partisan. They saw the Scots not so much as potential foreign invaders as fellow victims of the autocracy of king and archbishop. The Scottish Rebellion was in the name of constitutionalism and presbyterianism. One or other of these causes, or both together, could not fail to meet with sympathy among a considerable number of Englishmen (2). Parliament bargained with

1. "The Canons... are such as prove the violence of those who framed them, and who must have been activated by despair or fatuity to select such a time for their publication". Bishop T.V. Short, in Hole, op. cit. p. 290.

2. It is tempting, however, to exaggerate the breadth of this appeal. Montague points out that social unrest was not as great as events in Westminster might lead one to expect; the land was prosperous and justice, between citizen and citizen, was obtainable. "Those who valued the principles of a free constitution might abhor the precedents which Charles and his ministers were making and tremble to reflect how easily and how swiftly a mild despotism can become a remorseless tyranny. But men who grasp political principles are comparatively few and may be ignored unless some accident brings the multitude to their side. The puritans might complain of persecution....But (they) were a minority of the nation and an unpopular minority. The Average Englishman who blamed the bishops for harrasing the puritans was far from a puritan himself. The number of the discontented was great, but they were as yet
(footnote cont. next page).

the King, endeavouring to make such financial support as they were prepared to give contingent upon his ameliorating his more repressive judicial taxation and ecclesiastical policies. At the same time, conversations were held between parliamentarians and Scots. Charles found it expedient to dissolve (the "Short") Parliament within three weeks of its opening. As long as he persisted in his wilful course, his position was less secure with the Houses in session where passions could be concentrated and perchance channelled into action, than with no Parliament at all.

Yet, though Parliament was dissolved, the Convocation of Canterbury, contrary to precedent, but with royal assent, remained sitting and in the face of immense opposition already reflected in the Commons, pursued its project of drawing up the new Canons. The Canons of 1640 (which received ratification the same year by the Convocation of York) upheld the status quo as being of the "sacred order of things" and declared armed resistance to the King as tantamount to resistance to powers ordained by

(footnote 2 cont. from previous page)
 ignorant of their strength and they were not generally incensed to that point at which men forget personal safety in the longing for freedom and revenge".
 Montague, op. cit., p. 202.

God. They stipulated that the penalties prescribed for recusants (Roman Catholics) be applied also to "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, and the like." Most notorious among the Canons^{was} the "Et Caetera oath" whereby all ministers (among others) were bound to swear to their belief in and support of "government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, etc.". The most presumptuous aspect of this oath was not the "etc.", but the demand that this subscription be "without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever".

The Canon on rites and ceremonies, while it took care to guard against a Roman doctrine of sacrifice in the Eucharist, enjoined the altar-wise position of the table and the erection of railings before it, and recommended that worshippers, on entering and retiring from the church and on receiving Communion, should do reverence or obeisance to the altar, "not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship of the communion table... or... upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus on the holy table, or in the mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's majesty." And it appealed for mutual forbearance between those who might choose to follow this course

and those who might not (1).

From this date (May, 1640), events followed in tumultuous succession. The ensuing months saw rioting in London, a heated pamphlet war, the Scots invasion of the north, the assembling of the "Long" Parliament (in November), the London petition for the "root and branch" abolition of episcopacy, the liberation and return of Star Chamber victims, a declaration by Parliament of the illegality of the Canons, Laud's impeachment, the Lords' appointment of a Committee on Religion to inquire into the Laudian innovations, the King's consenting to Parliament's determining of its own date of dissolution, the abolition (in July, 1641) of the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission which had been Charles' chief judicial bodies for civil and ecclesiastical affairs respectively, and further negotiations with the Scots commissioners. These were but some of the opening events in the two decade-long revolutions. Most of them occurred after the Scots army had crossed the Tweed (August, 1640) and was firmly established at Newcastle. The presence of this army on English soil was the great lever employed by the Parliament to upset the

1. Lathbury, Thos., A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, pp. 250-3.

Caroline civil and ecclesiastical structure.

Subsequent events, particularly those which most directly concern us, were all conditioned by this military fact and by the political and religious principles which it represented. We turn now to survey the course of events in Scotland which brought the army to Newcastle and the commissioners to London.

3. Toward the Crisis: in Scotland

"Scotland differed from England in the faintness of its political and the intensity of its ecclesiastical life." (1). F.C. Montague's epigram serves as a useful comparison in an effort to understand the nature of the Scottish struggle with the Stuarts, in contradistinction to the struggle in England. Political life there was, of course: the history of the period is beset with the unending jostling for power by the competing and hostile aristocratic houses of the nation. But these forces never effectively pooled their resources of strength and influence in a national political body such as the English Parliament. The Convention of Estates was sparsely attended and, at best, represented only the three aristocratic and semi-

1. Montague, op. cit., p. 203.

aristocratic estates of which it was composed, and not the sentiments and yearnings of the majority of the people. Politically, Scotland was still a feudal state. Democracy emerged in a form other than a parliament. The Church was the only body within the nation which was alike representative and highly organized (1). The most persistent and, in the end, the most effective, opposition to Stuart policy was that of the General Assembly of the Kirk, undergirded by its subordinate courts. And however urgent the political and economic quarrels that the nation had with the crown, and to whatever degree men were motivated by these, the predominant points at issue were ecclesiastical. This was in the nature of the case since it was the Church that spearheaded the anti-autocratic movement. In any case, in these immediate post reformation years, when the Protestant-Roman struggle was by no means

1. Orr, R.L., reminds us that "when James set about playing the autocrat the only barrier in his way was the Presbyterian Church. This is why the struggle in Scotland against arbitrary power was in the main a struggle between king and Church, not between king and Parliament. In England Parliament was the guardian and champion of popular liberty. But the Scottish Parliament filled no such role... Supreme power was sometimes in the hands of a strong king, sometimes of a powerful noble or group of nobles, sometimes of the General Assembly, but Parliament was subservient to the ruler for the time being, it followed but did not lead... it did not govern or guide the country".
Alexander Henderson, Churchman and Statesman, p. 20.

settled, religion was bound to occupy a central place in any popular rising against such a dynasty as that of the Stuarts. For one of the critical factors in the movement of events in the latter sixteenth and most of the seventeenth century was the Stuart leaning toward catholicism, Roman or Anglo-, and that house's aversion to Presbyterianism and Puritanism. Add to this a doggedness and duplicity in pursuit of the claims of royal prerogative on the one side, and an intransigent hard core of Presbyterian conviction on the other, and the principal forces in a tense and prolonged drama are accounted for.

As has been observed frequently, the Reformation in Scotland, as against that in England, was more clearly a movement of the people. Reform was the will of neither monarchy nor hierarchy. It happened at the "grass roots". From the time of the first "covenant", of 1557, when a group of the gentry and ministers pledged the establishment in the realm of the Reformed faith and practice (and commended the use of the Book of Common Prayer of 1552), through to the Covenant of 1638, the Scottish Reformed Church had a sure foundation, sociologically speaking, in the will and convictions of large numbers of the nobility, and increasing numbers of the common people.

"For more than two centuries, " writes P. Hume¹ Brown, (1) "the kings of Scotland had to fight for their prerogative against a turbulent nobility....The new (circa 1580) enemy was the Scottish nation itself, led and directed by their spiritual teachers....They (the clergy) exerted their influence through those General Assemblies which, in far greater degree than the Estates, expressed the mind and will of the most strenuous section of the people. There were many reasons for this extraordinary authority that came to be wielded by these Assemblies....Laymen of all ranks sat in them and in greater number than ministers.... They met several times a year, and always on the same occasion as the Convention of Estates, the acts of which they freely criticised, frequently making suggestions which were but veiled commands. By two privileges of their order... the ministers were enabled to enforce their desires with convincing effect: they (with the Kirk-sessions) possessed the power of excommunication... and from their pulpits they had the opportunity of reminding their congregations of their duties as citizens as well as Christians."

1. History of Scotland to the Present Time,
II, p. 138.

By this period (the 1580's) Presbyterianism was self-conscious and its polity articulated. The indifference of the first Reformers to the question of episcopacy had changed to positive hostility to the prelatical principle. The first great charter of Presbyterian polity, the Second Book of Discipline, was adopted by the General Assembly in 1581. (The Assembly had, a year earlier, officially abrogated episcopacy). Besides condemning prelacy as wanting Scriptural warrant, the Book challenged the Stuart pretensions on a second point. It declared Church and state to belong to two distinct jurisdictions, within which, neither may invade the other. The estates refused to ratify the Book; the Church, consistent with the principles enunciated therein, nevertheless regarded it as its official discipline.

That the Convention of Estates was, at this period, a mere tool of James VI in his contention with the Church is suggested by the "Black Acts" of 1584, wherein the monarch was declared head of the Church, Assemblies permitted to meet only at his will, and pulpit utterances on public affairs forbidden on pain of treason (1). Eight years

1. "The function that came to be discharged by the ... clergy was at once that of the modern press and a House of Commons". Brown, op. cit., p. 132
James' object was to suppress the discharge of both functions.

later, with a reversal of the Court's political fortunes, the Black Acts were abrogated, but James, in 1597, undermined all Presbyterian successes by packing the General Assembly and, through it, establishing an ecclesiastical commission in whose hands was concentrated considerable judicial power (1). And Brown asserts, "When... James left his native country, he could boast that Presbytery was at an end in Scotland -- its forms abolished and the spirit of its champions crushed"(2). If he did, it was a self-deluding boast. Within three years he found it necessary to summon eight uncrushed champions to London (the Melvilles included) where they were forcibly detained and some ultimately exiled. This made a total of twenty-two leading spirits in prison, banishment or exile when, in 1606, the General Assembly consented to permanent moderatorships for presbyteries, and James did in fact, take another step in the abolition of Presbytery's forms and the progressive erection of an episcopal polity.

Throughout the execution of the Stuart programme for the Church, it was (and is) difficult to dissociate the reforms effected (or attempted) and the

1. This commission, for instance, named and appointed the new bishops of 1600.

2. *ibid.*, p. 185.

means by which the crown sought their achievement. It is possible to argue-- though not very convincingly -- that the same ends, sought by fairer means, might have resulted in a permanent episcopal reform in the Church of Scotland. The Episcopalian historian, George Grub, rather wistfully implies this, when he remarks, "It was through this usurped power that some of the most important of the ecclesiastical changes were effected; and so it came about that the very restorations, which, in themselves, were good and praiseworthy, became inseparably connected in the minds of the Scottish people, with the unconstitutional means by which they were introduced." (1) The fact, however, that the repressive measures were necessary for their enforcement, suggest the deep aversion to the "restorations" -- aversions inspired largely by a not unfounded fear of a Roman renaissance -- in the minds of the majority of the people and clergy of the Church. The autocratic measures taken by James and Charles served only to deepen the aversion.

Apart from certain ordinances relating to vestments and the services in the royal and university chapels, the Stuart reform programme did

1. An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, II,
pp. 333-4.

not bring about radical liturgical innovations until about 1615. Down to this point, the services in the Kirk appear to have been determined more or less by the Genevan-Knoxian Book of Common Order or "Psalm Book" (1). As late as 1601 (during a period of James' ascendancy in the Church) its use was vindicated in a resolution of the General Assembly which read, "It is not thought good that prayers already contained in the Psalm Book be altered or deleted; but if any brother would have any other prayers added which are meet for the time, ordains the same to be tried and allowed by the Assembly." (2)

But with the King's dream of ultimate conformity of the Kirk to the English Church, sooner or later the question of worship must come to the fore, and, indeed, loom very large. On a visit to England in 1615, Archbishop Spottiswoode of St. Andrews, prepared, undoubtedly in consultation with the King and some of the English hierarchy, a list of the "needs" of the Scottish Church. Liturgical recommendations predominate in the statement. "There is lacking," it reads, "in our Church a form of Divine Service;

L. See Maxwell, W.D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556, for the history and pedigree of this service book, and McMillan, Wm., The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, ch. II, in which an impressive array of evidence is presented for its use in the Kirk during this period.

2. B.U.K., pp. 497-8

and while every minister is left to the framing of public prayer by himself, both the people are neglected and their prayers prove often impertinent". If this polemical allegation is true -- and doubtless it is partly so -- it reflects a disuse of the Common Order at ordinary services. But even should we grant the claim that the book was used in some places, it was a liturgy that would hardly meet with the approval of Anglican minds. In another of the statement's articles (which admits the use of the "Psalm Book") we read, "the forms of Marriage, Baptism, and the Administration of the Holy Supper, must be in some points amended." And again, "Confirmation is wanting in our Church, whereof the use for children is most profitable." Other articles call for a revision of the Confession of Faith, orders for the election of bishops, archbishops, and ministers, a revision of the canons and constitutions, and the condition is laid down that all these reforms are to be agreed upon by a general assembly "which must be drawn to the form of the convocation house here in England" (1)

At the succeeding General Assembly, steps were taken, under pressure from the King and the

1. Grub, op. cit., p. 305.

guidance of Spottiswoode, toward meeting some of these needs. A system was adopted for episcopal examination of children that "they may be admitted to the Communion" which is suggestive of episcopal confirmation. It was resolved that a liturgy should be compiled, to be said by the reader before the sermon every Sabbath, or, when there was no reader, by the minister before conceiving his own prayer "that the common people may learn it and by custom serve God rightly". Further, it was agreed that the Communion be celebrated four times a year in the towns and twice in the country, one of these to be Easter Day. Such resolutions, though later repudiated as the acts of an assembly of "prelatical usurpers", were mild in comparison with the King's wishes and with what was to follow.

A committee was appointed for the execution of the order for a new or revised liturgy, and the commission entrusted to receive and revise the draft canons was empowered to "receive the books of liturgy or divine service, allow or disallow thereof, as they shall think expedient, and the same being allowed, to cause publish the same in print, for the service within all kirks of this kingdom (1). It was obvious from the remit to this

1. Sprott, G.W., *Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI*, p. xxii.

committee that nothing more was envisaged than a revision of the Book of Common Order (1). While the committee's work was never implemented (indeed, there is some doubt if the commission to receive it ever met) their revision survives in a draft form known as "Howatt's" liturgy (2). "It was of a morning service," writes Gordon Donaldson (3), "broadly on the Knoxian model, but with a more distinctive liturgical character, and with rubrics which were compulsory and not permissive." And he surmises, "The draft obviously represents the views of the central party who wished, in general, to uphold the standards of the Book of Common Order. It is most significant as illustrating how widespread was the desire for liturgical reform, and how far a very moderate man (Howatt) was prepared to go. It also suggests the line along which unofficial experiments

1. The committee was ordered to "revise the Book of Common Prayers contained in the Psalm Book and to set down a common form of ordinary service to be used in all time hereafter; which shall be used in all time of common prayers (in all kirks where there is exercise of common prayers), as likewise by the minister before the sermon where there is no reader," *ibid.*, p. xxi.

2. Sprott, *op. cit.*, pp. xxv-xxvi, provides ample evidence for "Howatt's" liturgy being the fruit of the Assembly's 1616 resolution.

3. The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book, p. 32.

in the parishes may have been proceeding. In its compulsory rubrics, in its prescription of specified prose psalms and its special occasions we have already at this stage an anticipation of some of the characteristics of the Prayer Book of 1637" (1) This is perhaps an optimistic view (from the Episcopalian side) of this unofficial, unpublished, unused liturgy. However, there is no means of knowing whether it would have found general acceptance in the Kirk, for with the King's further encroachments upon the freedom of the Church, the exasperation point was reached and a general reaction to all royal attempts at reform rendered its use, had it been published, highly improbable.

The climax of crown encroachment in this decade was reached in 1618 with the incendiary Five Articles of Perth. Only under great duress, and after a year's procrastination, did the Assembly submit to the articles virtually dictated by the monarch. Briefly, they enjoined kneeling at Communion, permitted private Baptism and Communion, established episcopal Confirmation (though the term was not actually used), and called for the observance

1. *ibid.* p. 34. That Howatt was Presbyterian rather than Episcopalian in sentiment is proved by the fact that in 1617 he was deprived and banished for opposition to the King's policies.

of the five major festivals of the Christian calendar. The same Assembly appointed a new commission to replace the defunct 1616 body, "to revise the Book of Common Prayers and collecting the Canons of the Church Discipline, and... to take for approbation and publishing thereof." The result was "Cowper's" liturgy (1), which bears a much closer resemblance to the English Prayer Book than the earlier draft by the Howatt committee. "The orders for morning and evening prayer were based on Mattins and Evensong, with ~~om~~ission of versicles and responses and the substitution of psalms for the morning canticles.... Yet the original 'Knoxian structure' was not superseded...." (2). But the circumstances following the passage of the Perth Articles were such as to preclude entirely the acceptance of such a book as this.

The liturgical edicts of the 1618 Assembly at Perth proved explosive. "To one article, that of kneeling at Communion, the strongest objection was felt and the change of posture had the effect of bringing the laity into action and of placing a great

1. So called, because William Cowper, with Bishop Spottiswoode, is believed to have been the key figure in its compilation. See, Sprott, op. cit., pp. xxxvi ff; and Donaldson, op. cit. pp. 36 ff.

2. Donaldson, op. cit., p. 37. The text, with "Howatt's" is available in Sprott, op. cit.

part of the nation in direct opposition to the king... There was a general alarm that the king was about to introduce all the ceremonies of the Church of England; and his claim of having a right to govern the Church now openly avowed, was openly resisted." (1). The popular pressure was such that James resolved to have Parliamentary sanction for the Articles; but they only passed the Estates on the condition that the King "would never burden them with any more ceremonies during his lifetime." (2). And with no more were they burdened until some four years after his death.

A result of the Perth Articles was the emergence of a new feature in post-reformation Scottish religious practice, the private conventicle. This was a type of meeting which, in later days of persecution, was to figure so prominently, and to become a part of the great legend of the Covenanters. In 1619 groups of Edinburgh citizens, who refused to communicate kneeling in the city churches, went to nonconforming rural kirks. This resistance movement grew rapidly and soon private house meetings were taking place, led by deposed ministers. The groups were denounced by the conforming clergy as

-
1. Spratt, op. cit., p. xxxiii.
 2. Calderwood, quoted in Spratt, op. cit., p. xxxiii

"conventicles" and were popularly labelled "candle-light congregations", "puritans", "separatists", and "anabaptists". (1). Independent action of this kind was viewed by the Church generally as seditious and schismatic, and later was to vex the General Assembly and threaten to split the Covenanting movement.

Of the ecclesiastical aspirations, assumptions, and methods of the ill-fated Charles I some notice has already been taken. His claim to prerogative applied equally to the Scottish Church as to the English. But from his northern subjects, he was even more remote than from his southern. "Charles grew up with little knowledge of human nature and complete ignorance of Scottish human nature," writes a modern Scot (2). His first major conflict with the Scots came when he sought to apply his theory of royal prerogative in the practical terms of Scottish revenues. His object was the recovery of the ancient Church lands from the nobility into the control of the Church's earthly and royal head, presumably for the benefit of the Church. This bitter encounter was followed by the crisis of the 1633 Parliament at which the King subdued the Estates

1. Grub. op. cit., p. 326; and Henderson, G.D., Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 100.

2. Orr, op. cit., p. 48 .

and ran rough-shod over their rights.

Charles was in Scotland this year, the occasion being his Scottish coronation. That event, itself, forbode trouble. The ceremony at the royal chapel of Holyrood was splendid in the dignity, colour, ritual and symbolism of a high-episcopal service, much to the alarm of most of the Scots subjects who beheld it. Probably the service's most symbolic aspect was one of a nonliturgical kind: William Laud's part in it. The Bishop of London was, throughout, the master of ceremonies. His was the genius which organized the service in every ceremonial detail, and his the firm hand which ensured its correct performance. He was later to bring the same genius and the same firm hand to bear upon the wider ecclesiastical life of the kingdom, with results as disastrous as the coronation was apparently successful. His translation to Canterbury, on the royal party's return to London, was, in Burton's opinion, of greater significance than Archbishop Spottiswoode's appointment to the civil post of Lord High Chancellor, or the erection of the new diocese of Edinburgh (in themselves, provocative steps).

Heretofore (Laud) had meddled in the affairs of Scotland: now he dictated the ecclesiastical policy of the country; and with him the ecclesiastical policy was

supreme over civil. He evidently entertained no project of asserting the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury over the hierarchy in Scotland. He was the king's minister, adviser, and organ as to ecclesiastical affairs, those of Scotland included; and he acted as a statesman rather than a prelate. His function was like that of a colonial secretary, who communicates the instructions of the home government to the governor of a colony. (1).

The Scots hierarchy, dependent on the crown for position and sustenance, had no alternative but to hearken to the voice of this minister of the crown.

Consistent with the principle of absolute royal prerogative over the Church, there were emitted from London two documents which, in their combined effect, initiated the convulsion which destroyed both prelate and monarch, and, for a time at least, upset prelacy and monarchy. These were the Canons of 1636 and the Prayer Book of 1637. The Canons formally established a fullblown prelati- cal polity in the Church of Scotland, and in so doing obliterated such Presbyterian courts as still functioned. Of the Canons, Burton writes,

It may safely be said that they stood alone among the State papers of Christian Europe. Whoever may have given personal help in their preparation, they were adopted by the King, and were as much his sole personal act as if he had penned them all alone... and sent

1. Burton, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

them as a despatch to those who were to obey his injunctions. On no record of ecclesiastical council or other deliberative body is any trace of their formulation or adoption to be found.

(Nor were the Scots prelates consulted, let alone the General Assembly).

Whatever humiliation the (Scots) prelates may have felt on seeing their authority usurped by one man, and he an English prelate, they had to endure it all in silence; for they were in the position of those who have no friends. The powerful aristocracy were their bitter enemies, and a democratic party equally hostile to them was waxing in size and strength. (1).

During their Edinburgh visit in 1633, Charles and Laud reopened the question of the new liturgy with the leading Scottish ecclesiastics. The king had revived the project as early as 1629, his purpose being the institution of the English book in the Kirk, thus achieving the desired uniformity throughout both kingdoms; but after tentative negotiations with the Scots bishops, (2) the matter was dropped until the Edinburgh meeting. More aware of the temper and prejudices of their fellow countrymen than the King or the English primate, the Scots bishops, particularly the elder of them, contended for a Scottish book rather than a mere

1. *ibid.*, pp. 109-112.

2. Donaldson gives a meticulous account of these complex negotiations (from 1629-1636) between Charles and Laud on the one side, and the Scots bishops on the other, in *op. cit.*, pp. 41 ff.

adaptation of the English Book of Common Prayer.

The result was a considerably modified version of the Anglican liturgy -- the Prayer Book of 1637, popularly designated, "Laud's Liturgy". Despite the fact that its appearance provoked violent protest, the book bears many marks of Presbyterian and Puritan influence. Donaldson sets forth the modifications which he conceives to be of a Presbyterian or Puritan nature (1). Salient among them are the displacement of the Apocrypha, the disuse of the term "priest", the appending of the doxology to the Lord's Prayer, the option of psalms in place of the canticles in morning and evening prayer, the inclusion of an epiclesis in the eucharistic prayer, and the deletion of the second phrase -- the purely commemorative phrase (2) -- in the words of delivery. (3). The same critic offers, further, a list of features "objectionable to Puritan and

1. *ibid.*, pp. 61 ff.

2. This was in fact, simply a reversion back to the English Prayer Book of 1549, and is usually regarded as evidence of Laud's "catholic" hand in the book. Donaldson, however, suggests that it was Presbyterian, in as much as a mere commemorative conception of the Lord's Supper was "contrary" to Scottish doctrine". *ibid.*, p. 69.

3. The critic adds to these the prayer for the sanctification of "this fountain of Baptism", arguing that while it appears in neither the Knoxian nor the English liturgies, something similar is found in the Directory. *ibid.*, p. 70.

Scottish opinion" (1), which he includes the responses, the recognition of the Christian Year, the ornaments rubric (with ornaments as yet unstipulated) the altarwise table, the ring in marriage, and Confirmation.

Of Laud's association with this book, Donaldson remarks,

Probably no one would now seriously contend that the traditional term 'Laud's Liturgy'... represents the substance of historical truth. The fuller information which has now become available about the composition of the liturgy... confirms the view that the responsibility for the chief characteristics of the book of 1637 belongs to the Scottish bishops and not to the king or to Laud...Laud's attitude, at least in the earlier stages of the revision, was wholly negative and obstructive and it is highly ironical that the Scottish Liturgy should go by the name of the man who pressed so hard for the introduction to Scotland of the English Liturgy (2).

However, remembering that this Scottish Liturgy is the English Liturgy, revised, and that the attempt, in 1636 and 1637, to enforce it upon Scotland was made, not by the Scots bishops, who, by themselves, were utterly powerless, but by the autocratic action of the King and his chief minister for ecclesiastical affairs, William Laud, the designation of "Laud's Liturgy" does not seem too inappropriate or especially

-
1. ibid. pp. 73 ff.
 2. ibid., pp. 78-9

ironical.

Events consequent to the imposition of this Book of Common Prayer are common knowledge and need little more than mention here. The service book was given its first liturgical reading in July 1637, which service precipitated the infamous riots of Edinburgh, the temporary interdiction of both Prayer Book and Common Order, the organization of the opposition with, first, permanent commissioners, and then the "Tables", to deal with the Council, and the signing of the National Covenant in 1638, in which was pledged the "defence and preservation of the ... true Religion, Liberties, and Lawes of the Kingdome. As also to the mutual defence ... every one of us of another in the same cause of maintaining the true Religion and his Majesty's Authority, with our best counsel, our bodies, meanes, and whole power, against all sorts of persons whatsoever" (1). During the

1. Dickinson, W.C., and Donaldson, Gordon, A Source Book of Scottish History, p. 102. In itself, the Covenant was "essentially a constitutional and not a revolutionary document." *ibid.* p. 104. G.D. Henderson rather cryptically sums up the Covenanters' grievances: "The Covenanters stood for the Reformation (against Rome), Constitutionalism, (against Tyranny), Calvinism (against Arminianism) Presbyterianism (against Prelacy), Scottish Independence (against English interference) and Puritanism in morals, arts and everything (against the Devil)."

Religious Life in the Seventeenth Century Scotland

summer of 1638, in the negotiations with the King, through his High Commissioner, the Marquess of Hamilton, and the Council, the Covenanters won from the King a number of concessions, though there can be little doubt of Charles' intention to reclaim as much as possible of what he had conceded at the opportune moment. He yielded to their demands for a General Assembly and Parliament, though he insisted that the Assembly should be exclusively clerical in its composition and that the bishops be included. He further consented to the abolition of the High Commission Court, and the withdrawal of the Perth Articles, the Canons, and the Prayer Book.

Contrary to the King's wishes, the Assembly, which was called for November, 1638, in Glasgow, was elected according to the presbyterian constitution of 1597. Lay-elders were predominant in a carefully packed house. Hamilton, who described his task there as being to "defend royal authority and monarchical government already established, under which I do conceive episcopacy to be comprehended"(1), found it necessary to dissolve the Assembly on constitutional grounds. In an act of public defiance, the Assembly remained in session as self-constituted,

1. Orr, op. cit., p. 180.

and transacted the business of disciplining the bishops, tearing down the episcopal structure which had been so painfully reared over the past 30 years, and re-establishing the old presbyterian polity. There can be no question but that these actions were outlawry and, therefore, tantamount to revolt against the existing powers and constitutions (1). Primarily, they were an open declaration of the Church's right to order its own life, doctrine and worship, (2), but beyond this, and inseparable from it, they were an assertion of national independence.

1. The usual justification offered is that it was a righteous rebellion against an evil autocracy which itself had played loosely with the law of the land; the laws it defied were the laws of a tyrant. As John Cunningham answers the charge that as an ecclesiastical court, it went beyond its province: "The Assembly of 1638 embraced the parliament; it was the convened representatives of all the states; its voice was the voice of the people." And anyway "Great movements seldom square themselves with the law." The Church History of Scotland, II. p. 107.

2. Worship was one of the predominant concerns in the minds of many who were involved in the fray, whatever other and underlying interests and motives might have moved some. "Worship", writes D.H. Hislop, "became the arena in which was fought a great question and wherein a spiritual issue was raised which had nothing to do with worship itself. This issue was freedom, and since in Scotland the assertion of freedom was linked with political aspirations toward liberty, the historic structure of worship was sacrificed on the altar of liberty. The noblest devotions of the past were neglected and even the use of the Lord's Prayer became suspect. From the standpoint of liturgical worship and the beauty of holiness, it was a night of darkness. Other vital issues were at stake, but worship as an art was demolished." Our Heritage in Public Worship, p. 197.

Forces were raised on both sides and when the two armies met at the Tweed, it was obvious to Charles which had the military advantage. He therefore temporized with the Scots, permitting a meeting of Parliament and a free (and constitutional) General Assembly. It was understood that the Assembly would formalize the resolutions of the Glasgow meeting and the Parliament would ratify the same. Charles, in effect yielding up episcopacy, (1) received, in return, the dissolution of the powerful Tables, and the restoration to the crown of the captured castles. The Assembly and Parliament in 1639 enacted the expected legislation and in addition, the latter court attempted to curtail the civil powers of the king. The upshot was a resumption of hostilities. Newcastle was occupied by the Covenanting forces, and commissioners, representing both Parliament and Kirk, were sent to London to deal with the king and, as it happened

1. That this was a pro tem concession in the King's mind is indicated in a letter that he subsequently addressed to Spottiswoode, in which he wrote in part, "We do hereby assure you that it shall be still our chiefest studies how to rectify and establish the government of that Church aright, and to repair your losses, which we desire you to be most confident of... Though we may perhaps give way for the present to that which will be prejudicial both to the Church and our own Government, yet we shall not leave thinking in time how to remedy both."
Burton, op. cit., p. 274.

with members of the English Parliament. From approximately this point onward, the centre of the events which most vitally affected both kingdoms was Westminster.

Before turning our attention to Westminster, one further observation might be made. Notice has been taken of the general similarity between English Puritan and Scottish Presbyterian criticisms of the English liturgy. This begs the question of "Puritan influence" in Scotland. To what extent was this common attitude toward the Prayer Book determined by a common heritage in Geneva, and how much can be attributed to the permeation northwards of anti-liturgy ideas? Again, to what degree were the more radical prejudices toward all set forms (as the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Doxology) indigenous and to what extent were they imported from the left-wing Puritan circles in the southern kingdom, where they had appeared earlier? There are no decisive answers. Undoubtedly their common roots in Calvinism and the Genevan worship form conditioned development of the thought and practice of both English Puritan and Scots Presbyterian along similar lines. Both, to a greater or less degree, held the Genevan Form of Prayer as a model, if not an authority. In England, however, its use in the form of the "Waldgrave Liturgy", circa 1584, was

"almost exclusively confined to Northamptonshire" despite the fact that it was offered to Parliament in 1584 as a substitute for the Prayer Book (1). It is impossible to know how wide would have been its reception among English Puritans had the political circumstances favoured its authorization or toleration. In any case, it might safely be said that a general acknowledgement of the Genevan mode by both Scots and English Puritans would determine a shared antipathy to certain features of the Anglican liturgy (2).

1. Davies, Horton, The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 122.

2. Dr. Donaldson suggests that the "Black Acts" exiles in England, who found conditions under Elizabeth no less foridable than under James in Scotland were directly influenced by Puritan ideas. In 1584 they drew up a statement which "shows how thoroughly some Scottish presbyterians had by this time come to accept the English puritan objection to the Book of Common Prayer. The document shows all the signs of being, not an independent production, but a copy by a Scot of a typical English statement of the period, containing the stock puritan criticisms" op. cit., p. 24. That these particular Scots "borrowed" from the Puritans is probable; the statement's twenty-two articles do represent typical Puritan objections to the liturgy. But this is no indication that the Scottish Church would not have had the same criticisms to make had it been confronted with that book at this earlier date, quite apart from any direct Puritan influence. Even a rigid and intolerant adherent to Knox's liturgy could have made these twenty-two objections to the Prayer Book, had he never heard of the English Puritans. 1584 was also the year of the appearance in Scotland of the first Brownist, Mr. Brown himself. He had the temerity to attack Presbyterian polity and discipline and refuse to submit to the jurisdiction of the Edinburgh Presbytery. His Scottish visit was cut short. His influence is of doubtful significance. See Grub, op cit. II. p. 231.

That later in the period under discussion, the more radical Presbyterians (chiefly centred in the western counties, though by no means confined there) absorbed Independent and Separatist ideas, there is less doubt. The first Scots conventicles have been mentioned. The very names by which these groups were known (albeit applied by their enemies) suggest the origins of the conventicle practice. The Scottish Church historian, G.D.Henderson, unhesitatingly ascribes the "novations" controversies which vexed the Covenanting movement and the General Assembly in the years following 1638, to the English inroads. (1). And certainly there was no question in the mind of Robert Baillie, who had to deal with the "innovators" in his own parish, as to the source of their radical notions about the use of the Lord's Prayer, the Belief, and "Conclusions". He traced (2) the views of his protesting yeomen to the "Brownists" -- a general term used to cover the English Sectarians. Certainly this radical movement, which would do away with any form whatever (except, normally, the metrical psalms) was one which recognized not the Scottish-English border.

1. op. cit., p. 102.

2. In an undated paper (before 1642 when he went to the University of Glasgow) quoted in McMillan, op. cit., pp. 90-1.

14. An Assembly of Divines.

Scotland's entry into England's civil war was in the nature of a mission, perhaps even a crusade. To the Scots was given the opportunity and the duty to guide and support the reform of the Church of England by the establishment of presbyterian doctrine, polity, and worship and to achieve, thereby, the long sought unity of faith and practice in the two kingdoms on the sure foundation of the Word of God. "The king and Archbishop Laud," remarks Grub, "had not been more desirous of assimilating the Scottish Church to that of England by means of royal prerogative, than the Covenanters now were to force the Presbyterian government on the southern kingdom by the authority of parliament" (1). Grub writes this of the Scottish commissioners in London in 1640 and is possibly somewhat premature in his attribution of motives. The commissioners that year were in London to arrive at an understanding with the English government in the interests of their own civil and religious liberties (2). They

1. Grub, op. cit., III. p. 83. Episcopalian Grub makes this sound slightly sinister. But while doubtless the element of sweet revenge was not entirely absent, there can be no question of the sincerity of those who led the crusade, however blindly obsessed they might have been.

2. "They themselves had felt that even in Scotland they must not fall back purely and simply on the status quo, as it existed before the recent innovations (footnote cont. next page)....

negotiated with both sides in the English dispute. In the course of the ensuing months it became increasingly clear to them which side offered the more hopeful and attractive terms. Charles, whatever he promised in extremity, remained adamantly Episcopalian and could therefore offer no convincing guarantee of the future security of the recent Scottish gains. The Parliamentary party and the Puritan clergy, on the other hand diligently wooed the Covenanters with talk of reforming the English Church according to the dictates of the Word of God, which, to the Scots, could mean only a presbyterian reform. They made overtures to successive meetings of the General Assembly expressing the hope that both kingdoms might have one confession of faith, one directory for worship, one catechism and one form of church government, and indicating their intention of appointing an assembly of divines to work toward this end. Royalists though the Scots remained (in principle), they perceived a higher loyalty in the cause of true

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 were pressed on them, content with thir old Confession and Catechism and Book of Common Order, but that further safeguards must be devised and additional securities taken against the danger of any recurrence to that policy which had wrought them such havoc and woe." Mitchell, A.F., The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, pp. 102-3.

religion. "A great idea was now (1642) filling the vision of Presbyterian Scotland. At first it had loomed dimly in the distance; it had gradually become nearer and nearer; and now it seemed quite within its grasp. Scotland was ambitious of bestowing on England the blessings of Presbytery. They felt themselves bound to present this as an article of their faith... a part of their religion." They would have "the proud distinction of bringing back prelatic England to the purity of apostolic times". And John Cunningham adds, "Nor were their hopes altogether unfounded. Many of the Puritans were known to be Presbyterians; Independency was still in its infancy; and the parliamentary leaders secured the assistance of Scotland by flattering its ambition."(1)

The Parliamentary party, on its side, had no intentions of establishing Presbytery in the Scottish sense of it. They were concerned to put down clericalism in whatever form, and Scottish Presbyterianism promised only the replacement of one form of clericalism by another. Thus Orr writes:

The grievance felt by the great mass of Englishmen was against the powers and pretensions of their bishops. They wished these severely curtailed; if that

1. op. cit., pp.128-9.

were done they would have been content with a moderate episcopal system. Failing such a reform, they were prepared to get rid of bishops and adopt the system which cast them out altogether. Such men were accounted presbyterian, and so they were in the sense that they preferred their Church to be without bishops than to be ruled by the kind of bishops they knew. Many of the so-called presbyterians in the English Parliament were men of this stamp. But they had no belief in the divine right of presbytery, and no idea of accepting the Scottish view of a Church claiming jurisdiction in spiritual matters independent of the State. That view of the relation of Church and State was alien if not abhorrent to the English mind. The supremacy of the State over the Church was to them a part of their creed; it was rooted in the history and traditions of England. The Long Parliament held it as firmly as Henry VIII or Charles I, only they held the supremacy to be not in the king alone but in the king and Parliament..... (1)

1. op. cit. p. 321-2. See also Shaw, A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, I, pp. 3-4 and 100 ff. Hetherington views it otherwise: "Both the example of other churches... and their own already begun practice, had led them so far onward to the Presbyterian model, that they would almost inevitably have assumed it altogether apart from the influence of Scotland. In truth, that influence was exerted and felt almost solely in the way of instruction, from a Church already formed, to one in the process of formation; and none would have been more ready than the Scottish commissioners themselves to have repudiated any other kind of influence." History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, p. 130. This is very fanciful. Equally partisan, but in this instance, more accurate, is Clarendon, who writes, "Few of the commons wished to destroy the hierarchy: they were for moderate episcopacy. This would have satisfied the popular leaders, but was offensive to the Scots. The necessity of humouring that prejudiced people led the majority in the commons to give more countenance to the bill for abolishing episcopacy." quoted in Lathbury, A History of the (footnote cont. on next page)

About the reform of worship, there was more enthusiasm, though the zeal was by no means shared by all. By June, 1642, Parliament "made no concealment of its intention to attempt a reform of the liturgy after advice had with the intended assembly of divines.... Pending such action, however, the situation regarding the Prayer-Book and the performance of Divine service was decidedly uncertain, and great laxity and difference of practice prevailed"(1). "Before, therefore, the liturgy was set aside by authority," writes Lathbury, "it ceased to be used; and those ministers who adopted it become obnoxious to the parliament, and generally lost their livings. The people were gradually prepared for the destruction of the ancient order" (2).

With the outbreak of the civil war, Scottish aid became essential to the Parliamentary success,

(footnote cont. from previous page)

English Episcopacy, p. 143. A Parliamentary declaration to the nation in April, 1642. reads: "The Lords and Commons do declare that they intend a due and necessary reform of the government and liturgy of the Church, and to take away nothing in one or the other but what shall be evill and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome; and on the better effecting thereof speedily to have consultation with godly and learned divines. And... they will... use their utmost endeavours to establish learned and preaching ministers...." Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714) p. 98.

1. Shaw, op. cit., I., p. 117.
2. Lathbury, op. cit., p. 161.

and a condition of this support was the abrogation of episcopacy and the establishment of the promised assembly of divines. Parliament procrastinated several months, even after avowing its good intentions to the Scots (1), but the conditions were finally met by June, 1643. An assembly of divines was necessary in any case, the ecclesiastical revolution having gone as far as it had. The old order, as much of it as was left, was deteriorating rapidly and a new structure was urgently needed to replace it. This was a work for ecclesiastics. The function of the Assembly was to provide the necessary blueprints for a new, or reformed, ecclesiastical edifice. The ordinance (June, 1643) of Parliament constituting the Assembly gives some indication of the revolutionary nature of the task being laid upon it. Professing to have found the existing church

1. "We hope" stated the Houses, "by God's assistance to be directed so that we may cast out whatsoever is offensive to God or justly displeasing to any neighbour Church, and so far agree with our brethren of Scotland and other reformed churches in all substantial parts of doctrine, worship, and discipline, that both we and they may enjoy those advantages and conveniences which are mentioned by them (the Scots).... Our purpose is to consult with godly and learned divines that we may not only remove this (episcopacy), but settle such a government as shall be most agreeable to God's holy word, most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and happy union with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches abroad." Quoted in Orr., op. cit., pp.288-9.

government pernicious, the Parliament resolved

that the same shall be taken away and such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad. And for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly and judicious divines to consult and advise of such matters and things touching the premises as shall be proposed to them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel to both or either of the said Houses, when and as often as they shall be thereunto required (1).

Both the avowed desire for conformity with the Church of Scotland and the obvious intention to keep a firm hand on the Assembly's proceedings are noteworthy in this ordinance. The former was a reluctant concession, but had at least to be professed as the final stages of an agreement with the Scots were being reached. The latter implied Parliament's firm Erastianism (2), a political-ecclesiastical

1. Quoted in Burton, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

2. "The members of this Assembly", notes Burton, "were not left to selection through any ecclesiastical organization. They were named by Parliament. They consisted of ten Peers, and 20 members of the Commons as lay assessors, and 121 clergymen. The constitution of the body was shifted from time to time, according to the rate of attendance and other incidents; but Parliament never quitted a firm hold on its construction and power. The Proculator or president, Dr. Twiss, was named by Parliament; and when difficulties and disputes arose, they were referred to Parliament". *Ibid.*, p. 380. Burton conjectures that the Independents were deliberately
(footnote cont. on next page)

philosophy, which if retained must render conformity with Presbyterian Scotland impossible.

Through the first half of 1643 Parliament had deliberately delayed committing the nation in any effective way to the proposition of uniformity with Scotland, and the promised commission to the General Assembly was not appointed until military misfortunes left no alternative. "There was a very remarkable parallel between these (military) events and the action of the two Houses in the matter of the Scotch negotiations", observes W.A. Shawc (1). Thus Parliament had to submit to the stringent terms of a religious covenant with the Scottish nation in order to gain their own political and military ends. To the Scotsmen, the religious cause was the raison d'être of their involvement in the English affair, and nothing short of a solemn covenant, binding both nations, under God, to the cause of true religion and, therefore, to each other, would be acceptable. Robert Baillie

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 invited for their obstructionist value in the Assembly's endeavours to construct a presbyterian polity. Further, "Another element of interruption was carefully planted in the Assembly in the body called in Presbyterian language, 'Erastians!...They consisted in great measure of what Baillie calls 'worldly and profane men, who were extremely affrighted to come under the yoke of ecclesiastical discipline'". *ibid.*, pp. 388-9

1. *op. cit.*, pp. 139 ff.

in his personal account, expressed Scottish demands, fears, and the joy of the Scots at the achievement of the Solemn League and Covenant:

The English were for a civill League, we for a religious Covenant. When they were brought to us in this, and Mr. Hendersone had given them a draught of a Covenant, we were not like to agree on the frame; they were, more nor we could assent to, for keeping a door open in England to Independencie. Against this we were peremptor. At last some two or three in private accorded to that draught, which all our three committees, from the States, our Assemblie, and the Parliament of England, did unanimeslie assent to. From that meeting it came immediately to our Assemblie; in which, at the first reading, being well prefaced with Mr. Hendersone's grave oration, it was receaved with greatest applause that ever I saw anything, with so heartie affections, expressed in the tears of pitie and joy by very manie grave, wise, and old men....In the afternoon, with the same cordiall unanimtie, it did passe the Convention of Estates. This seems to be a new period and crise of the most great affaire, which these hundred yeares has exercised thir dominions. What shall follow from this new principle, you shall hear as tyme shall discover (1).

Thus did the English Parliament "capitulate". While Shaw admits that "it may be that a slight proportion of the Commons had no dislike of the Presbyterian system -- it is certain that a Presbyterian party had sprung up amongst that clergy -- (and that) it may also be that the course

1. Letters and Journals, II, p. 90.

of the ecclesiastical debates of the year 1641 had educated the majority of the Commons, or had habituated them to the conception and terminology of a primitive Presbyterian system in the abstract", he nevertheless insists that "the final adoption of the Covenant was, under the circumstances, of the nature of a capitulation". (1).

The Solemn League and Covenant was drafted and accepted in Edinburgh in August, 1643, and in September, with minor revisions (in the interests of ambiguity on the point of Church polity) was accepted by the English Parliament and sworn to by the members of both Houses in St. Margaret's Church on the 22nd. Thus the two nations were engaged to

1. op. cit., pp. 141-2. Mitchell, on the other hand, rhapsodizes on the Scottish "sacrifices" implicit in the Solemn League and Covenant: "Bidding away the suggestion of worldly prudence, (the Scottish people) resolved with one heart and soul, for the sake of the faith which was dearer to them than life, to put in jeopardy all they had gained, and make common cause with their southern brethren in the time of their sorest need. If ever a nation swore to its own hurt, and changed not, made sacrifices ungrudgingly, bore obloquy and misrepresentation uncomplainingly, and had wrongs heaped on it most cruelly by those for whom its self-sacrifice alone opened a career, it was the Scottish nation at that eventful period of its history. It felt that the faith which was its light and life was really being imperilled, and it was determined... to dare all for its safety, in England as well as Scotland." op. cit. pp. 166-7. The latter admission qualifies considerably the sacrificial character of Scotland's involvement in the 1643 Covenant.

"the preservation of the Reformed Religion of the Church of Scotland, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government", "the Reformation of Religion in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland" in the same respects "according to the Word of God", and to "endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms, to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church-Government, Directory for Worship and Catechizing", and to the "Exterpation of Popery, Prelacy... Superstition, Heresy, Schism, Prophaneness...", to "uphold the Rights and Privileges of the Parliaments, and the Liberties of the Kingdoms" and " to preserve and defend the Kings Majesty's Person and Authority, in the preservation and defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdoms"; to peace between the kingdoms, to mutual defence, and to national and personal righteousness (1).

With this bond established, the Scots were promptly invited to participate in the Assembly of Divines, which had been in session since the beginning of July. For a while it remained a commission of the English Parliament, its transactions were now as much the concern of Scotland as of

1. Dickenson and Donaldson, The Solemn League and Covenant, A Source Book of Scottish History, III, pp. 122-5

England. The Scottish commissioners, appointed by the General Assembly, were invited to sit as voting members, but "this honour they very wisely declined". Rather, "they held the position of ambassadors from one supreme power to another... Their country could not be compromised by any resolutions of that body". (1).

The influence of the Scots at the Assembly, out of all proportion to their numbers, was discussed in Chapter I. The political and military context, indication of which has been attempted here, helps to explain the weight of this influence (2). Haller suggests a further reason. He speaks of the sheer personal power of the four clerical delegates and ascribes it to the peculiarities of the long Scottish struggle with the monarchy, which "supplied a body of ideas, a vocabulary, a social instrument for the organized direction and expression of considered opinion" (3). The Scots, in short, had

1. Burton, op.cit., p. 389.

2. Thus Baillie, op. cit., p. 111, in a letter dated 7th December, 1643, quite bluntly states the relation between the military facts and the Assembly's decisions. He favoured a postponement of the vexed question of lay-eldership and explains, "This is a poynt of high consequence, and upon no other we expect so great difficultie except alone on Independencie; wherewith we purpose not to meddle in haste, till it please God to advance our armie, which we expect will much assist our arguments". By rhetorical or military persuasion, it would be the hand of God.

2. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, P. 105.

both the experience and the tools for effective work in such an assembly of divines.

As could be anticipated, the major point of contention in the long and wearisome deliberations of the Assembly was the large question of polity and discipline, rather than the Directory, or the Confession of Faith or the Catechisms. As we have seen, there was little or no likelihood of the establishment in England of Presbyterianism^s on the Scottish pattern. Political and sociological forces and, ultimately, armed forces, militated against such an eventuality. The handful of "dissenting brethren", the Independents, drew their inordinate power from precisely this fact. Vastly outnumbered in the Assembly, they played their hand with consummate^m skill by taking the battle out of the narrow confines of the Assembly to the wider theatre of Parliament and the community at large, where the balance was in their favour. This they did in the premature (so far as the Assembly's deliberations were concerned) publication of An Appologetical Narration, a skilfully reasoned appeal for toleration of their congregational polity. The Assembly "might go on debating... and finally produce a directory for worship and a confession of faith for the Scots to take home with them. But

2 No?

among Englishmen, from this point on, the Presbyterians in the assembly were but one party to a dispute which had been shifted... to a broader arena and the outcome of which could as yet be neither foreseen nor controlled." (1). With the inhospitality of the whole Parliament to Scottish Presbyterianism, of a substantial part of it to even a modified presbyterian polity, with the Independent sentiment in the army and the army's progressive ascendancy of influence under Cromwell, and the diminishing strategic significance of the Scots army in the civil war, it became increasingly evident that the great Scottish mission must dismally fail. Without the establishment of the Form of Presbyterial Church Government, the Assembly's other documents, including the Directory, had but negligible hope of taking root, for they would want this ecclesiastical structure to sustain them. The rising tide of Independent sentiment precluded the possibility of their effective enforcement as standards for the English Church. Thus it was that the Assembly's real achievement was not the reform of the English national Church, but the modification of the doctrine, discipline and practice of the

1. *ibid.* p. 117. Hetherington, *op. cit.*, pp.177 ff., makes essentially the same judgment.

Scottish Church. For the documents arising out of the labours of this commission of the Parliament of England became the standards of the Church of Scotland.

As to the Assembly's work on the compilation of the Directory itself, the major factors and factions within that body which were involved in its production were discussed in the previous chapter. Some references to debates on, and amendments to, specific passages will be made in the study of the text itself.

An attempt has been made here to see the Westminster Directory in its historical context. And the conclusion must be drawn that while this service book owes its character, in part, to certain theological presumptions and the Assembly's lengthy doctrinal deliberations, the prolonged politico-religious struggles which preceded its birth, and the state of ferment and flux at the time of its compilation were also formative factors.

The Directory is a reformers' document, and the nature of the liturgical convictions and worship practices of these reformers of the "Second Reformation" were conditioned negatively, by the liturgical standards of the politico-eccelesiastical forces against which they were in revolt. Being in

the nature of a reaction to standards which were highly ritualistic, the convictions and practices of the reformers were undoubtedly "lower" than they otherwise would have been, and the Directory, which gives expression to them, partakes of their character. Had Puritanism in the southern kingdom and Presbyterianism in the northern, evolved unmolested by these antagonistic and authoritarian forces, such extremity would probably have been avoided, and their liturgical formulation (had they sought a uniformity of practice) would have borne more resemblance to its predecessors in the two kingdoms. But the Directory is a document -- nay, a manifesto -- of the revolutionary party at the very climax of a century's bitter conflict. No such manifesto is moderate. One would expect it to reflect the excesses of conflict and the violence of revolution, to be immoderate and iconoclastic. The wonder is not that this service book is radical, but that it is so conservative.

This relative conservatism is in part due to the fact that the revolution had not quite reached its extremity. The Directory was a document of compromise between faction in the revolutionary group -- between those of moderate Anglican liturgical sympathies and Scots conservatism on the one side, and, on the other, those whose views of worship

might, for convenience, be called "Separatist" -- at a time before the extremists had attained the absolute ascendancy. In the ferment of changing opinions and the fast flowing stream of events, in the rapid movement from right to left in liturgical thinking among the English Puritans and, to a degree, among the Scots, the Directory stands as a half-way-house. But revolutions rarely stop at half-way-houses, and the Directory was left behind. So that while it was legally established in both nations, it stood little chance of being effective in either.

In a word, the worldly facts of politics and armies, of tyrannies and revolutions, had something to do with the "shape of the liturgy", and, in this instance, gave it a more radical character than it otherwise might have manifested.

CHAPTER IIIThe Holy Scriptures: Read, Preached, and Sung.

Being an examination of the sections entitled

"Of Public Reading of the Holy Scriptures"
 "Of the Preaching of the Word"
 "Of Singing of Psalms"

1. Of Public Reading of Holy Scriptures.

a). Reading and Expounding (Paragraphs 1 and 7 in the Directory).

The principle set forth in the opening paragraph, that since the reading of scripture is a means of grace in worship it is therefore primarily a ministerial function (1), was not only new to both the Scottish and the Anglican tradition (if not the Puritan), but, ironically, resulted in the minimizing of the place of the scripture lesson in public worship. Qualified by paragraph seven, a very guarded permission of "expounding", the result was the abolition in Scotland of both the office and the function of the reader and the emergence of ministerial exposition of scripture, or "lecturing", in its place.

The "Reader's Service" appeared in both Scotland and England at the time of the Reformation.

1. Paragraph two, which qualifies this, is considered in the section on preaching.

In England, it took the form of Matins, which, by early Anglican custom, came to be conjoined with the Sermon or Homily and, when celebrated, the Eucharist, as the Sunday morning diet of worship. Assuming the fairly widespread use in Scotland of the 1552 BCP until the adoption of the BCO, W.D. Maxwell puts forth the hypothesis that the Reader's Service in Scotland, was the "purified" (1) successor to Matins after 1562 (2). In the main, the Reader's Service in the Scottish Church consisted of metrical psalms, common prayers and the reading of the Bible. In the towns it might be conducted (by a lay reader) several times a week; and virtually everywhere, it preceded the Sunday morning preaching service (3). The Reader's Service in some form or other, continued in Scotland down to the time of Westminster, and beyond. In spite of the attempt by the General Assembly in 1580 and again in the following year to abolish the office of Reader, or at least to assert that it had no status in the Kirk, it persisted. Andrew Edgar remarks,

-
1. Or perhaps, better, "Puritanized".
 2. John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 179.
 3. For full account of the Reader's Service, cf. McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, pp. 111 ff. and pp. 136 ff; and Sprott's edition of BCO, pp xxi ff; Maxwell, op. cit., pp.177 ff.

It is evident that readers continued to be employed in the Church of Scotland long after (1580), both during the episcopacy.. and during the ascendancy of Presbytery... Indeed the employment of readers is distinctly sanctioned in the acts of the ultra-Presbyterian Assembly of 1638; and in the records of the Presbytery of Ayr from 1642 to 1645, readers are so frequently referred to as make us think that there was one in every or almost every parish in Ayrshire during that period (1).

Among the English Puritans, a Reader's Service was the customary prelude to "the preaching", if WALD and MIDD can be regarded as normative. The opening rubric in both of these versions of the FF reads:

Upon the days appointed for the preaching of the word, when a convenient number of the congregation are come together, that they may make fruit of their presence until the Assembly be full, one appointed by the Eldership shall read some chapters ... singing Psalms between at his discretion (2).

However, these liturgies represent conservative Puritan ideals and not necessarily practice (3), since conservative Puritans remained within the Establishment and were more or less bound by the Prayer Book. Horton Davies' singular silence on

-
1. Old Church Life in Scotland, p. 59; Acts, p.26.
 2. Hall, Fragmenta Liturgica, I, p.24 (WALD); and Reliquae Liturgicae I, p.17 (MIDD)
 3. Except, of course, in the English congregation at Middleburgh.

the subject of the Reader's Service as such, suggests that it occupied no significant place in "pure" Puritan worship, that is, among Separatists.

According to W.H. Frere, Anglican lay readers went out of fashion, due to Puritan pressure, beginning in the last quarter of the sixteenth century (1). But the retention of the Prayer Book guaranteed regular lections at all services, whoever read them.

In the long run, the Directory rubric under consideration had more radical implications for the Scottish Church than the English. The Independents probably had no Reader's Service (2). The Anglicans, after the Restoration, returned to the Prayer Book. The Church of Scotland lost its Reader's Service.

1. "The standard of requirements for the ministry was raised, and the temporary expedient of supplying the place of clergy by readers began to come to an end; at a later stage they became discredited in the eyes of ecclesiastical authority because they made it more easy for the Puritan preachers to escape reading the services of the prayer-book and to confine himself to the sermon: thereupon they disappeared from history, and their name became adopted as a term of reproach for non-preaching ministers." W.H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 167

2. Baillie claims that since the Independents permitted anyone - lay or clerical - to preach or expound, they did not "scruple the office of Readers and Expounders". op. cit. p. 30.

To be sure, the transition from the old custom of reading chapters to lecturing and expounding was already underway in Scotland when the Directory was established. The ease with which the new custom was accepted by the Kirk -- indeed, the readiness of the General Assembly to regard the Directory's almost reluctant admission of lecturing as a warrant for its practice -- would suggest that the custom would have emerged and flourished had there been no Directory at all (1). The General Assembly in 1645 in an Act "regulating the Exercise of reading and expounding the Scriptures read upon the Lord's Day, mentioned in the Directory" ruled "that the Minister and People repair to the Kirk, half an hour before that time, at which the Minister now entreth to the publick Worship; and that the Exercise of reading and expounding, together with the ordinary Exercise of Preaching, be perfected and ended at the time which formerly closed the Exercise of publick Worship". (2). The idea of an

1. The practice, like other "novations" which entered the Scots Church at the time of Westminster, seems to have originated with the English Independents and Separatists, who, according to Davies, "were noted for their 'running exposition' of the Scriptures". The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 190. It was, he says, of Baptist origin. ibid. p. 95. Baillie found the practice among the Independents quite obnoxious. Dissuasive, p. 30.

2. Rec. Kirk, p. 421.

expository lecture in addition to a sermon is unlikely to have been entirely novel. (1). That such a liberal construction was put upon the Directory's brief word about expounding is attributed by Thomas Leishman to the interpretation given to it by Scots Commissioners at Westminster, who, with the exception of Baillie, appear to have favoured the innovation. (2). G.D. Henderson, in his chapter on this practice in seventeenth century worship, refers to Wodrow's account of its weekday beginnings in Edinburgh in 1638 and implies that this was its earliest known appearance in Scotland. Six Edinburgh ministers in that year took it upon

1. The replacement of the Reader's Service with lectures was not without reverberations. Thus in 1653 some Edinburgh folk "were dissatisfied because ever since the discharging of the office of common reader, there was no reading of chapters nor singing of psalms on the Sabbath-day, but in place thereof a system of lecturing." McCrie, C.G., The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, pp. 224-5.

2. Leishman cites a letter written by the Commissioners while at Westminster to the Scottish Church at Rotterdam in which they argue that "the exposition of a chapter at once is not only lawful, but since the Reformation has always been practiced in some of the Kirks of Scotland, and now is appointed by Synod of London to be part of the uniformity of divine service in all the Kirks of the three kingdoms". "No doubt" comments Leishman "they conveyed the same impression to their friends in Scotland." Story, R.H. (ed) The Church of Scotland Past and Present, V, p.383. This letter could however, refer to a possible interpretation of paragraph three in the section on Preaching as it relates to the custom "always practised in some of the Kirks" of preaching from an "ordinary", a practice enjoined by the First Book of Discipline. See Section 2 of this Chapter.

themselves to convert the daily service of prayer and reading to lecture services. But the burden of carrying them proved too heavy "and at length it fell in disuse and lectures on the sabbath forenoon came in room of it". (1). Whatever the state of preparation for the Assembly's act, certain it is that the practice was acceptable, and was to become a characteristic feature of Scottish worship for the ensuing two centuries and more. The General Assembly advanced the cause further in 1652 by encouraging the usage in an act bearing upon the "promoting of the knowledge of the grounds of salvation and observing the rules of discipline".(2) With the Restoration and the erection of the Second Episcopacy attempts were made to abolish the custom and restore the Reader's Service in the established Church, but success was variable (3) and short-lived. After the Revolution and the re-establishment of Presbytery, the General Assembly (in 1694) enjoined the ministers of the Kirk "in their exercise of lecturing" to "read and open up to the people some large and considerable

1. Quoted in Henderson, G.D., Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 8.

2. Acts, p. 1151

3. Henderson, op. cit., p. 10; Edgar, op. cit., p. 63. Henderson claims that the BCO was restored, the Directory "explicitly laid aside", as also lecturing, and cites Aberdeen Synod records as his authority. op. cit., pp.148-9

portion of the Word of God; and this to the effect the old custom introduced and established by the Directory may by degrees be recovered". (1). But increasingly the tendency was toward shorter portions of scripture "read and opened up" and longer discourses, until the "reading of chapters" all but disappeared from Scottish Presbyterian worship (2). According to the critical Bishop Sage, writing early in the eighteenth century, Presbyterian ministers read "two or three verses by way of text to a lecture, and sometimes perhaps but a corner of a verse by way of text for I cannot tell how many sermons". (3) A complainant in 1758 recommends to the clergy that "ordinarily one chapter out of each Testament should be read at every meeting". And he adds, "It is true that you indulge us now and then with ten or a dozen verses of pure scripture...but as we have no regular plan of reading the scriptures... we only hear detached places, chosen at the pleasure of the preacher and applied to what purpose he

1. Acts, p. 238. And in 1704 the Assembly reaffirmed the act and reminded Presbyteries of their obligation to enforce it. Acts, p. 327.

2. For example, John Anderson of Dumbarton who dared to recover the use of the Lord's Prayer in worship in 1705 would not hazard the restoration of the reading of Holy Scriptures in the Church. Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, I, 1903-6, pp. 168-9.

3. The Reasonableness of Toleration, quoted in Henderson, op. cit., p. 11.

thinks fit" (1). "Expounding" and "lecturing", became two well defined functions. "It is not many years since," writes M.M. Crichton in 1857, "over the greater part of Scotland, there was no part of the Bible read as a portion of service.... After the (opening) prayer, a few verses were commented on by the minister, called technically the 'exposition', and this was followed, after a short extemporaneous prayer or singing a few verses of a psalm, by the 'lecture', -- a more methodical, longer, doctrinal or historical discussion, generally one of a continuous series in some book of the New Testament." (2)

1. A Letter from a Blacksmith to the Ministers and Elders of the Church of Scotland, pp. 4,5. This work is sometimes attributed to John Witherspoon, D.D., but not with certainty.

2. Spots on the Sun, p. 39. Tait, in Border Church Life, describes a Secession Church in 1772 and mentions that there was "a lecture and a sermon occupying with singing and prayer but no reading of Scripture all the time from eleven till two o'clock." And he speaks of a Kelso Secession minister who in 1830 introduced the scripture reading into his service -- "a habit unknown at that time in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland". G.D. Henderson, from whose work this quotation is taken, comments, "Things were not exactly as bad as that". op. cit., pp. 11-12. On the other hand, Sprott says that the old Reader's Service had not entirely disappeared. "In a mutilated form it lingered on till our day (1882). Within the memory of many still living, both in the South and the North, precentors and school-masters were in the habit of reading psalms and chapters from the Lectern while the people were assembling, and a few generations earlier, they read also the Belief, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments." The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland, p. 41.

The nineteenth century, however, saw the recovery of the Scripture lesson in Scottish Presbyterian worship. In 1812 the matter came before the General Assembly of the established Church on an overture from the Presbytery of Aberdeen. (1). The Assembly accordingly recommended "to all the ministers in this Church, according to their discretion, to read at one of the meetings of public worship such portion of the Old or New Testament, or of both, as they might judge expedient". But this was not to be to the exclusion of the practice which had replaced the scripture lesson. "The Assembly at the same time declare, that they do not mean that this recommendation shall in any degree supercede^s the exercise of lecturing, which they enjoin to be observed throughout this Church, in conformity to the Acts of Assembly, 1694 and 1704, as a most important branch of the public ministrations of pastors and teachers." (2) Almost half a century later, in 1856, it was thought necessary to reiterate the recommendation. It was applied this time to both diets of worship. A movement toward the recovery of

1. The overture indicates that "the practice of reading the Word in the Congregation, which is recognized by the Directory... was revived by the recommendation of the Synod of Aberdeen, and is now generally adopted within the bounds of that Synod". Acts, p. 931.

2. *ibid.*

a more balanced ordering of worship was by this date making itself felt, and the latter half of the century saw the re-emergence of the scripture lesson in worship, and the absorption of expounding and lecturing into the sermon. Dr. Lee's liturgy (1857ff) called for two lessons at each diet and alternated lecture and sermon. The first edition (1867) of the Church Service Society's Euchologian contained a biennial table of lessons for morning and evening service, and makes no mention anywhere of a lecture or exposition. The Devotional Service Association's (United Presbyterian) PFS, first published in 1891, provides a table of lessons and ambiguously designates the one address in the service as "the Discourse". The Public Worship Association's (Free Church) NDPW, first edition, 1898, suggests two lessons for each diet, but provides no table, and refers to the address as "Sermon or Lecture".

The emergence of the practice of expounding and lecturing which, for two centuries, occupied so dominant a position in the Scottish worship pattern, can be traced to the Westminster Assembly and its Directory, though, as already admitted, this service book may only have authorized what would have come about anyway. When the Assembly of Divines pronounced that scripture reading was an ordinance

of worship and therefore a ministerial, rather than lay, function, it appeared merely to be combining the old Reader's Service and "the Preaching" under the leadership of the clergyman. But as Dr. Leishman has suggested, the Scots minister "must consecrate every ordinance which he administered by his special function of preaching. As he prefaced a little when he gave out the psalm or called his people to pray, so if he were to read scripture ought he not to magnify his office by interpolating or adding his own comments?" (1). Obviously, seventeenth and eighteenth century opinion was that he should. It made for an excessively prolix and didactic service, but the result surely must have been a people knowledgeable in theology and the scriptures. But one must acknowledge the cogency of the criticism offered by the aforementioned mid-eighteenth century rebel, against this clericalism. He complains that "the whole plan of our worship is as happily calculated for making a property of the laity, and keeping their judgments and consciences in the power of the parson, as any part of the popish system: for the

1. in Story, op. cit., V, p. 382.

minister need not read any part of scripture unless he pleases; he may chuse what place he thinks proper, may begin where he inclines, and break off when he has a mind...." (1). Be that as it may, Scottish Presbyterian worship from Westminster to the mid-nineteenth century was, as N.M. Crighton described it, "a long series of sermons" (2).

b). The Selection of Lessons (Paragraphs 3,4,5, and 6 in the Directory).

The paragraphs three to six, concerning what is to be read, the amount to be read at a given service, and the procedure to be adopted in the selection and sequence of lessons,³ are the Directory substitute for a lectionary. The principle (set forth in paragraph five) of reading the books of the Old and New Testament in course is soundly Reformed, the practice having evolved among the continental Reformers as a corrective to the cramping limitations of the old Roman lectionary (4). And the principle was applied, in differing ways, in both the English and the Scottish usage.

-
1. Letter from a Blacksmith, p. 6. This overlooks the daily reading of scripture in family worship.
 2. Spots on the Sun, p. 42.
 3. Of necessity, some of these things were touched on in (a) above; but, as far as possible, repetition is avoided.
 4. For a full account of this evolution on the continent, see Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, pp. 180 ff.

The English Prayer Book, in all three pre-Westminster editions, reads:

The Old Testament is appointed for the first lesson, at Morning and Evening Prayer and shall be read through every year once, except certain books and chapters which be least edifying, and might best be spared, and therefore left unread.

Included under the Old Testament were lessons from the Apocrypha.

The New Testament is appointed for the second lessons, at Morning and Evening Prayer, and shall be read over orderly every year thrice, beside the Epistles and Gospels (propers of the Eucharist); except the Apocalypse, out of which there be only certain lessons appointed, upon divers proper feasts.

The lectionary was based on the civil year and began, on January 2nd (1), with Genesis 1 and 2 as the first lessons, morning and evening, and Romans 1 and Matthew 1 as the second. Each lesson was normally one chapter in length. In the earlier editions, remarkably few proper lessons, which would break the sequence, were prescribed. The 1559 Prayer Book was the first to acknowledge the ecclesiastical year, so far as the lectionary for daily service is concerned, by giving proper lessons for each Sunday.

Clearly, the Reformed notion of reading scripture in course was the informing principle in the early BCP lectionary for Morning and Evening Prayer.

1. January 1st, being the feast of Circumcision, had a proper lesson.

The Puritan objection to the Prayer Book lectionary was at three main points: i). the inclusion of 134 chapters out of the Apocrypha and the exclusion of 182 canonical chapters; ii). the "anthologizing" tendency, and the "shredding" of Epistles and Gospels in the Eucharist; and iii) its proper lessons for festive and holy days, the Puritans regarding the Church Year as being without Biblical warrant. A further difficulty is presented by the fact that the lectionary assumes a daily offering of morning and evening prayer, with lessons fixed to calendar dates. Less frequent services disrupted the continuity.

The Scottish Church applied the same principle of continuity differently. The First Book of Discipline enjoined it as

most convenient that the Scriptures be read in order: that is that some Book of the old or new Testament be begun and orderly read to the end: and this same we judge of preaching, where the minister for the most part remains in one place; for this skipping and divigating from place to place of Scripture, be it in reading or in preaching, we judge not so profitable to edify the Kirk as the continued following on one text (1).

Thus, while the BCO made no provision for scripture lectures, the Book of Discipline laid down a rule

1. The First and Second Books of Discipline, (Calderwood ed.), p.59. This procedure had the sanction of Knox who, in 1556, in a letter to the reformed congregations in Scotland, recommended that
(footnote cont. on next page)

for the Reader's Service which assured continuity, whatever the frequency of service. According to one observer in Edinburgh in 1635, the custom was for chapters of the Old Testament to be read at the Sunday morning diet and chapters of the New in the afternoon (1).

It is of interest to note that a rubric in the Sunday service of "Howatt's" liturgy, compiled during the First Episcopacy, reads:

..... let there be read a chapter of the Gospel, and another of the Epistles, as they shall by course. (2)

It thereby retains the principle of reading in course unfixed to a calendar, and yet, in a curious neglect of the Old Testament, calls for Epistles and Gospels, reflecting the Eucharist lectionary of the Prayer Book. The second liturgy ("Cowper's") compiled during this period included, like the BCP a lectionary fixed to the civil calendar for Old and

(footnote cont. from previous page)

at assemblies "some place of scripture be plainly and distinctly read, so much as be thought sufficient for one day at a time" and that they "should join books of the Old and some of the New Testament together as Genesis with one of the Evangelists, Exodus with another, and so on, ever ending such books as ye began..." Quoted in McMillan. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, p. 15.

1. From Sir W. Brereton's Travels, quoted in Sprott, BCO, pp. xxv-vi.

2. Sprott, G.W., (ed) Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, p. 9.

New Testament lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, and proper lessons for the five major feast days. (1). This was but a short step from the Scottish BCP of 1637, which the Directory is recognizably a reaction and a reassertion of the Scottish Reformed practice.

The Puritan service books, WALD and MIDD, are, like the Directory, more explicit on this point than their progenitor, the FP. Scripture readings (at the Reader's Service) are

...to be in order as the books and chapters follow, that so from time to time the holy Scriptures may be read through. But upon special occasion, special chapters may be appointed (2)

Baxter's Savoy liturgy, in this as in most things, presents a softened Puritan view. It enjoins simply "a chapter" from each Testament "such as the Minister findeth most reasonable; or with the liberty expressed in the Admonition before the Second Book of Homilies (3).

1. ibid. pp. 30 ff. The rubrical material preceding this table is practically identical to that of the BCP.

2. Hall, Fragmenta Liturgicae, I, p. 24, and Reliquiae Liturgicae, I, p. 17.

3. The Admonition referred to runs somewhat ambiguously as follows: "And where it may so chance some one or other Chapter of the Old Testament to fall in order to bee read upon the Sundais or Holydayes which were better to be changed with some other of the New Testament of more edification, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of such Chapters before-hand, whereby your prudence and diligence in your office may appeare, so that your people may have cause to glorify God for you..." The Second Tome of Homilies (1633) preface page.

The SPS, the paraphrase of the Directory for ships at sea, prescribes simply "some Psalms and Chapters...out of both Testaments (but none of those books which are commonly called Apocrypha)".

As already noted in this chapter, the Directory admonitions about a careful and systematic reading of Scripture were not scrupulously adhered to; indeed, the evidence suggests that they were ignored altogether. The nineteenth century service books, rather than revert to the Directory principle of at least a full chapter from each Testament, and that in sequence, either ignore the matter of scripture selection (as in Dr. Lee's and NDPW) or propose lectionary guidance in selection (as in Euchologion and PFS). The 1940 BCO provides lessons for every Sunday in the year on a two year cycle. Three lessons, Old Testament, Epistle and Gospel are given for the morning diet and two for the evening.

c). Private Reading (Paragraph 8 in the Directory)
The eighth paragraph, bearing on the use of the Bible in families and exhorting the illiterate to learn to read, was appended to the Assembly's draft by Parliament (1)

1. Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, (Mitchell ed.) p. 217; and Journals of the House of Lords, VII, p. 125.

2. Of the Preaching of the Word

a). The Centrality of Preaching in Reformed and Puritan Worship

The central place occupied by preaching in Scottish and English Puritan religion is clearly manifest in this section of the Directory. The very inclusion of so unusual a chapter in a service book bespeaks the Reformed and Puritan estimate of its significance. The only near parallel to this section is to be found in A Directory for Church Government by the Elizabethan Puritan divine, Thomas Cartwright (1). This work, presumed to have been intended for presentation to Parliament in the 1580's but not published until after Cartwright's death, sets forth, in the manner of the Directory, certain rubrical materials for worship, the longest of these directives being entitled "Of Preaching". While it is informed by the same Puritan presuppositions about preaching, it is not as comprehensive as the Directory on the subject. With this exception, if it can be counted at all, there existed to that date no other service book which dealt with this aspect of public worship. Indeed, the question of its propriety was raised in the Assembly of Divines

1. Reprinted in Neal, D., History of the Puritans V. App. 4.

when the section was first brought forward in draft from committee. Mr. Whitacre thought it "needless and not expected; and he queried of what use the Directory (of preaching) should be". (1).

Yet, as the opening sentence stoutly proclaims, to the Puritan mind, "Preaching of the word (is) the power of God unto salvation, and one of the greatest and most excellent works belonging to the ministry of the gospel". On this premise, a Reformed or Puritan service book which neglected to deal with "the preaching of the word" -- and, indeed, to deal with it extensively and "painfully" -- must be judged as neither a faithful reflection of the Reformed-Puritan concept of worship nor an adequate guide to worship. Hence, those who favoured its inclusion, among them the Scots, carried the day.

It was clear you brought up that Directory merely to cozen (deceive) the world; which otherwise might have been startled, to have been without all form, or rule of Worship: for, even your leaders quickly wearied of it, and regarded it not. And one thing clearly followed, that the Preaching was the greater matter of Worship: all the Prayers and Psalms relating to it (2).

However unfair Bishop Burnet was in his imputing of motives behind the framing of the

-
1. Lightfoot, John, Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, p. 277; cf. MS Minutes II, p175.
 2. Burnet, Gilbert, A Modest and Free Conference, pp. 70-1.

Directory, he touches on a major characteristic of this service book. Its normal Sunday diet is thoroughly sermon-centred. Even had the ministry not "quickly wearied of it" as a rule of worship, the preaching would have proved "the greater matter of worship". That, in fact, is what it was, with or without the Directory. As on the continent, so in England and Scotland, the exposition and proclamation of the Word was of the very substance of the corporate life of Calvinism. The sermon, as D.H. Hislop (1) has observed, was the "objective element in worship", the "exposition of a Will declared" in scripture. The Reformed faith placed a sacramental value on preaching and in practice gave it priority over all else. The sacraments proper could not rightly be administered without it, yet sermons could rightly be preached without the sacraments, and usually were. And, as we have seen, the bare reading of the Word, was regarded as hopelessly inadequate to the task of saving and

1. Our Heritage in Public Worship, p. 181. "Since Calvinism did more rigourously apply than Lutheranism the authority of Scripture, it gained a greater objectivity in worship..." observes Hislop. Again, "As the Roman service through the sacrifice offered experienced the miracle of God's presence in the world of space, so this service, through the ministry of hearing knows the revelation of God in the world of time.... Neither in the original Roman nor in the Calvinistic service is there anything vague or indefinite". *ibid.* p. 183.

building up the people, without its exposition in lecture and sermon.

The Word is all one read and preached, but it pleaseth the Lord to work more effectually with the one than the other; thereby approving and authorizing that means and way which he especially ordained for us to be saved by (1)

Therefore, "the Pastor is bound to teach the Word of God in season and out of season" (2), whatever else he may or may not do in his ministry of worship.

In England, preaching and Puritanism were almost synonymous during the eighty years preceding the Assembly's meeting. For while Anglicanism had its great preachers, the clerics throughout the land who preached consistently at Morning and Evening Prayer and at the afternoon lecture meetings, were almost invariably of Puritan persuasion. The Anglicans read homilies (3). The political impact

1.....Thomas Cartwright, quoted in Davies H., The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 64.

2. Alexander Henderson, The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland., p. 15.

3. "Preaching was not regular in every place," writes W.H. Hutton of the Church of England during the reign of Charles I, "and it was for this reason, no doubt, as well as for the propagation of particular opinions, that lectureships were so frequently established...The lack of rules was the real difficulty of the time and the demand for a 'preaching ministry' was really a protest against individualism. Men could do what they liked. Thus Tobie Matthew preached incredibly often, Richard Neile, incredibly seldom, when each was Archbishop of York" The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Queen Anne, p. 110. In what short supply the Church of England was of preaching ministers is admitted, and the serious implication this had for the (footnote cont. on next page).

alone of Puritan preaching is attested by the various measures taken by James I and Charles I to confine sermons to non-controversial subjects (1) And we have Fuller's dictum explaining the spread of Presbyterian Puritanism in England: "What won them most repute was their ministers' painful preaching in populous places: it being observed in England that those who hold the helm of the pulpit always steer people's hearts as they please" (2).

The Puritans protested the unlawfulness of homilies as being "very unmeet for the congregation of the faithfull; namely where it is held competent without the employment of a preaching Pastor; whereas a Pastor's diligent, discreet, and judicious preaching

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 Church when the BCP was abolished and the Directory established is pointed out, by the author of A Dirge for the Directory (1645). He notes the need for "some good provision for the weaker sort of Protestants; for as many hundred Churches in England that have not meanes to maintain a Preacher to instruct the people in God's lawes, there is no sermon in half a year: and this idol, as many call it, being taken away, what grosse ignorance will these poore souls fall into?" With an untrained and ungifted clergy, they are left without either prayer or preaching.

1. cf. Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 382; and Davies, G. The Early Stuarts, p. 22.
2. In Henson H.H., Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century, N., p. 90.

and applying of God's Word, is the power of God unto salvation ordinarily". (1). Admittedly, Puritan preaching was not always "unto salvation", rather unto the promotion of party opinion and peculiar doctrines. Probably the best indication of the difference between Anglican preaching, where it was done, and Puritan, where it was most partisan, is reflected in the "Root and Branch" petition of the "fifteen thousand" Londoners, presented to Parliament in December, 1640. The petition lists the subjects untouched in Anglican sermons which Puritans thought ought to be treated and which they, themselves, undoubtedly did treat with great emphasis. These included the doctrines of predestination, free grace, perseverance, and original sin after Baptism, and Sabbath observance. And among the doctrines and practices which ought to be preached against were universal grace and free-will, the Anti-Christ, non-residency of the clergy, and human inventions in God's worship. (2). But for all its party spirit in these times of heated controversy, preaching was the great positive power of Puritanism; and the wonder is that the Directory precepts on the subject

1. From "Confession and Protestation of Faith of Certain Christians in England", 1616, quoted in Davies, Horton, op. cit., p. 187.

2. Hole, Charles, A Manual of English Church History, p. 291.

are so free from the excesses of partisanship.

If in England the centrality of preaching in worship was a point of contention between the two major parties in the Church, in Scotland, from the beginning of the Reformation, it was accepted as of the essence of Reformed religious practice. While there were, in fact, Reader's Services through the week without sermons, these were alternated, where possible, with preaching services; and while the Sunday diet commenced with the Reader's Service, this was but the preliminary to the main service, and the main service was known as "the Preaching". Such was the Scottish concept of worship under Presbytery and Episcopacy alike. The authority and priority of preaching were never seriously challenged.

The ideal of Scots preaching may fairly be judged by the Directory itself. For this section, if we are to accept Baillie's account of it, is mainly the work of the Scots (1). It underwent, of course, the criticism and correction of the English divines, both in committee and in the Assembly, but

1. Letters and Journals, II, pp.140 and 148. The assignment belonged originally to Mr. Marshall, but when he presented his draft in committee, Baillie wrote "we no wayes like it", though Marshall "be the best preacher in England". Consequently the draft, along with Mr. Palmer's paper on catechising, was "past into our hands to frame them according to our mind".

if we may credit the Scottish commissioners with its broad outlines and at least some of its details, we may conclude that Scottish churchmen conceived of the sermon on a magnificent scale, and of the office of preacher in the most demanding and exalted terms.

G.D. Henderson contends that there was nothing unique about seventeenth century Scots preaching, that it shared its major characteristics with Reformed preaching elsewhere. "Common to the preparation of Protestant preachers everywhere were the Bible, the academic method of disputation, the regular use of the Latin language, mediaeval traditions of rhetoric, and the writings of the Reformed leaders. Even in detail there were strong resemblances between Dutch and Scottish sermons in those days." (1)

But Scots preaching, like English Puritan, lent itself to the contentiousness of the times, and too often the pulpit was prostituted to party polemics and inelegant name-calling. Indeed, by the mid-seventeenth century, an ear-mark of a "Scotch sermon" was, as even Baillie admits (or boasts), its vehement charges and terrible pronouncements of God's judgement upon the guilty (2). Thus an English lady

1. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland
p. 192.

2. Thus Baillie reports with satisfaction from Westminster that the Englishmen Palmer and Hill
(footnote cont. on next page).

visiting Kirkcudbright in 1650 complains,

The sermons which I have heard in this place are horrible, having nothing of devotion in them, nor explaining any point of religion, but being full of sedition, warning people by their names, and treating everything with such ignorance and without the least respect of reverence, that I am so scandalized I do not think I could live with a quiet conscience among these atheists. (1)

Allowance must be made for the possibility of this being an isolated case, the probable English bias of the writer, and the intense dissensions of the times. Nevertheless, Edgar asserts that this style of preaching was "popular, and ministers were occasionally requested by their Kirk Sessions to give a genuine Scotch sermon for the special benefit of some particular members of the congregation" (2) But to admit that there were abuses (3) is not to gainsay the significance of the positive role of preaching in Scottish worship, and indeed, in the

(footnote cont. from previous page)

preached "two of the most Scottish and free sermons I have ever heard... (They) laid well about them, and charged publick and parliamentary sins on the backs of the guilty". Letters and Journals II, pp.220-1

1. The Countess of Derby, quoted in Edgar, A., Old Church Life in Scotland, p. 102.

2. ibid.

3. Critics of Scottish preaching can name more excesses and abuses than suggested here. Lathbury, for instance, blames what he conceives to be a marked degeneration in Puritan preaching from the 1640's onward, on "the unpolished eloquence of the Scots (commissioners in London). Their sermons, so immoderately long, were imitated by the puritans.... There is much more purity of style in..the earlier period...From this time until the restoration, the

(footnote cont. on next page)

moulding of the Scottish national character. R.L. Orr has spoken of the formation, through preaching, "of a thoughtful and reverent people accustomed to great themes and serious reflections upon them by the ministrations of an educated clergy, whose first vocation has always been held to be the preaching of the Gospel in its fulness and the elucidation of the mind of the Spirit in the Word of God. That kind of training did much to open and strengthen the mind even where there was a

(footnote cont. from previous page)

sermons of the most celebrated preachers are remarkable for their verbosity, new and singular expressions, and their obscurity." A History of English Episcopacy from the Period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity, p. 121. Another weakness of the preaching-centred (and therefore preacher-centred) religion of Scots Presbyterians is offered by an anonymous eighteenth century Scot, as he describes the preaching at the sacramental occasions where there was inevitably a large gathering of ministers and people. These events "raise contention, heart-burnings, envy, and factions among our clergy, while they contend for popularity, vie with one another who shall convene the greatest crowd, and work up the mob to the highest pitch of enthusiasm.... It is here that the ministers display their false eloquence which catches the crowd, and consists in a strong voice, a melancholy tone, and thundering out at random damnation, death and hell, fire and flames, devils and darkness and gnashing of teeth..." The contest is "who shall appear most frantick, cry loudest, speak with deepest, strongest and most hollow tone; and be most wrapt in mystery, and scholastick terms." Letter from a Blacksmith, pp. 16-7.

little book learning." (1)

Preaching is the indispensable element in the Scottish religious tradition. And apart from its being a reflection of that fact, it must be said that the Westminster Directory had very little to do with it. It has but to be observed that at the point of the centrality authority of preaching, the English Puritan and Scottish minds were at one at Westminster -- as much so as in any major issue deliberated in the Assembly of Divines, and more so than in most.

b). Some Notes on the Text.

1. Authority to Preach.

The second paragraph in the Directory implies, without actually stipulating it, that only ordained ministers shall preach. The Scots, in the debate on this section, argued that probationers ought to be permitted. That a candidate should have opportunities of testing and exercising his gifts is essential to an ecclesiastical system whose rules of ordination are as stringent as the Presbyterian. Though the matter was left indefinite here, the directory for the "Public Reading of the Holy Scriptures" concedes that "such as intend the ministry may occasionally

1. Alexander Henderson, Churchman and Statesman, p.79.

... exercise their gift in preaching in the congregation, if allowed by the presbytery thereunto".

ii. Choice of Scriptural Text.

The third paragraph, concerning the choice of text, permits of two methods: the orderly exposition from week to week of a chapter or book, and the freer method of choosing a text to expound a specific doctrine or meet a specific occasion. The First Book of Discipline enjoins the former, being as impatient about "this skipping and divigating from place to place" in preaching as in scripture reading(1).

Cartwright's Directory recommends the same:

...in his ordinary ministry, let him not take postils, (as they are called) but some whole book of holy scripture, especially the New Testament, to expound in order: the choice whereof regard is to be had both of the minister's ability, and the edification of the church (2).

G.D. Henderson provides evidence that this was the general practice in seventeenth century Scotland.

"The sermon was from an 'ordinary'. A passage of scripture was selected and this formed the basis of teaching from Sunday to Sunday over a considerable period." (3) Alexander Henderson's description of

-
1. Books of Discipline, p. 59.
 2. The reprint in Neal, History, V, App.4.
 3. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 196. Henderson cites some instances: "At Fraserburgh the ordinary in August 1614 was in Haggai and a year later it was still there. The minister at Rathen in 1619 had been so long engaged with the same portion of Scripture that the
- (footnote cont. on next page)

contemporary Scottish practice is vague on this point. "His text is ordinarily some part of that book of canonical Scripture, which in his judgement he conceiveth to be fittest for the times, and the conditions of his flock." (1). Whether the "times and conditions" determined the choice of "that book" or the "part" of it, is not clear. It is unlikely that the adverb "ordinarily" is used in a technical sense as implying the use of an "ordinary".

iii. Sermon Structure

Following these introductory paragraphs, the Directory proceeds to deal with the sermon itself. And it will be noted that the discussion is based on the orthodox Scottish notion of how a sermon is organized: Introduction, followed by three main heads, Doctrine, Reason and Use. The corresponding divisions in the Directory are at the paragraphs

(footnote cont. from previous page).
 Presbytery had to order him to 'change his text'. On Presbyterial visitation there was an inquiry as to the ordinary. There was trouble at Tyrie in 1617 because the minister preached from 'no ordinary text but as occasion offers'.... At Fordyce in (1651) there was complaint that the minister insisted too long on one text 'as on the fourth commandment ten dayes' and the schoolmaster being questioned admits that he had heard the minister preach two or three Sundays upon one text 'and for a great part the same matter'. Session records at some periods in this century and later give the texts of all sermons and show that to follow an 'ordinary' was the usual practice." *ibid.*

1. Government and Order, p. 16.

beginning: "Let the introduction....," "In raising of doctrines....", "The arguements or reasons...." and "He is not to rest in general doctrines...but bring it home to special use...."

G.D. Henderson says of this period that this three-fold sermon structure was the regular method used among Scottish preachers (1). Alexander Henderson confirms this. "The doctrine deduced is explained and confirmed by Scripture, and fitly and faithfully applied...." (2). Bishop Burnet, writing of preaching later in the century reveals that the method was a well worn "track" and, though unsympathetic, suggests its value:

The preachers went all in one track, of raising observations on points of doctrine out of their text, and proving these by reasons, and then of applying those and showing the use that was to be made of such a point of doctrine, both for instruction and terror, for exhortation and comfort, for trial of themselves upon it, and for furnishing them with proper directions and helps; and this was so methodical that the people grew to follow a sermon quite through every branch of it (3).

-
1. op. cit., p. 204.
 2. op. cit. p. 16.
 3. Quoted by Leishman in Story, op. cit., V.p.392. It is possible to question the extent to which this is reporting of fact and how much is conjecture on the basis of official documents. The Bishop's description appears to be a condensed version of the Directory, even to the last clause which echoes the clause "very helpful for people's understanding and memories". This is worth observing, for it would be futile to make assumptions about the use or influence of the Directory on the strength of a document dependent upon it.

But not all Scottish preachers went in "one track", for as early as 1654 we find Baillie bemoaning a "new guise of preaching" among certain west country clerics. He criticises its "contemning the ordinarie way of expounding and dividing a text, of raising doctrines and uses". The new method "runs out in a discourse of some common head, in a high, romancing unscriptural style, tickling the ear for the present, and moving the affections in some, but leaving...little or nought to the memory or understanding". (1) The testimony of the Scot Robert Kirk suggests that by the end of the century, Scots preaching had strayed far from the norm set down in the Directory. This diligent sermon-taster, having spent a full winter in London and listened there to sermons of Anglicans and Dissenters alike, draws a comparison unfavourable to the Scots.

Englishmen's sermons (he writes) delivered in writing require more pains, are more strong, rational, convincing than the Scottish harangues communicated viva voce which move the affections to aid and contribute for the practice before the judgment be fully cleared. Besides, writing bringeth men to a habit of treating methodically on a subject (2)

-
1. Letters and Journals, III, pp. 258-9
 2. Quoted by McLean, D., London at Worship, p.11. Kirk was of Episcopalian persuasion. He nevertheless deplores the habit of mind of the English clergy who "would wish only to read homilies and prayers. They value not the substance of religion but form, sillabub, froth and ceremonies."

This implies that to Kirk's knowledge, Scottish sermons were unprepared extemporaneous offerings, lacking sound judgment, method and clarity. One must deduce from this that the standard of sermon structure and content set forth in the Directory was not regarded by the Scots clergy in the years following as necessarily normative.

Horton Davies suggests, though not convincingly, that for the post-Westminster English Puritans, it was normative. "That the Puritan sermon was characterized by this triple division is proved by the following citation from an Anglican divine, Dr. Simon Patrick:

Some indeed, I have heard, find fault with our Sermons for not keeping the old method (as they call it) of Doctrine, Reason and Use.

This document, written forty years after the Parliamentary Directory, witnesses to the existence of a tradition". Davies alludes, further, to Baxter's similar sermon structure (1). It may indeed suggest a tradition, but the evidence presented is too scanty to "prove" that it was characteristic of Puritan preaching in general.

Finally, on this point, it should be observed that the Directory itself does not hold this method

1. The Worship of the English Puritans, pp.191-2.

to be prescriptive. The draft from the committee implied that it was prescribed, but this was objected to in the Assembly "as too straight for the variety of gifts, and occasion doth claim liberty". The issue, says Lightfoot, "cost a great deal of time before we could find terms for it". (1). In the end it was "only recommended as being found by experience to be very much blessed of God, and very helpful to the people's understanding and memories."

iv. Of Quantity and Length

As Dr. Leishman has pointed out (2), nothing is said about the length of a sermon. The paragraph beginning "In analysing and dividing his text..." (the sixth paragraph) had in the original draft an implied warning about over-long sermons. It read, "The preacher will handle so much for each time as may be kept in memory by the hearers..." This, says Lightfoot, "cost large debate about long sermons, and whether the people's memory must be the stint of sermons." (3). The resulting compromise, the admonition not "to burden the memory of the hearers in the beginning with too many members of divisions", successfully circumvented the original threat to limit the length of a sermon, by merely advising

-
1. Journal of Proceedings, p. 278.
 2. Westminster Directory, p. 100.
 3. op. cit., p. 277.

against too involved a "beginning". However, the Assembly did reveal some concern about excessively long sermons when it inserted the clause "as there shall be cause" into the draft of the paragraph beginning "In dehortation, reprehension and publick admonition", because, says Lighfoot, "of the tediousness this course could bring to all sermons"(1).

v. Difficult Doctrines

The Directory leaves freedom to the preacher to wrestle with the whole range of orthodox doctrine. It is noteworthy that Pardovan, in his parallel passage to this on preaching, after quoting almost verbatim the first three paragraphs, appends to the third:

By the 8th Art. Cap. 3d. of our Confession of Faith, the Doctrine of the Mystery of Predestination is to be handled with special Prudence and Care. And albeit Mr. Turretine in his Instit. Theol... maintains very warrantably, that it should be taught publickly, yet he thinks it a Subject more proper for the Schools than the Pulpits (2).

Pardovan's cautious interpolation might well reflect a changing climate at the opening of the eighteenth century -- the century that saw the rise of the

1. ibid., p. 280.

2. Steuart, Walter, (of Pardovan) Collections & Observations Methodized Concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland (1709), pp. 105-6.

Moderates. If the observation of the English traveller, Thomas Pennant, is accurate and reflects a general situation, the climate had very remarkably changed by 1772. His description of Scottish preaching in that year indicates the distance sermons had travelled from the standards of doctrinal preaching implicit in the Directory.

The tendency of their preaching is to instruct their hearers in the essential doctrines of natural and revealed religion, and improve these instructions in order to promote the practice of piety and social virtue. Of old, it was customary to preach upon controverted and mysterious points of divinity, but it is now hoped that the generality of the Clergy confine the subject of their preaching to what has a tendency to promote virtue and good morals, and to make the people peaceable and useful members of society.(1).

The Directory leaves the reader in no doubt of its intention that the full scope of Christian doctrine is to be handled in preaching, that while the "doctrine is to be expressed in plain terms", if it should be difficult or "mysterious" and "need explication, it is to be opened...."

vi. Of the Use of Dead Languages.

The question of the use of Latin, Greek and Hebrew in sermons cost the Assembly almost two full morning's debate -- such was their capacity to lose

1. A Tour of Scotland, II, p. 375. Italics mine.

themselves in minutiae. Calamy, a spokesman for the affirmative, argued thus:

We speake to mixt auditoryes...That every word of my sermon should edify all my people is a burden (that) was never layed upon a minister...Some are wicked, some godly, some need milke and some strong meate. I must give to everyone his portion...A minister told me he was converted by a Latin sentence, Malle esse porcus Herodis quam filius.

At one point in the discussion, Nye commented dryly, "There is a disposition in every man that is a scollar to show himselfe a scollar".

Those on the other side argued that the use of the dead languages was unedifying at best, and ostentatious and pedantic at worst. When brought forward, the draft had read, "Abstaying from the unnecessary use of such Languages as the people understood not" (1). The final version as in the Directory is "abstaining also from an unprofitable use of unknown tongues". The long debate yielded an improvement in the English, if not a change in the sense, of the clause.

c) Catechising

It is curious that no reference is made in this section, or anywhere else in the Directory, to the

1. This account is from MS Minutes, II, pp. 178-84.

public exercise of catechising. It was, in Scottish usage, a regular feature of the worship of the Church. The First Book of Discipline directs that at the afternoon service "the young children be publicly examined in their Catechism in the audience of the people, whereof the Minister must take great diligence...." (1). It then refers to Calvin's catechism which is printed in the BCO and which indicates "how much of it is appointed for every Sunday" (2). According to William McMillan, (3) the practice of afternoon catechising was general, though the details of procedure varied. Sometimes catechising was taken to mean preaching on some article of the catechism; at other times, the actual catechising of children. More often it meant both. We find that Alexander Henderson cannot write about the worship usages of the Church without taking catechising into account. Thus in his 1641 treatise he explains that the afternoon service either follows the same order as the morning "or some part of the Catechism is expounded, and thereafter so much time as may be spared is bestowed in catechising some part of the parish

-
1. Books of Discipline, p. 58.
 2. See Spratt, BCO, pp. 175 ff.
 3. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp. 133 ff.

warned particularly to attend" (1).

Catechising was a regular feature of Anglican practice as well. Indeed, in the struggle with the Puritans, it became a matter of particular concern in the Church party to encourage the exercise.

"In 1622 the king (James) issued directions concerning preachers in every diocesan, which contained special rules for... afternoon sermons, and expressed the opinion that preachers would do better to catechise than to preach". (2). The reason for this is obvious. Hutton remarks that "Catechising...was made a special feature of Laud's revival of discipline. It was directed to be held everywhere in the afternoon, and it was intended to replace the sermons and lectures. Its enforcement was a part of that supervision which was designed to control...the lecturer pledged to the propagation of particular views...." (3). All pre-Westminster editions of the BCP, including the Scottish, contained a rubric instructing the curate to catechise children during the half hour preceding Evensong on Sundays and Holy days. It is

-
1. Government and Order, p. 17.
 2. Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 382.
 3. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne, p. 105.

noteworthy that the Restoration Prayer Book (1662) incorporates catechising into Evening Prayer on Sundays and Holy days after the Second Lesson.

The Assembly of Divines, besides going to great pains in compiling two catechisms, states, in its Form of Church Government under the office of Pastors, that it is a ministerial function "to catechise, which is a plain laying down the first principles of the oracles of God, or of the doctrine of Christ, and is a part of preaching." (1).

Curious it is, then, that the Divines do not take it into consideration in their directory on preaching.

It was, in fact, considered in the early stages of the compilation of the Directory. Mr. Palmer was given the assignment of drawing up the first draft on the subject, which draft was brought before the committee at the same time as Marshall's paper on preaching. The Scots liked neither and so, as

Baillie reports, "their papers are past into our hands to frame them according to our mind" (2).

And to all appearances, that was the end of the matter. In the Assembly debates on the catechisms themselves, the subject of catechising technique was discussed (3), but this was after the Directory was

-
1. *Italics are mine.*
 2. Letters & Journals, II, p. 148.
 3. Mitchell, Minutes, p. 92.

completed and published.

Horton Davies, in his broad survey of English Puritan worship says remarkably little about catechising (1), and Neal's single reference to it concerns an "exhortation to catechising" by the (Presbyterian) provincial assembly of London, circa 1655, in which is urged the catechising of the young at the Sunday afternoon diet before sermon (2). Later we find L'Estrange lamenting the fact that in the English Presbyterian worship, preaching had been allowed "so totally to usurp and jostle out this most necessary office. The afternoon sermon hath not that countenance of authority in our Church which catechising hath...." (3). The indications are that among the English Puritans, catechising was not generally conceived of as a part of worship or as an accompaniment or alternative to preaching, and this might explain the apparent indifference of the Assembly to its omission from the Directory for Public Worship.

In Pardowan's version of the Directory, the exercise of catechising is included; and it appears

-
1. Except that it was a part of family worship in some places, *op. cit.*, pp. 281-2.
 2. History of the Puritans IV, pp. 132-3.
 3. Quoted in Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland p. 92.

under the heading of preaching. For the most part, he follows this whole section in the Directory verbatim, with certain omissions, and one interpolation already noted. However, he leaves off at the conclusion of the paragraph beginning "This method is not prescribed..." and in the place of the subsequent material, writes: "Ministers are to preach Catechetical Doctrine, besides their ordinary Work of Catechising, in such a manner as they find conducive to the Edification of their Flocks, by Act of Assembly, 1695, Sess. 17." (1). He goes on to amplify this, and then, like L'Estrange, complains that, despite legislation in its favour, it has fallen "too much in Desuetude" (2). The significant fact, for our purpose, is that in this statement of what was normative in the worship of the Church of Scotland at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Pardovan saw fit to include the exercise of catechising as a function of preaching, and incorporated it, accordingly, into his redaction of the Directory.

-
1. Collections & Observations, p. 108; Acts, p. 252. An act in 1652 enjoins both catechetical preaching and catechising "every Lord's Day... before the whole congregation". Acts, p. 1151.
 2. ibid, p. 110.

3. Of Singing of Psalms

a). Metrical Psalmody in the Reformed-Puritan Tradition.

It is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly, by Singing of Psalms together in the Congregation....

(Paragraph 1 in the Directory)

While this proposition was not axiomatic in the minds of all members of the Westminster Assembly, "the prevalent feeling of the time was that singing was what our First Book of Discipline had called it -- 'a profitable, but not necessary act of worship'". (1). The psalms which it was a Christian's duty to sing, were, of course, the Biblical "Psalms of David". And although it is nowhere stipulated, or even hinted at in the Directory, it was equally understood that they would be psalms in metre. As the Psalter in one form or another, had been the primary vehicle of praise for all Christendom from the beginning, so the Psalter in metrical form had been the primary medium of praise for the Reformed churches since the Reformation. To the divines at Westminster, all of them the inheritors of the Genevan-Reformed tradition, the "Singing of Psalms together" in worship meant the singing of metrical psalms. Their

1. Leishman, Westminster Directory, p. 147

Directory need not mention it.

The metrical Psalter fulfilled two important requirements of Reformed thought and practice. In the first place, it met the basic criterion of Biblical warrant. A document dated at Geneva in 1556, addressed "To our Brethren in England and Elsewhere", which was printed in London in 1644 as the Preface to The Setled Order of Church-Government, Liturgie and Discipline (a book which included an attenuated version of the Genevan FP) is quoted here at some length. It is of interest both for what it says, and for the respective places and dates of its appearance. It contains a statement of the Reformed rationale for the use of metrical psalms. It was written in the city and year of the appearance of the FP, the parent of all Reformed liturgies to the time of Westminster. And it was published, in this instance, in the city and year of the compilation of the Directory. It might therefore be taken as a fairly representative statement of Reformed (Genevan and British) opinion on the subject of metrical psalmody.

St. Paul, giving a rule how men should sing, first saith, I will sing with understanding. And in another place, shewing what songs should be sung, exhorteth the Ephesians to edify one another with psalms, songs of praise, and such as are spiritual, singing in their hearts to the Lord with thanksgiving.

As if the Holy Ghost would say that the song did inflame the heart to call upon God, and praise him with a more fervent and lively zeal. And as music or singing is natural unto us, and therefore every man delighteth therein; so our merciful God setteth before our eyes how we may rejoice and sing to the glory of his name, recreation of our spirits, and profit to ourselves....

Seeing, therefore, God's word doth approve it, antiquity beareth witness thereof, and the best Reformed Churches have received the same; no man can reprove it, except he will contemn God's word, despise antiquity, and utterly condemn the godly Reformed Churches.

And there are no songs more meet than the Psalms of the prophet David, which the Holy Ghost hath framed to the same use, and commended to the Church, as containing the effect of the whole Scriptures....

Here it were too long to entreat of the metre: but forasmuch as the learned doubt not thereof, and it is plainly proved that the Psalms are not only metre, and contain just caesures, but also have grace and majesty in the verse more than (in) any other places of scriptures; we need not enter into probation. For they that are skilful in the Hebrew tongue, by comparing the Psalms with the rest of the scriptures, easily may perceive the metre.... (1).

1. Hall, Reliquae Liturgicae, I, pp.119-21. John Cotton, the New England Independent, states the case for metre more succinctly: "Pre-supposing that God would have the Psalms of David and other Scripture-Psalmes to be sung in English...then as a necessary meanes to that end, he would have the Scripture-Psalmes (which are Poems and Verses) to be translated in English-Psalmes (which are in like sort Poems and Verses) that English people might be able to sing them". He goes on in his support of the metrical psalms with the more dubious argument that the Roman Catholics ridicule them, therefore they must be right. The Catholics had derided them as "Genevah Gigs". Davies, H., The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 167.

A second requirement of the Reformation was that the people be enabled to enter intelligently and corporately into the worship of God-- a privilege of which they had been deprived over many generations by the highly specialized nature of Roman praise, which required musical training and a knowledge of Latin. "The Reformation became an inescapable necessity" writes Millar Patrick in the Introduction to his work on Scottish psalmody (1). "And nowhere was the need for it more imperative than in loosening the tongues of the silenced people by restoring to them the right and power to use their own understanding and voices in the common praise of God. In words and in music new methods to meet their needs had to be found or created; and metrical materials, to suitably simple tunes, furnished the means required." In a word, the Reformers' use of metrical psalms restored the people's part in worship (2).

-
1. Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody, p. xxiii.
 2. "Historians who wish to gain a true philosophical account of Calvin's influence in Geneva ought probably to refer a great part of it to the enthusiasm attendant on the singing of Bourgeois's melodies." Robert Bridges, quoted *ibid.* p. 26. (Bourgeois was responsible for most of the tunes used by Calvin's congregations, and Marot and Beza, the French paraphrasing). The metrical psalms in English published in the FP, 1526, were paraphrased by the Englishmen, Sternhold, Hopkins, (both of whom had already published metrical psalms in England) and Whittingham. The Psalter's title page read, "One and fiftie Psalmes of David in Englishe metre, whereof. 37. were made by Thomas Sterneholde: and the rest by others. Conferred with the hebrewe, and in certain places corrected as the
(footnote cont, on next page)

Metrical psalmody, like other aspects of Genevan worship, was carried to Scotland, and became, in the course of time, so deeply rooted in the national religious habit that to this day metrical psalm-singing is identified with Scottish Presbyterianism. The first Scottish Psalter, proper, was published in 1564, and, for convenience, is generally termed the "Old Psalter". It draws heavily on the Genevan 1556 and the English 1562 Psalters, though its pedigree is mixed (1). It was the official psalm book of the Church of Scotland until replaced by that which came from the Westminster Assembly. "The old Psalter continued in use till 1650", says Sprott (2), "but Patrick questions the extent of its use, claiming that it was "too far ahead of the capacity of the people" (3). Yet it must be born in mind that in

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 text, and sense of the Prophete required. Iam.5. Yf any be afflicted let him pray, and if any be merye, let him singe Psalmes." As in Maxwell, W.D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 63. The tunes, says Patrick, were common property. See op. cit., Chap.2 & 3.

1. Patrick gives a detailed list of authors and sources, noting nine different authors, two of whom were Scots. op. cit., pp. 45 ff.
2. BCO, p. 205.
3. "The 1564 Psalter cannot at any time have had more than a restricted use.... The metres used were too various, and many of the versions were far from simple enough to make memorizing easy for a people who were still, in the mass, unable to read. The music, too, was more than the people could learn...." op. cit., pp. 79-80.

some quarters the standard of musical culture was higher in the post-Reformation years than it was in later centuries. Calderwood's defence of the Old Psalter in which he claims popular familiarity with both its verses and music, is described by Patrick as "an endeavour to make the best of a doubtful case" (1). At stake, in this instance, was the maintenance of the Old Psalter in the face of its threatened deposition by that ascribed to the pen of King James, published posthumously in 1631 and urged on the Church by Charles. The king's version was used in some few places (2), but it is probable that political considerations had much to do with the general aversion felt toward it. In any case, Patrick's verdict is that psalm singing in the Kirk's worship was not as widely practised as might be imagined during the pre-Westminster years, due to the difficulties presented by the official Psalter. And he observes that by the time of the Assembly, "psalm singing was in a very bad way in Scotland", and that "it is significant...that, so far as is known not a single word of regret is recorded when the old version was dismissed from use"(3). When

1. *ibid.*, p. 80.

2. McMillan, W., The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Churches, 1550-1638, pp. 83-4. The king's psalter appeared again in the 1637 Prayer Book.

3. *op. cit.*, p. 81.

it was to be replaced by a Psalter without political contamination, it had no Calderwood to defend it.

In "Howatt's" liturgy for Sunday service, prose psalmody is introduced. There appears after the opening prayer this rubric: "...then let be read or sung the fourscore and twelfth psalm", and this is immediately followed by the text of the Psalm, in prose, with the heading, "A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath Day". (1). "Cowper's" order for Morning Prayer includes the ninety-fifth Psalm in prose with the rubric, "Then shall be said or sung this psalme following". (2). But it must be remembered that these were but draft liturgies, drawn up under Episcopal auspices and the harbingers of the 1637 Prayer Book, and that, therefore, the quoted rubrics can no more be taken as representative of Scottish Presbyterian practice, than many other things these orders contain.

Hymns, mainly metrical paraphrases of other parts of scripture, were not unknown in the pre-Westminster Scottish Church and appeared in many editions of the Psalter (3). McMillan makes a

1. Sprott, Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, pp. 6-7.

2. ibid, p. 46.

3. Sprott lists fourteen of these hymns or metrical canticles in his BCO, pp 206-7. They include the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Song of Simeon, the Creed, and the Magnificat.

strong case for their probable use, and points out that during this period, the Kirk was not as rigid in its attitude to hymns as in later days when only the psalms would be countenanced. (1).

Metrical psalmody was an expression, too, of English Puritan praise.

The Puritan rascals of the country had strongly possessed the soldiers that all the commanders of our regiment were Papists, so that I was forced for two or three days to sing psalms all the day I marched, for all their religion lies in a psalm. (2)

So wrote an officer in Charles I's unhappy and mutinous army for putting down the Scots in 1640. From some points of view it might be said that Puritan religion lies in a sermon, or in an extempore prayer, but the psalms were uniquely the people's religious expression and therefore, in a very true sense, Puritanism "lies in a psalm".

As early as 1559 (with the return of the Marian exiles) metrical psalms were used for congregational praise in England. Strype reports the introduction that year into the Church of England of metrical psalm singing "as was used among the Protestants of Geneva, all men, women, and young folks singing together; which custom was about this time brought

1. See McMillan, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-7.
 2. Burton, J.H., The History of Scotland, VI, p. 297. The italics are mine.

into St. Paul's" (1). Metrical psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins had appeared earlier, and these predominated in the English Psalter of 1562, a much more singable psalter than the Scottish, by the fact that it was less varied metrically (2). It seems clear that from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, metrical psalms figured in English worship in addition to the prose psalms prescribed by the official liturgy. A royal injunction in 1559 read:

For the comforting of such as delight in music, it may be permitted that at the beginning or end of Common Prayer, either at Morning or Evening, there may be sung a hymn or such like song to the praise of the almighty God, in the best melody and music that may be devised, having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understood and perceived (3).

While it does not mention metrical psalms, the injunction was obviously designed to permit their use, in conjunction with the Prayer Book service. "Sternhold and Hopkins" (the 1562 Psalter) became the official version, and Lathbury shows that this psalter "was required by ecclesiastical authority to be placed in churches in the reign of Elizabeth". (4).

-
1. Quoted in Maxwell, op. cit., p. 62.
 2. See Patrick, op. cit., Chap. 4, for full account of this Psalter.
 3. Quoted in Davies, H., op. cit., p. 164.
 4. A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, pp. 508-9.

It was among those of Puritan persuasion that the metrical psalter met with the greatest enthusiasm (1). The prose Psalter (2), remarks Davies, "continued to be sung antiphonally in the cathedrals, or to be said responsively by the clerk and people in the parish churches. (But the metrical psalm) became in effect almost exclusively the one liturgical form in the worship of those who rejected liturgies. For the regular and enthusiastic use of the psalms in their worship, we must turn to the Puritans". (3). As at Geneva and in Scotland the psalms became (with the repudiation of the old liturgy) the people's part in the worship of God.

Cartwright's Directory advocates the same systematic use of metrical psalms as it does of

-
1. ibid., p. 509.
 2. The prose psalms, pointed for liturgical use, were not actually incorporated into the Prayer Book until the 1662 version. Until then, the psalms in the Great Bible (as revised in 1640), mainly the work of Coverdale, were used. However, the use of prose psalms were of course prescribed in the BCP from 1549 onward. See Ratcliffe, E.D., "The Choir Offices", in Clark & Harris, Liturgy and Worship, p. 289. There was, evidently, very early, some question among those in authority as to whether the psalms ought to be chanted. Thus James Begg quotes bishops Grindal and Horn in a letter to Bullinger dated 1567 as saying, "We do not assert that chanting in churches, together with organs, is to be retained, but we disapprove of it as we ought." Purity of Worship in the Presbyterian Church, p. 40.
 3. The Worship of the English Puritans, pp. 164-5.

scripture lessons.

Let the minister that is to preach, name a psalm, or a part of a psalm, (beginning with the first and so proceeding) that may be sung by the church, noting to them the end of their singing, (to wit) the glory of God and their own edification. (1).

WALD and MIDD recommend psalms between the lessons at the Reader's Service "at his discretion"; and two in the service proper, one following the prayer of confession, the other before the benediction (2).

But not all Puritans favoured the metrical Psalter. To some it was but another instance of formalism in worship, and therefore a deterrent to the free activity of the Spirit. Davies sums up the controversy which emerged, thus:

There were two points at issue. Firstly, whether it was scriptural to sing with conjoined voices in worship, since it necessitated a 'set form' of praise; or whether the scripture was to be interpreted as allowing only a single person at a time to sing, when moved to do so by the Holy Spirit. The second question raised was: whether it was proper to sing David's Psalms in metre at all, since this involved an alteration of words and often the thoughts divinely inspired in the Scriptures. (3).

-
1. Reprint in Neal, History of the Puritans V, App. 4.
 2. Hall, Fragmenta Liturgica, I, pp.24 ff; and Reliquiae Liturgicae, pp. 17 ff.
 3. op. cit., pp. 168-9.

Such scruples were shared by certain of the divines at Westminster, among whom was the Independent Nye, who, says Baillie, "did speake much against a tie to anie Psalter, and something against the singing of paraphrases...." (1). Such was the feeling among the Baptists and Congregationalists against this particular "form" during the pre-Westminster period, that, according to Davies, it appeared that the singing of the metrical Psalter would be left to the sole province of the Presbyterians. However, the same authority observes that from about the middle of the seventeenth century there was a broadening of mind on the matter, and the "use of the metrical psalters became more widespread among Independent congregations. Ultimately the earlier scruples were overcome...." (2).

b). Metrical Psalmody and the Assembly of Divines.

The "Directory for the Singing of Psalms" passed through the Assembly with little debate. Exception was taken to "reading the line" by the Scots (see below), but this is the only point of contention recorded. The Independents made no attempt to obstruct, in spite of Mr. Nye's earlier expressed misgivings (3). The mind of the Assembly on the

-
1. Letters & Journals, II., p. 121
 2. Davies, H., op. cit., pp. 170-2.
 3. Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, pp. 343-4; Mitchell, Minutes, pp. 21-2.

significance and function of psalmody in worship is best revealed in the rubrical instructions in the Directory. The first thing to be observed is that there are not many. And secondly, they are remarkably casual. Only two psalms are suggested for the ordinary Sunday service. The first rubric reads:

After reading of the word (and singing of the psalm) the minister who is to preach...

The second comes at the conclusion of the service:

The prayer ended, let a psalm be sung, if with convenience it may be done. After which...let the minister dismiss the congregation with a solemn blessing.

One is in parenthesis; the other, a matter of convenience (1). Psalms are not mentioned in the directories for the sacraments (2) or in the marriage

1. Dr. Leishman hopefully comments, "we may suppose that the two that are spoken of so incidentally under the direction for ordinary service fix the minimum, not the maximum of praise." Westminster Directory, p. 152. The text suggests the contrary. The first might be considered a directive; the second is clearly optional. The minimum is one, the maximum, two. Robert Lee, writing in the middle of the last century, observes of these two rubrics, "What is more serious (than their optional nature) is the omission of all direction or mention of what is to be sung, whether Psalms alone, whether all Psalms; or whether in metre, or in prose, or in both". The Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship, Doctrine and Government pp. 150-1. It is difficult to take this criticism seriously.

2. The supplementary Act of the General Assembly, 1645, adds this rubric to the Communion order: "That while the tables are dissolving, there be always the singing of some portion of a Psalme, according to the custom". Reed Kirk, p. 422. And Pardoan's redacted version of the Directory places a psalm at the conclusion of the Communion Service: "After prayer, all joyne
(footnote cont. on next page)

service, though it must be borne in mind that all these ordinances are intended to be observed within the context of the Sunday morning service, where, as indicated, two psalms are commended.

In the directives for the Lord's Day, the "singing of psalms" is urged as a family exercise (as it is again in the section under consideration). And in the articles concerning "Public and Solemn Fasting," one of the activities in the church is to be the "singing of psalms, fit to quicken affections suitable" for the occasion. Singing is among the exercises proscribed at the burial of the dead.

Indeed, the only section in the entire Directory where psalms are prescribed with any apparent enthusiasm, is that entitled "Concerning the Observation of Days of Public Thanksgiving". The rubrics are as follows:

.... because singing of psalms is of all other the most proper ordinance for expressing of joy and thanksgiving, let some pertinent psalm or psalms be sung for that purpose before or after reading...

And at the conclusion,

And so having sung another psalm, suitable to the mercy, let him dismiss the congregation....

(footnote cont. from previous page)
singing a part of a psalm, suitable to the occasion, and are dismissed...." Collections and Observations, p. 142

(A literal reading permits at least three psalms.)
 Here the true function of the Psalter, as seen by
 the Westminster Divines, is revealed: "The most
 proper ordinance for expressing joy and thanksgiving".
 It is a commentary on the view of worship -- and,
 indeed, of the gospel -- taken by these divines that
 they saw fit to include so little of this ingredient
 in their Directory for the Public Worship of God.

One of the charges laid on the Assembly was the
 framing, or authorizing, of a new metrical Psalter
 for use in the churches of the three kingdoms. The
 Commons, on commissioning the task, recommended the
 version by Rous (1); the Lords, some two years
 later (October, 1645), suggested consideration of
 Barton's paraphrase (2). Full documentary details
 tracing the progress of Rous's Psalter through the
 Assembly and Parliament, its commendation to the
 Scottish Church and the General Assembly's revisions,
 are provided by David Laing in an appendix to
Baillie's Letters and Journals (3); and a narrative
 account is given by Millar Patrick (4). It is
 enough to note here that after it was submitted by

-
1. Commons Journals, III, p. 315.
 2. Lords Journals, VII, pp. 627-8
 3. Vol. III., pp. 536-49
 4. Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody, Chapter 9.

Parliament to the Assembly of Divines in November, 1643 (the year of its first publication) it went through three revising committees, including one of the General Assembly of the Kirk, to which body it was sent for tentative approval, and emerged in November 1645 as the Westminster Psalter. It was authorised by Parliament for use in England in April 1646 and subsequently ignored in the southern kingdom. The version was submitted to the Scottish Assembly in July 1647 from whence, over the next three years, it underwent revisions by at least five different committees and the "animadversions" of presbyteries. The end result was the Scottish Psalter of 1650 -- an amalgam of at least ten psalters which, in all fairness, could no longer be called Rous's. (1).

In his appraisal of the 1650 Psalter, Patrick points out that its major weakness was its real strength. It reduced the Psalter almost entirely

1. Burton ascribes the Scottish Church's failure to credit Rous with its Psalter to political considerations. "There seem to have been contemporary reasons for keeping his name out of sight among Scots Presbyterians". He cites Baillie's letter of September 1649, wherein he expresses some anxiety about the Psalter's progress in Scotland since "Mr. Rous has complied with the Sectaries, and is a member of their republick: how a Psalter of his framing, albeit with much variation, shall be received by our Church, I doe not weell know....." The History of Scotland, VI., n. p. 400, and Letters and Journals, III, p. 97.

to common metre, which meant the loss of "the most splendid Reformation melodies", but made possible a popular usage such as the Old Psalter with its rich variety of expression never achieved. (1).

c). Metrical Psalms in Subsequent Service Books

A Supply of Prayer is only slightly more definite in its rubrics for the singing of psalms than the ordinary Sunday service of the Directory, of which SPS is a liturgical version.

Baxter's Savoy liturgy is more liberal than the Directory in its distribution of psalms; and, in addition, provides canticles. The rubrics read in order:

Then may be said the 95th, or the 100th Psalm; or the 84th. And next the psalm in order for the day: and Luke IV, 16, 17, 18, (& 19?)

.
After which may be sung a Psalm, or the Te Deum said
.

1. "The Psalms in that simple metre were easy to memorize, and it became possible to draw upon a wider range of portions because the tunes used were few and suitable to the great majority of them. Probably for that reason the new Psalter passed straight into the affections of the common people. It was a godsend, coming just then, when the Killing Times were not far distant; for when the sufferings of those bitter times arrived, it had won its place in the people's hearts, and its lines were so deeply imprinted upon their memories that it is always the language thus given them for the expression of their emotions, which in the great hours we find upon their lips." op. cit., pp. 144-5.

And after that, the 67th or 98th, or some other Psalm, may be sung or said; or the Benedictus or Magnificat. (1).

The rubrics do not indicate whether the psalms are to be metrical or prose. Their juxtaposition to the canticles suggests, on the face of it that they are meant to be prose. However, a general rubric "Concerning the Psalms for public use" in effect enjoins metrical psalmody by its recommendation for use in the Church of both the Barton and Scottish Psalters "at least until a better than either of them shall be made". (2). In any case, a consideration of the historical context of the proposal of this liturgy, and Baxter's own Puritan inclinations, suggests that whether the psalms be prose or metrical is at least optional.

Modern Presbyterian service books recommend five or six metrical psalms or hymns at each diet of worship.

d). Melody unto the Lord.

In the Singing of Psalms, the voice is to be tunably and gravely ordered; but the chief care must be to sing with the understanding, and with grace in the heart, making melody unto the Lord. (Paragraph 2 in the Directory)

In psalm singing, as in all else, spiritual

1. Hall, Reliquiae Liturgicae, IV, pp. 31-2.
2. ibid, p. 44.

reality took precedence over elegance of form. Where external things were necessary in corporate worship, the utmost care must be taken that they serve the purposes of true "spiritual" worship, and do not draw attention to, or become ends in, themselves. This clearly applied to music. Therefore, in general, Scots Presbyterians and English Puritans alike were averse to the ornate and ostentatious in musical expression in worship. The Preface to The Setled Order, written in Geneva in 1556 and published in London in 1644, already referred to, states moderately the Reformed view:

But as there is no gift of God so precious or excellent, that Satan hath not after a sort drawn to himself and corrupt, so hath he most impudently abused this notable gift of singing; chiefly by the Papists his ministers; in disfiguring it, partly by strange language that cannot edify, and partly by a curious wanton sort; hiring men to tickle the ears and flatter the fantasies, not esteeming it as a gift approved by the word of God, profitable for the Church, and confirmed by all antiquity. (1).

What is condemned here is not music in worship, but music detracting from the glory of God, simply by being conspicuous. On this principle, Calvin, while he encouraged the singing of the metrical psalms, refused to permit their being sung in harmony (2).

-
1. Hall, Reliquiae Liturgicae, I, p. 120.
 2. Patrick, op. cit., p. 25.

And Knox, speaking of the obligation upon all to worship with the gathered congregation, warns, "But mark well by the word 'gathered', I mean not to piping, singing, or playing.... nor to commit idolatry, honouring that for God which is no God indeed". (1)

In Scotland, during the post-Reformation century, the Reformed aversion to the idolatry of music expressed itself in an increasingly hardened view on the subject of instrumental music in worship and the destruction of such organs as there were.(2). "The prelate loveth carnal and curious singing to the ear", writes Calderwood in 1628, "more than the spiritual melody of the gospel, and therefore would have antiphony and organs in the Cathedral Kirks...."(3) It would appear from this that party prejudice had entered into and coloured the picture, and with the increasing political and ecclesiastical tensions of the times, organs, and anything but the simplest

1. Quoted in Begg, Purity of Worship in the Presbyterian Church, p. 23.

2. McMillan, W., The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp. 94 ff. McMillan claims to find nowhere in the writings of the Reformers or in the documents of the Kirk any negative reference to instrumental music. He leaves us in no doubt, however, that the aversion existed, and that, for the most part, organs did not.

3. Quoted in Begg, op cit., p. 35.

choral music, were stigmatized as "prelatic" and pronounced anathema. What began as a cautious and not unfounded fear of idolatry ended in blind and bigoted iconoclasm. Thus in 1644, in the heyday of anti-episcopal feelings, the General Assembly could rejoice with the Assembly of Divines in the destruction of the organs in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey (1).

The English Puritans, too, probably from an earlier date than the Scots, were violently opposed to instrumental and choral music in the Church. The repudiation, in 1567, of chanting and organs, by the Puritan bishops Grindal and Horn, and the petition to Parliament of 1568 against the "piping of organs, singing, ringing, and the trawling of Psalms" may be taken as instances. (2)

But the approach to corporate praise that put "grace in the heart" ahead of grace in a tune, the "spirit" of worship ahead of the means, resulted (in Scotland, at least) in the utter deterioration of the means. And this could not but have

1. Rec Kirk, p. 403
 2. cf. Scholes, P.A., The Puritans and Music, pp. 230-1. For a full account of the Puritan attitude to organs and ornate music in worship, see *ibid*, Chapters XIV and XV. This authority shows incidentally, that there have been "Puritans" in all branches of Christendom opposed to the ostentatious in choral and instrumental music.

destructive effects on the "spirit". There can be little doubt but that the extreme poverty and ugliness in the praise of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was, in part, the bitter fruit of the negation of music here observed. The 1650 Psalter was both a reflection of this negation, and a further contribution to it. By limiting the psalms to common metre in order to broaden the selection of those that might be sung, it had the effect of limiting the tunes with which to sing them. Patrick speaks of "the Tyranny of the twelve tunes" (1). And even these, by reason of the Church's hostility to musical culture (which was flowering in the secular world) and the lack of instrumental support and trained precentors, were sung very badly (2). Only when the Church was

-
1. Patrick, M., op. cit., p. 144.
 2. Patrick, op. cit., pp 133. ff., provides quotations from numerous contemporary witnesses which make entertaining if somewhat painful reading. A further instance is the commentary by a "Blacksmith" (a very literate one) written c 1758. "As to praise, we seem to study to give this part of our worship as much the air of rusticity, and contempt of God as possible; because we thought that the engagement of the heart was (as indeed it is) the essence of this part of worship, we have whimsically thrown out every thing that helped to engage and elevate the heart; many of the words are obsolete and low, the versification is mean and barbarous, and the musick bad and ill performed; our harmony, otherways not very sweet, is entirely lost, and the sense broke off at every line; our posture too is most indecent, negligent, and improper for singing well...We hear a congregation addressing God in some ardent hymns or earnest petition, and see them sitting on their
- (footnote cont. on next page)

prepared to run the risk of idolatry by taking music seriously as a vehicle of worship (and, itself, an offering of worship) were decorum, decency and beauty recovered in her praise, and voices "tunably and gravely ordered".

e). Lining the Psalm

By the third and final paragraph of the directory on the "Singing of Psalms", all literate folk are to possess a copy of the Psalter, and, as enjoined in the concluding paragraph in the section on scripture reading, the illiterate are to learn to read.

But for the present, where many in the congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the minister, or some other fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the psalm line by line, before the singing thereof.

In the Assembly, the Scottish delegation protested vigorously at this countenancing and encouraging of the practice of "lining the psalm". It was evidently quite acceptable to the English divines

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 breech, or lolling with the most negligent air upon their seats...." Letter from a Blacksmith, pp. 8-9. Such ill-executed praise was not confined to Scotland. James Boswell writes in his diary of attending a Presbyterian service in London, in 1763, where his sensitive spirit was shocked by the "Dissenters roaring out the psalms sitting on their backsides" and he had to hasten "from this place to St. Paul's where I heard the conclusion of service and had my mind set right again". London Journal F.A. Pottel, (ed.) p. 231.

who passed this section "in short time" (1) in the absence of the Scots. When it was re-read for the benefit of the latter, Lightfoot informs us that "Mr. Henderson disliked our permission of any to read the psalms line by line: and this business held us some debate: which ended in this,-- that the Scots were desired to draw up something for the purpose." (2). He says no more about the matter, and the minutes merely indicate that Henderson "made a report of that committed to them", that "it was ordered",⁽³⁾ and that a week later it was resolved that the "Report of the Directory for singing of Psalms be sent up" to the Parliament.(4). Either the Scots yielded or their wishes were ignored. Or perhaps Henderson alone objected and what the Scots brought in did not amend the original.

The practice of lining out the psalm was of English origin. Writes Davies, of early Elizabethan

1. Journal of Proceedings, p. 343. Baillie refers to a state occasion, in which the Assembly and both houses of Parliament participated, wherein "All was concluded with a psalme, whereof Dr. Burgess read the line". Letters and Journals, II, p. 134. With their recommendation of Rous's Psalter in November 1643, the Commons suggested that it "be permitted to be publickly sung, the same being read before singing, until the book be more generally dispersed." Commons Journals, III, p. 315. This probably meant line by line reading.

2. op. cit., p. 344.

3. Mitchell, Minutes, p. 22.

4. ibid., p. 23.

times, the custom "was the only practicable way when organs were in disfavour and choirs were unpopular, to say nothing of the scarcity of books and the illiteracy of the common people. Such a custom almost certainly prevailed in Dissenting congregations (as well as in the Established Church), except that the minister took the place of the parish clerk" in reading the line. The practice did not, apparently, come into general use in Scotland until after the establishment of the Directory and the appearance of the 1650 Psalter (1). Pardovan, in 1709, says that the innovation came, of necessity, with the new Psalter, but pleads that now, with more people able to read, the psalm book becoming more familiar, and with advance notice given as to what psalms were to be sung, "the ancient custom (of singing without interspersed reading) should be revived, according to what is insinuated by the Directory on the subject"(2) The practice, however, had by this time firmly established itself in the Kirk. With a view to its ultimate abolition from public worship, the General Assembly, in 1746 "do recommend to private families

1. McMillan makes no reference to it in discussing the praises of the Church prior to 1638, and Patrick does not mention it until discussing the use of the 1650 Psalter.

2. Collections and Observations, p. 117.

that in their religious exercises, singing the praises of God, they go on without the intermission of reading each line" (1). But Edgar reports that "Great resentment arose...when attempts were made to abolish the practice in public worship, and it was not until the year 1809 that it was abolished in this (Mauchline) parish" (2).

Certainly the lining of the psalm was a contributing factor to the general decadence of Scottish praise during the one hundred and fifty years after Westminster. The only real solution to the problem was universal literacy, and upon this the worship of the Church had to wait. (3).

f). Singing the "Conclusion"

Nothing is said in the Directory about the uses of the Doxology at the end of the psalm, a problem which was vexing the Scottish Church at the time.

-
1. Acts, p. 687
 2. Old Church Life in Scotland, I, p. 70.
 3. The problem was the same in England. Among the conditions that "hampered" Isaac Watts in his prodigious hymn writing for English Congregationalists, according to Bernard Manning, was that "He was writing for congregations that were ignorant. His hymns had to be suitable to be announced and sung line by line by illiterates." The Hymns of Wesley and Watts, p.81. And Davies quotes Watts as urging that "the clerk read the whole Psalm over aloud before he begins to parcel out the lines, that the people may have some notion of what they sing; and not be forced to drag on heavily through eight tedious syllables without any meaning, till the next line comes to give the sense of them". op. cit., p. 178.

The fact of the controversy, itself, suggests that the singing of the "Conclusion" had had fairly wide usage in the Kirk for some years (1). The practice came to be called into question by the Puritans of Scotland's west country, who, like their spiritual kin in England, anathematized so much in the Church's worship which they had not explicit Biblical warrant. Its use was a natural development from the pre-Reformation and Anglican tradition of concluding the prose psalm with the Gloria Patri. Some editions of the Old Psalter contained conclusions, that of 1595 (or 1596) being the most noteworthy for its inclusion of some thirty-two doxologies, one for every form of metre in the book (2). But with the extremes of the covenanting period, the use of the Conclusion, as well as of the Lord's Prayer and "bowing in the pulpit",

-
1. McMillan does much to establish that its use was fairly universal in the Church during the period covered by his work. op. cit., pp. 87 ff.
 2. cf. *ibid.*, p. 89., McMillan notes that this was not in a period of Episcopal ascendancy, rather, the contrary. It suggests that the Doxology was accepted Presbyterian practice. Patrick, on the other hand, thinks that this was but the whim of a printer (Henry Charteris) and not necessarily a reflection of popular usage. Since this was the edition which also included the famous Psalm Collects, a form of prayer alien to the Reformed tradition, some weight is lent to Patrick's argument. Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody, pp. 53-5. The earliest edition containing a Conclusion is that of 1575, the latest, 1635. Each contained one. The 1650 Psalter contained none.

became the focal point in a controversy which threatened to divide the Covenanting party. The upshot was the yielding up of the practice, both in Scotland and at Westminster, in the interests of unanimity and peace. Baillie was loath to forgo its use in Scotland for he saw in the objections and instance of "Browninst", that is, English Independent, intrusion (1). The matter was considered in committee at Westminster and Baillie reports:

....about the Conclusion of the Psalmes, we had no debate with them; without scruple Independent and all sang it, so far as I know, where it was printed at the end of two or three psalmes. But in the new translation of the Psalmes, resolving to keep punctuallie to the original text, without any addition, we and they were content to ommitt that whereupon we saw both the Popish and Prelatical partie did so much dote, as to put it to the end of most of their lessons, and all of their psalmes. (2).

If Baillie and those of like mind were desirous of retaining the Doxology in Scotland on the principle that the Independents were against it, they finally yielded, on the principle that the Catholics and Anglicans were for it. Probably the Conclusion was among the "old customs" that were the subject of the conciliatory letter from the Divines to the Scots

-
1. See especially Letters and Journals, I., p. 362 and II, pp. 69-71.
 2. Letters and Journals, II, p. 259.

Assembly in 1644/5 in which the latter was entreated to "be studious to please others rather than themselves" in "matters of lesser consequence...not specified in the Directory". (1)

The practice appears to have fallen into desuetude in the Church of Scotland (2) until the establishment, at the Restoration, of the Second Episcopacy, when its usage or non-usage (with that of the Lord's Prayer) became one of the few distinguishing points between conformist and nonconformist worship (3). Thenceforth, if not before, the Doxology had about it the stigma of the

1. Acts, p. 114.

2. G.D. Henderson cites a pamphlet published in 1693 which says that the Doxology (and the Lord's Prayer) was used by all ministers until the arrival of Cromwell's army. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 102.

3. C.G. McCrie quotes Robert Edward, a conforming minister of Dundee Presbytery on the subject, and if only for its scathing wit, it is worthy of quotation: "In one parish-church you may hear the doxology christianly sung, but in the next parish-church no mention of it, nor in the wandering conventicle at the hillside or in the Den, they have gone from Mountain to Hill, they have forgotten their resting-place and have forgotten the Doxology, as if they were all anti-trinitarians, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, yea, and too often in the same Church-Assembly,...when it comes to the closing of the Psalms, some sing the Doxology decently, others...instantly turn silent... yea, some are worse, deriding and scoffing the singers of it; this among Christians is a lamentation and shall be for a lamentation. Tell it not in Gath, but (no doubt) it is proclaimed at Rome long ago, who rejoice in our halting, and say, aha, aha, our eyes hath seen". The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, pp. 213-4.

Episcopal party, and accordingly disappeared from Presbyterian worship (1).

1. cf. Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland, I, pp. 71-3; Henderson G.D., op. cit., pp. 102-3. Millar Patrick opines that the disappearance of the Conclusions was no loss. "Endeavours to resuscitate their use in Scotland have thus far failed, and after 300 years of misuse of them are not likely to succeed. They are not part of the present Scottish tradition, any more than they were of the original Reformation practice, and no one who ever sings them say to Psalms 23 and 100, will have any doubt in his mind about their being an intrusion, and sometimes and extremely irritating superfluity." op.cit. p. 55

CHAPTER IVPrayers for Public Worship.

In the Directory being examined:

"Of Public Prayer before the Sermon" and
"Of Public Prayer after the Sermon".

also, the prayers in the sections:

"Of the Assembling of the Congregation" and
"Concerning Public Solemn Fasting".

1. Public Prayer in the Scottish and Puritan
Traditions

In one respect, the "prayers" of the Directory are its most distinguishing feature. They lie at the focal point of the compromise which the whole Directory, in fact, represents -- the compromise between set form of worship and no form at all. Thus when Mr. Marshall first brought before the Assembly the early drafts of the Directory, he described the dilemma confronted by the committee, and its resolution of the dilemma, in terms of the problem of public prayer. His speech as recorded in the Assembly minutes reads in part:

...another doubt whether they should make formed prayers or only a directory....If formed, then either they must be imposed or not(;) if impose them upon the consciences of ministers and people (it) would leave them in the same pinch that the consciences of many be under now... and increase the gap that is open to separation....But on the other side (there is) a difficulty if noe formed prayers (are) made but every one left to his

owne will...(there are) so many raw and inexperienced ministers as would make the ordinances of god ridiculous....The directory that the committee hath thus farre proceeded in doth in good measure prevent against many dangers, that the weake may have some helpe and the scrupulous (be satisfied)...and (we may achieve) a kind of uniformity as great as need be looked after in the variety of gifts that god hath given....This doth not only set downe the heads of things but so lardgly as that with the altering of here and there a word, a man may mold it into a prayer. (1)

On the one side, there was of the opinion that formal prayer was unlawful and even idolatrous, and the desire for individual freedom. On the other, was the need for prayer material for the inexperienced, and the covenanted object of uniformity in worship. The novel solution was the provision of the "heads of things", yet, full enough that with minor verbal alterations, "a man may mold it into a prayer". In theory, if not in practice, it was an ingenious solution to a knotty problem.

The antipathy toward the use of set prayers which, by the time of Westminster, was rife among Puritans in both kingdoms, was another instance of a seminal idea of the Reformation germinating and growing to such exaggerated proportions that another, and balancing, ideas were all but obliterated.

1. MS Minutes, II, pp. 168-9. 22nd May, 1644.

With the early English Puritans, the issue was not a major one. Horton Davies sums up the sixteenth century objections to the BCP. They include criticisms of the collects as being too short and, sometimes, theologically unacceptable, and of the Litany as involving "vain repetitions" and petitioning for too many material blessings. But there was no objection to liturgical prayer, as such. (1). W.H. Frere says of the London and Midland Presbyterians, circa 1583, that they took liberties with the Prayer Book and, from the pulpit, offered prayers extempore. (2). Yet this was the very period in which the Presbyterians were seriously putting forth the Waldgrave prayer book, a version of the Genevan FP, as a substitute for the Anglican liturgy. The Elizabethan Puritans obviously desired freedom in prayer, but not to the necessary exclusion of formed prayer. Gradually, the extreme views of the Separatists permeated Puritan thought. Nevertheless, even at the time of Westminster not all who might be designated Puritan were prepared to castigate formal prayer as unlawful, whatever their bias in favour of

-
1. The Worship of the English Puritans, pp 67-9.
 2. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 226

extemporaneous prayer. This was evident in the Assembly itself, where the question emerged as to whether something ought to be said in the Preface "forbidding the Directory to be turned into a set form". Lightfoot reports:

This I spake against, as dangerous to hint anything against a set form of prayer: and this held us a very long and strong debate; at last it was put to the question, Whether we should proceed to say any such thing? and it was voted negatively (1)

The Directory itself was turned into direct prayer form during the Puritan regime in the SPS. The Preface to this little service book reads,

Whereas there are thousands of ships belonging to this Kingdom, which have not Ministers with them to guide them in Prayer, and therefore either use the old Form of Common-Prayer, or no Prayer at all; the former whereof for many weighty Reasons hath been abolished, and the latter is likely to make them rather Heathens than Christians (the Lord's Day being left without any mark of Piety or Devotion) Therefore to avoid these Inconveniencies, It hath been thought fit to frame some Prayers, agreeing with the Directory established by Parliament; It being hoped that it will be no grief of heart to wise and full Christians, if the thirsty drink out of Cisterns, when themselves drink out of Fountains; But they will rather pity the wants of their needy Brethren, and out of Compassion immitate him who filleth the hungry with good things.

These Prayers being enlivened and sent up by the Spirit in him that

1. Journal of Proceedings, p. 323.

prayeth, may be lively Prayers and acceptable to him who is a Spirit, and accepts of service in Spirit and Truth. And, in truth, though Prayers come never so new, even from the Spirit, in one that is guide in Prayer, if the Spirit do not quicken and enliven that Prayer in the Hearer that follows him, it is to him but a dead Form, and a very carcase of Prayer.

The second paragraph contains a very remarkable admission on the part of the unknown editor of this book. Despite what is said in the first paragraph, the second as much as concedes that whether prayer be formal or conceived is, in the last analysis, irrelevant to its reality. Hammond, the contemporary critic of the Directory, refers to this concession as "what the providence of God and the power of truth hath exhorted from them" (1). A.F. Mitchell views the SPS as a "devise of the enemy to burlesque (the Assembly's) work" and thinks that this preface "to be written in a serio-comic vein". (2). This is very doubtful. See Appendix B.

Davies contends that conservative Puritans, Presbyterians in particular, were never averse to liturgical prayer until the BCP was entirely discredited by the unfortunate events which followed the Act of Uniformity at the Restoration and the

-
1. A View of the New Directory (1646 edition)p.79.
 2. The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 238.

imposition of the 1662 Prayer Book. After the "Great Ejection" and "for over two centuries the successors of the Puritans confined themselves to extempore prayers". (1).

The Scottish Church, at the Reformation and for some time thereafter, allowed both formal and free prayer. It established a book of order, yet the rubrics in the order for the normal diet of worship make it clear that the ministry was not bound by the book. (2).

-
1. op. cit., p. 161. Yet in 1710 we find the eminent Puritan, Matthew Henry, having some second thoughts about conceived prayer. He does not advocate liturgical prayer, but urges "that some proper Method be observ'd...that we offer not any thing to the Glorious Majesty of Heaven and Earth which is confus'd, impertinent, and indigested...." A Method of Prayer, p. A 4 recto, in ibid., p. 114. He might have suggested a return to the Directory. Also of interest is the indication that ministers within the Establishment, even after the Act of Uniformity, did not confine themselves always to the Prayer Book. Robert Kirk reports that in 1689 he heard an Anglican divine, one Dr. Holinworth, "pray fervently (without set form) for the city, its government and governors, for the armies by sea and land, for all captives and banished, for people expiring, and for the clergy. This minister had his prayers in front of him, but made seldom use of them. He was very prompt, apposite and ornate in his expressions." Donald Marlean, London at Worship, p 11.
2. Calvin apparently felt the need for formed prayers. In a letter to Somerset anent the English liturgy, he wrote "As to what concerns a form of prayer and ecclesiastical rites, I highly approve that there should be a certain form, from which the ministers should not be allowed to vary....There ought to be a stated...form of prayer and administration of sacraments." McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 56.

...the Minister useth this confession or like in effect.

Again,

It shall not be necessary for the Minister daily to repeat all these things before mentioned, but, beginning with some manner of confession, to proceed to the Sermon, which ended, he either useth the Prayer for all Estates before mentioned, or else prayeth as the Spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and matter which he hath entreated of.

No form whatever is provided for the prayer of illumination; rather the simple rubric says,

...the Minister prayeth for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, as the same shall move his heart, and so proceedeth to the sermon.

The First Book of Discipline commends both methods, and issues a warning lest the notion get about that extempore prayers were no prayers at all. (1)

In all probability, both types of prayer continued to be offered in the Kirk down to the time of Westminster, with emphasis upon one or the other varying with the district and the inclinations of the individual minister.

1. In urging that in the towns there be daily service, "either Sermons or common prayers", it adds: "What day the publick sermon is, we can neither require nor greatly approve, that the common prayers be publickly used; lest that we shall foster the people in superstition, who come to the prayers as they come to the Masse, or else give them occasion, that they think them no prayers, but which being made before or after sermon." Books of Discipline, p. 58.

Two General Assembly pronouncements are of interest. In 1601 the official status of the BCO and, by implication, the use of formal prayer were affirmed:

It is not thought good that prayers already contained in the Psalm Book be altered or deleted; but if any brother would have any other prayers added, which are meet for the time, ordains the same to be tried and allowed by the Assembly. (1)

And in 1640, in the face of a rising tide of opposition to formal prayer, the Assembly declared that it "does not disallow the reading or using of set prayer, neither in private nor in public". (2). The negative framing of this declaration suggests that it was but a rear-guard action in the retreat and ultimate disappearance of liturgical prayer from Scottish worship until the late nineteenth century. (3) Even in the modern Scottish service books, two opposing views are represented. The Preface to the NDPW is quite frank in advocating the use of read prayers, and says of the Westminster

1. B.U.K., pp. 497-8
2. cf. Sprott, BCO, p. xxix
3. In 1695 the Assembly revived the acts of Assembly of 1639 and 1641 against innovations. (Acts, p. 248) But as Dr. John A. Lamb has pointed out, "It is very significant that the Act of 1640 which had refused to discountenance read prayer was not mentioned." Article, "Examination of Innovations" in Records of the Scottish Church History Society, Vol. XI, Part I, 1951, p. 29.

Directory that it "furnishes a considerable amount of valuable material and suggestion...so prepared and arranged that (it) can, with very little difficulty, be turned into direct forms of prayer".(1) On the other side, the editors of PFS, though they supply prayer forms for all parts of service and all occasions, are careful to profess anti-liturgical sentiments:

It scarcely requires to be said that the Forms here presented are not intended to be used liturgically, but are offered merely as illustrations of the manner in which the various services may be appropriately conducted under the existing system of public worship in the United Presbyterian Church. (2)

And the 1940 BCO of the Church of Scotland, while not prohibiting the liturgical use of the prayers contained therein, states,

The General Assembly...have recognized that the provision of such forms implies no desire to supersede free prayer....But a service book is necessary to express the mind of the Church with regard to its offices of worship....

Thus, in this particular, the Kirk has come full circle: to the official provision of a book of common order which sets the norm, may be used liturgically, but which is in no wise binding. It

-
1. NDPW (1898), p. ix
 2. PFS (1894), p. vi.

has returned to the balance of freedom and order achieved at the Reformation. The Directory represents a not very effective attempt to retain the balance when it was being upset by a movement which ended in unfettered freedom and chaos. (1)

Behind the objection to liturgical prayer lay the question of Biblical authority. All things must be submitted to this. "When Christ hath not bound the churches, you will not bind them." (2). Puritans of both kingdoms could see no Biblical warrant for formal prayers; even the Lord's Prayer was viewed, by some, as a pattern of prayer, rather than one to be offered verbatim. Therefore, since it was not positively enjoined in scripture, liturgical prayer was unlawful and to be repudiated, an idolatrous device of men to be thrown down.

1. The chaos is described, albeit in exaggerated terms, by the mid-eighteenth century critic, "Blacksmith". "Tho' our church have the appearance of the same worship, yet in fact their worship is as different as the tempers, principles, and parties of the parsons who manufacture it; and this leads the laity into the dangerous blunder of offering contradictory petitions, and praying at different times, upon principles as opposite to one another, as light is to darkness. It is an usual thing amongst us to pray for and against presentations in one week; I have thanked God for his decree of election and reprobation in the forenoon, and in the afternoon offered my humble thanks that all men have equal access to salvation...." Letter from a Blacksmith, p. 27.

2. Samuel Rutherford at the Assembly of Divines. MS Minutes. II, p. 48.

Anglicans were not so far from Puritans as to argue from any other criterion than Biblical authority. In general, however, they refused to argue from silence. They would admit no scriptural repudiation of formal prayer, therefore held it to be lawful. Combined with this, they had a greater respect for the inherited usages of the Church than had the Puritans, who took an iconoclastic view of tradition.

From this basis, the argument about public prayer seems to have revolved around two main points. One was whether or not formal prayer constituted a necessary "circumstance" or "accident" of worship. A distinction was drawn between the "substantial means" of worship (those dictated by scripture) and the "accidental means" (those which were necessary to fulfill the substantial). The Anglican, not only refusing to acknowledge that it was unlawful, saw liturgical prayer as a valid and orderly accidental if not a substantial means, hallowed by centuries of usage (1). The Puritan concern was to

1. Thus an Anglican contended: "If all substantial means of worship must be ordained of God, or they shall be unlawfull, God must have no worship at all from us, in the same means which he himself hath ordained; because it is impossible to use the means he hath ordained and not to do many things he hath not instituted." John Ball, A Friendly Trial of the Grounds Tending to Separation, (1670), p. 17. Most Puritans would concede this principle.

keep all "accidental" means to a minimum, and liturgical prayer, if not absolutely unlawful, was, in any case, dispensable.

The second point of debate was how God, through his Holy Spirit, functioned in public prayer.

Prayer is not a work of nature but of grace. The principall authority thereof is the holy Ghost. Man, indeed, doth pour out his soul unto the Lord, but he is the first taught, moved, and enabled thereunto by the Spirit of grace; so that prayer is God's gift and man's act.

This might have been written by a Puritan in defence of free prayer. In fact, however, these are the words of an Anglican at the outset of his defence of liturgical prayer. (1) The Puritan made a black and white distinction between what was mere tradition, tainted with human sin, and what was, in Scripture, dictated by the Holy Spirit and infallible. He could not, therefore, accept the Anglican claim that liturgical prayers might be the work of inspiration. But, what was more to the point, to the Puritan, set prayers, inspired in their writing or not, inhibited the free operation of the Spirit in the minister conducting worship. They were a denial of Pentecost. If John Ball argued that the "principall author" of prayer, the Holy Ghost, was able to move men's hearts more

1. ibid., p. 1.

effectively, through the ordered prayers of the Church than through the prayers of the individual minister, the Puritan maintained that ordered prayer bound the Spirit by fettering the minister whose utterances the Spirit might inspire.

At the more practical level, but partly arising out of their theological tenets, the Puritans, according to Davies, leveled four charges against the use of set prayer: i. it stunted ministerial gifts; ii. it did not meet varied needs and occasions; iii. it produced the obsession that formal prayers were necessary to worship; and iv. it fostered hypocrisy in divine service (1). The latter two are somewhat presumptuous. In the two former, the Puritans stood on firmer ground, particularly with reference to the Prayer Book. The BCP in allowing no extempore prayer whatever, discouraged the exercise and improvement of an important pastoral gift; and its occasional prayers were few and too general to meet varied needs and conditions.

2. Some Notes on the Prayers

(a) The Confession of Sin

1, Original Sin: The prayer of confession opens with an acknowledgement of "original sin... the seed

1. The Worship of the English Puritans. pp. 193-8

of all other sins". This specific idea does not figure largely in the prayers of the FP/BCO tradition, but the suggestion is there. The prayer of confession which is common to all books in the tradition (the second Confession in the FP, the first in the BCO, and the only Confession as such in WALD and MIDD) speaks of our being "conceived and born in sin and iniquity, so that in us there is no goodness". Closer to the cause and effect relationship so explicitly stated in the Directory is the first supplementary post-sermon prayer (in BCO, WALD, and MIDD) (1) which says,

there remaineth no spark of goodness in our nature...nothing in us...which we receive from our parents meet to enjoy the heritage of God's kingdom.

And it goes on as if this were the result of the above condition,

we are...so much inclined unto sin that we fall continually and swerve....We are not able to stand upright one minute of an hour.

The second supplementary post-sermon prayer (in BCO, WALD and MIDD) (2) confesses that

-
1. According to the rubric (Sprott, BCO, p. 92) this prayer comes from the Genevan French Church.
 2. This, too, is from the French Church in Geneva.

we were conceived in sin, and in iniquity
 (were we) born...and all the days of our
 life we have so still continued in sin
 and wickedness...(as) to follow the
 corruption of this our fleshly nature.

But these passages are as close as the FP/BCO
 prayers come to the Directory on this point, and
 as can be seen, there is no verbal similarity.

"There is no health in us" in the BCP Morning Prayer
 Confession is not so much a dogmatic statement of
 original sin as a conclusion drawn from the fact of
 the sins already confessed in that prayer.

ii. Actual Sins: As distinguished from a
 confession of original sin, there follows confession
 of "actual sins", both private and corporate. Of the
 latter, the prayer speaks of "the sins of magistrates,
 of ministers, and of the whole nation unto which we
 are many ways accessory." Once again, the FP/BCO
 prayers are not so explicit; they do not as
 dogmatically state the connection between public
 sins and individual involvement in them. However,
 it is implicit in some. The first Confession in the
FP (which does not appear elsewhere) is distinctly a
 confession of corporate, national sin and it binds
 the worshippers to them, indeed, to the sins of all
 generations.

We would never obey thy servants the
 prophets, that spoke in thy name to our
 kings and princes, to our forefathers and
 to all the people of our land (England)....
 And yet...both they (our rulers) and we

alas, to this day do not earnestly
repent.

The unrepentant were those at home who accepted the Marian return to Rome, yet the exiles had such a sense of involvement in this apostasy that they must say "we...do not earnestly repent". The second Confession (BCO only) speaks of national sins in the third person:

the whole body of this miserable realm
still continueth in their former impiety
...following the footsteps of the blind
and obstinate Princess (Princes in later
editions)....

A sense of the confessors' involvement is partly recovered by "we do obstinately rebel" which comes in the same context of corporate sins. The fourth Confession (BCO only) speaks of the sins of "Kings, Princes, and People" and admits the Church's responsibility. The third supplementary post-sermon prayer (BCO only) involves all the people in the betrayal of "the Leagues of unity and concord... with our neighbours", whereas the seventh "confesses" the sine of the nobility "possessed with avarice" and the notion of the "accessory" agency of the present worshippers is entirely absent. The BCP Confessions are too general for any idea of the sins of the body politic or involvement in the same to be discerned.

iii. Their Enormity: The remainder of this first

paragraph seeks to express the enormity of the sins to be confessed: transgressions against the holy commandments of God and presumptuous defiance of his gracious overtures and his forbearance. This is a note which sounds clearly through all of the penitential prayers in the FP/BCO tradition though with varying emphases and differing degrees of intensity. The Confession common to all liturgies in the tradition says "we continually transgress thy holy precepts and commandments", but apart from the brief word, "the flesh evermore rebelleth against the Spirit", there is nothing to suggest an acute awareness of gross repudiation of God's grace, such as we find in the Directory. But this thought does pervade the other prayers of confession as well as the penitential passages in the post-sermon prayers (1). There is no verbal similarity, however, between these prayers and the Directory. The passages in the Directory,

1. One example must suffice. The second Confession in the BCO reads: "And this was done not only in our blindness, but even now when of thy mercy thou hast opened unto us an entrance to thy heavenly kingdom...we utterly despise the light of thy gospel....So lovingly thou callest us again to thy favour and fellowship, and...yet we do obstinately rebel." See also the post-sermon prayer, and the second and seventh supplementary post-sermon prayers, in Spratt, BCO.

we having broken all the commandments of the holy, just, and good law of God, doing that which is forbidden, and leaving undone what is enjoined,

echoes the BCP Confession:

We have offended against thy holy laws, we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done.

And one suspects that unconsciously the compilers were paraphrasing what must have been to them the familiar words of Morning Prayer. An approximation of this same passage (from "we have broken" through to "no cloak for our sins") won its way, as did little else in this Confession, into at least two modern Scottish service books. Turned into direct prayer form it appears almost verbatim in Euchologion (1) among the supplementary prayers, and in the third morning services in PS&F (2)

iv. Particular Sins: There follows a particularization of sins committed. This, again, is a characteristic of Reformed prayers, though a notable exception is the one Confession shared by all books in the FP/BCO tradition which contains no such enumeration. The second Confession and the sixth and seventh supplementary post-sermon prayers in

1. At least from 1905 onward. cf. the 1905 edition, p. 259.

2. In three representative editions examined: 1860, 1889, and 1910.

Sprott - BCO contain examples of this listing of particular sins. But in none of these is there a literal correspondence to the Directory list (such is the gamut of human wickedness and the words to describe it). The Prayer Book confines itself to generalities. The words and phrases (in the Directory) "our blindness of mind, hardness of heart", "impenitency", "lukewarmness, barrenness", were incorporated into the above mentioned prayer in PS&F.

v. God's Judgment: This is succeeded by an acknowledgement of "worthiness" of "God's fiercest wrath" and "heaviest judgment", spiritual and temporal. Such a confession is common to virtually all of the penitential prayers in the FP/BCO corpus. It is most tersely stated in the one Confession common to all: we "purchase to ourselves through thy just judgments, death and damnation". The other compositions are, like the Directory, at pains to particularize God's judgments. The first Confession in the FP sees the plight of England under Mary as the manifestation of a deserved judgment. Likewise, the third supplementary post-sermon prayer in the BCO says of the persecutions by the French,

Worthily and justly mayest thou...give us to be slaves of such tyrants;

and the sixth reads,

We know the dumb insensible elements of the world admonish us for our unthankfulness, the heavy face of the heavens, the unnatural dealings on the earth, the contagion and infection of the air threaten thy judgment.

But not only are political and natural catastrophes the merited punishment of the Lord, eternal damnation is earned. Thus, for instance, the third Confession (BCO only) says,

If thou shouldst enter into judgment with us, just occasion hast thou to punish these our mortal bodies, but also to punish us both in body and soul eternally, if thou shouldst handle us according to the rigour of thy justice.

The Confession in the BCP Communion order states it more succinctly:

...provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us.

Clearly, there were liturgical precedents for this paragraph of the Directory, though none of them compare with it for comprehensiveness and terror.

The modern service books in the Presbyterian tradition are less inclined to speak of the wrath and judgment of God, and when they do, they confine themselves to very general terms.

(b) Prayers for Pardon, for Assurance of Forgiveness, and for Grace.

i. For Pardon: With a sudden and dramatic change of mood, appeal is made to the promises of the gospel -- to "the all sufficiency of that only one oblation"

which alone can "deprecate the heavy wrath and curse of God" and enable the worshippers to pray for the "free and full remission of all our sins". There are two elements here, and possibly a third: the supplication for remission of sins, the clear appeal to the atoning work of Christ by which remission is possible, and some measure of confidence that remission will, in fact, be granted (1). In this respect, this Prayer for Pardon is as satisfactory as any in the Reformed liturgies, and more so than most. Of ten prayers of confession in the FP/BCO tradition consulted, eight are followed by a direct plea for pardon or remission. Only five of these explicitly plead the oblation of Christ. (2). And only two contain the third ingredient, the buoyant confidence that God does hear and answer the plea for the absolution and remission of sins. Happily, the prayer that is common to all books in the tradition embraces the three elements:

1. While there is a plea for assurance in the succeeding paragraph, the note of assurance is nevertheless here. It is discernible in the confident opening phrase, "Notwithstanding all this", and in the clause, "in confidence in the...promises of mercy and grace in the new covenant".

2. Such as, "...our Lord Jesus Christ...by whom thy wrath is taken away, the law satisfied"; or, "Jesus Christ...in whose name and for whose obedience we...crave...remission"; or, "our Lord Jesus Christ, through the offering up of his body in sacrifice, hath reconciled us unto thee".

...humbly beseech thee for Jesus Christ's sake to show thy mercy upon us, to forgive us all our sins...for the merits of Jesus Christ...whom thou hast already given oblation for our sins and for whose sake ...thou wilt deny us nothing that we shall ask....

The Anglican book deals with these three elements differently. In both the formula for daily services and that for the Eucharist, the supplication for pardon is made and the merits of Christ pleaded (though not very explicitly) in the prayer that was to become (after 1662) the corporate prayer of the people, and the remission of sins is supplicated, in Matins, or pronounced, in the Eucharist, by the priest.

Phrases of this Prayer for Pardon appear in PS&F, appended to the Confession above referred to. Similarly, the compilers of Euchologion drew on this as they drew on the preceding Confession for one of the supplementary prayers in that book. But in both instances, direct quotation is very slight.

ii. For Assurance: Following the Prayer for Pardon we have what is surely one of the tenderest passages in the Directory, supplication for God's love to be "shed abroad...in our hearts by the Holy Ghost", for "the full assurance of our pardon and reconciliation", the "Comfort of all that mourn in Zion", that the Holy Ghost would "speak peace to the wounded and

troubled in spirit, and bind up the broken hearted", and that the unrepentant might be brought to repentance, in order that they too might be the beneficiaries of this grace. There is nothing quite like this following the prayers of the FP/BCO tradition, though the Confession common to the tradition ends thus:

For thy Spirit doth assure our consciences that thou art our merciful Father, and so lovest us thy children through Him, that nothing is able to remove thy heavenly grace and favour from us.

And one other reads (1), "that the bright beams of thy countenance may shine upon us to our great comfort and assured salvation". But the Directory is fuller and less casual about the matter. The pattern of Confession, Prayer for Pardon, and Prayer for Assurance of pardon, reflecting as it does the Prayer Book pattern of Confession, Prayer for Pardon and Absolution, suggests that the compilers were endeavouring to provide a satisfactory substitute for the BCP at this point.

Unlike either BCP or BCO, the Directory ties to this supplication for the assurance and consolation of forgiveness, an evangelical concern for those who as yet know it not, by reason of their hardness

1. The second of the supplementary post-sermon prayers in the BCO, WALD & MIDD.

of heart. Or is this petition meant to be a corrective to the foregoing, a bar against those who would grasp for the consolation without going the hard road of true repentance? (1)

The first half of this prayer for assurance appears almost verbatim in Euchologion (2), incorporated into a prayer by the Anglican, Jeremy Taylor. It also appears, down to "assurance of our pardon and reconciliation" in the 1860 edition of PS&F (3), and in a paraphrased form in some subsequent editions.

iii. For Grace: "With remission of sins through the blood of Christ, to pray for sanctification by his Spirit...." Such a supplication for grace to live the sanctified life is common to most of the prayers of the FP/BCO corpus, though not necessarily in this particular position. And all of the ideas expressed

1. "Although hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favour of God and estate of salvation...; yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus and love Him in sincerity, endeavouring to walk in all good conscience before him, may in this life be certainly assured that they are in the state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God...." The Westminster Confession of Faith, XVIII, 1. The hard doctrine of election and reprobation is behind this.
2. cf. 1905 edition, "Additional Forms", p. 261.
3. The third morning service.

8/

here are to be found, explicitly or implicitly, in them. A few verbal similarities to the Directory are inevitable, and can be attributed to the language and thought-forms held in common by the writers of the BCO prayers and the authors of the Directory, rather than to any borrowing by the latter (1). The BCP contains no such supplication for grace at this point in its services. But no service is without at least one "collect for grace to live well". Phrases of this prayer appear in the 1860 edition of PS&F, following the above-noted quotation, but disappear from later editions.

(c) The Intercessions.

i. For the Church: The opening paragraph of the intercessions divides itself into four: general intercession for the gospel and kingdoms of Christ, intercessions for the churches abroad, for the three covenanted kingdoms and the churches thereof, and particular intercessions for "this church and

1. The one supplication in the Directory that was not found explicitly stated in any of the prayers examined was for "grace to fit and enable us for all duties of conversations and callings towards God and man". One example of a similarity might suffice. The first supplementary post-sermon prayer in BCO, WALD & MIDD pleads "that he dwelling in us, may mortify our old man, that is to say, our sinful affections; and that we may be removed unto a more godly life". The first clause is an instance of similitude of words; the second of idea.

kingdom". In the Reformed liturgies there are parallel passages to all except, of course, the third, the League and Covenant (1). Predominating in these liturgies are intercessions in the second category: prayers for the harassed continental Protestant churches and the downfall of their adversaries. "Behold the tyranny used against our poor brethren and sisters" (2); let not those by whom it hath pleased thee to have thy praises celebrated, be destroyed and brought to nought... that the Turks, Pagans and Papists, and other Infidels might boast themselves thereby". (3). In the life and death struggle in which Protestantism was involved when these prayers were composed, it is little wonder that her intercessions were so directed. Nor was the struggle ended in the mid-seventeenth century, and these characteristic Reformed Church intercessions were carried into the Directory as a matter of course. The tenor of the

1. The fourth supplementary post-sermon prayer (BCO only) does, however, contain a petition for concord between England and Scotland: "Dissipate... the counsels of such as deceitfully travail to stir the hearts of the inhabitants of either realm against the other". It appears in the 1564 edition, and in its original form was used by Knox. Spratt, BCO, p. 202, note (4).

2. Third supplementary post-sermon prayer, BCO
 3. Second supplementary post-sermon prayer, BCO
WALD & MIDD.

prayers for the Church in the BCP is quite different, they being general and unrelated to any particular historical circumstances.

ii. For King and Country: There follow in the next paragraph general intercessions for the state and nation: the crown and royal family, all in authority, the various estates, pastors and teachers, institutions of learning, the local congregation and local civil government. Two of the post-sermon prayers in the BCO, WALD and MIDD contain prayers for the king and his council (1), and two more (one in BCO only) have marginal rubrics which prescribe and permit, respectively, the intercessions for the crown found in one of the former. Except in certain editions, the monarch is not named. In addition, the BCO contains a special "Prayer for the King" which first appeared in the book in 1573 (2). James is named,

1. In the first of these two, the intercession is for "the noble estate of the king's majesty, his honourable council with all the estates and whole body of the Commonwealth. Let thy fatherly favour so preserve him, and thy Holy Spirit so govern his heart, that he may in such sort execute his office, that thy religion may be purely maintained, manners reformed, and sin punished, according to the precise rule of thy word." And the second intercedes for "the king's majesty, and all his honourable council, with the rest of the magistrates and commons of the realm" that he might "advance (Christ's) kingdom in his dominions (ruling by thy word his subjects...) that we, being maintained in peace and tranquility...may serve thee in all holiness and virtue...."

2. This prayer, slightly altered, later appeared in the BCP (1604)

and, in later editions, Charles. Like its BCO predecessors, the Directory's main petition, so far as the monarch is concerned, is that he be an instrument in the advancement of Church and gospel. The intercession for the Queen of Bohemia and Prince Charles, Elector Palatine, was as much a prayer for the Protestant cause in Europe as for the royal house. The Prayer Book, as is well known, is not wanting in prayers for the monarch and royal family (1), but the function of the crown as defender of the Church and servant of the gospel is not given so much emphasis as in the BCO and the Directory. The prayer for the High Court of Parliament was a natural development from the BCO and BCP prayers for king and council, but it is of interest as the first such intercession in the liturgies of either Scotland or England. The BCP "Prayer for the High Court of Parliament, to be read during their Session" did not appear until the 1662 revision (2). The clause,

1. Prayers for the monarch are to be found in the suffrages of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, the prayers appended to the Litany, and the Eucharist.

2. E.C.Ratcliff says that this prayer "is thought to have been written by Laud". "The Choir Offices" in Clarke and Harris, Worship and Liturgy, p. 277. This seems as ironical as the Parliament's Assembly devising a prayer for "the King's Majesty; that God would make him rich in blessings, both in his person and his government". Christian charity knew no bounds.

"the nobility, the subordinate judges and magistrates, the gentry, and all commonality" echoes the BCO prayer for "the rest of the magistrates and commons of the realm", only in this, as in so many things, the Directory is more particular.

Prayer for the ministry following on intercession for royalty and governors is a common sequence. The first of the two main intercessory prayers of the BCO, WALD and MIDD follow in this order, and it is the invariable pattern in the BCP to be discerned in the suffrage of Matins and Evensong, the Litany, the supplementary prayers to the Litany, and the Communion order. And the two ideas in this prayer for "pastors and teachers", that the clergy be found faithful both in private life and public ministry, are common to both traditions (1). The intercession for "universities and all schools" is to be found in neither tradition. Nor is the prayer for the local congregation (2) and civil government. Prayer for

1. BCO, WALD & MIDD first prayer of intercession: that the ministers "may in their life and doctrine be found faithful"; the BCP Litany: "illuminate all Bishops, Pastors and Ministers of the Church with true knowledge and understanding of thy Word; and that both by their preaching and living they may set it forth, and shew it accordingly" (as found in pre-Westminster versions); BCP Communion order: "that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word".

2. The BCP Holy Communion intercession "and especially for this congregation here present; that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word", is perhaps analagous, though it is more akin to the Directory's prayer for illumination. The same might be said of the similar supplication in the Litany.

the afflicted and distressed is common to both traditions, and in this case, they are more detailed than in the Directory (1). The only precedents for reasonable weather are in the Prayer Book. The petition for the averting of the "judgements" is more characteristic of the FP/BCO than of the BCP tradition, but the latter contains four such in the "Occasional" prayers.

The Prayers of Intercession in the Directory follow remarkably the pattern set by the BCP intercessions. (The various intercessory prayers in the BCO reveal no consistent pattern) Thus:

<u>BCP Litany</u>	<u>BCP Eucharist</u>	<u>Directory</u>
Holy Church.....	Universal Church.....	Universal Church National Church & Nation.
The Monarch.....	The Monarch.....	The Monarch
Royal Family.....		Royal Family
The Clergy Council and Nobility.....	King's Council.....	Parliament and Nobility
Magistrates.....	Magistrates.....	Judges and Magistrates
All the People.....		Gentry and Commonality
	Clergy.....	The Ministry
	All the People	
Peace among nations		Universities and Schools
Grace for Congregation to hear the Word) Grace for Congregation to) hear the Word	(Blessing of Word (on congregation (& community
The distressed..	The distressed.....	The distressed

1. The Directory, of course, assumes that this clause will be amplified by the minister.

BCP LitanyBCP EucharistDirectory

Forgiveness
of Enemies
Fruits of the
Earth.....

Seasonable
weather & fruit-
fulness.

The departed

Averting of
judgment.

It will be seen that apart from three items in the Directory intercessory prayer, each has its parallel in either the Litany or the Eucharist intercessions; and, what is more to the point, the sequence of items in the Directory follows that of one or other or both of the Prayer Book intercessions..

The Directory prayers of Intercession can be recognized in the fourth morning service of PF&S, though in a much attenuated form. The first three clauses of the first paragraph and about half of the second are used in the 1860 edition, and considerably less in the versions of 1889 and 1910.

(d) Some Further Supplications

- i. For Right Use of Ordinances: There follows now a supplication for grace to use rightly the holy ordinances, in particular the sabbath "in all the duties thereof". This prayer has no specific parallel in either the BCP or FP/BCO traditions.
- ii. For Growth in Grace: The rather verbose and general supplication for growth in knowledge and

true piety has no direct parallel in either tradition, though certainly its sentiments are expressed in the liturgies of both. The proper collects of the Prayer Book are mainly of this sort(1).

iii. For Illumination: Finally we have what might be termed a Prayer for Illumination, the double supplication that the preacher would "divide the word of God aright" and that the Lord would "circumcise the ears and hearts of the hearers" to the end that "Christ may be formed in them". The liturgies of the FP/BCO tradition, while they do not actually provide a prayer for illumination, give rubrical instructions that one be offered. The rubric in WALD and MIDD is more explicit than that in the FP and BCO. It reads,

...which ended, the Pastor prayeth for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, that the word may be expounded faithfully, to the

1. As, for instance, the collect for the first Sunday after Epiphany: "Lord we beseech thee mercifully to receive the prayers of thy people which call upon thee; and grant that they may both perceive and know that which they ought to do, and also have grace and power faithfully to fulfill the same...." Add to this the collects for the seventh and eleventh Sundays after Trinity, and the sum is the substance of the Directory prayer. A parallel in the BCO, conveniently brief for quotation, is the preface to the creed at the conclusion of the post-sermon intercessions: "vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to grant us perfect continuance in thy lively faith, augmenting the same in us daily, till we grow to the fullness of our perfection in Christ".

honour of his name and the edification of the Church, and that it may be received with such humility and obedience as thereunto belongeth.

We have already noted somewhat analogous prayers in the Litany and the Communion liturgy of the BCP (page 206, n. 2.)

(e) The Post-Sermon Thanksgiving and Petitions

i. General Thanksgiving: The comprehensive thanksgiving with which the post-sermon prayer opens has no parallel in the FP/BCO corpus, nor in the BCP before Westminster. Presumably the metrical psalter in the Reformed, and the psalms and canticles in the Anglican Church fulfilled the function. The second post-sermon supplementary prayer of the BCO, WALD, and MIDD, a prayer "to move us to true repentance", contains an acknowledgement of God's "benefits" (1). There also appeared in the BCO of 1564 a special "thanksgiving unto God after our Deliverance from the Tyranny of the Frenchmen", but this, obviously, did not belong to the normal diet of worship. The BCP contains certain specific thanksgivings (for fair weather, plenty, peace and

1. "benefits which thou dost universally bestow upon all men on earth. Thou hast given us such special graces, that it is not possible for us to rehearse them....We have obtained them, by thy goodness, a far more excellent covenant...which thou first madest and established by the hand of Jesus Christ our Saviour."

victory, deliverance from plague) but these were for "occasional" use only. The well known BCP "General Thanksgiving" did not appear until the 1662 revision and it is possible that the precedent set by the Directory had something to do with it, for it was the Presbyterians at Savoy who complained of the want of thanksgivings in the Prayer Book (1) and the Anglican party yielded the point with this addition to the BCP. According to A.F. Mitchell (2), both the general thanksgiving of the Directory and that of the 1662 Prayer Book are the compositions of the Westminster Divine, Edward Reynolds. A comparison of the texts does not suggest their common authorship.

ii. For the Word: The prayer for the "continuance of the gospel" in this post-sermon context finds a parallel in the opening petition of the FP/BCO "Prayer for the Whole Estate of Christ's Church", "that this seed of thy word now sown among us may take such deep root...that it wither not nor choke". The suggestion to "turn the most useful heads of the sermon into a few petitions" had a BCO precedent: the general rubric at the end of the prayers for ordinary Sunday worship in that book, says that the

1. Proctor, F., & Frere, W.H., A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 175.

2. The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 121.

minister may use "the Prayer for all Estates before mentioned, or else prayeth, as the Spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and matter which he hath entreated of" A prayer conditioned by the sermon is, of course, foreign to the BCP (2).

iii. Preparation for Judgment: The supplication for "preparation for death and judgment, and a watching for the coming of our Lord" does not appear in the ordinary services of the FP/BCO tradition. Its nearest parallel is in two of the Advent collects of the Prayer Book (3). The plea for pardon for "the iniquities of our holy things" has no liturgical precedent in either tradition.

The first half of the first paragraph of this post-sermon prayer, and most of the second (except

2. "An appendix of the Sermon is Prayer, both before and after" is a Reformed-Puritan principle, as is the application: "In prayer following after... the chiefe heads of the Sermon should be turned into petitions". Quoted here is eminent English Puritan, William Ames (The Marrow of Sacred Divinity, 1642, p. 162). The Anglican, in neither principle nor practice, would subordinate prayer to preaching. Thus, for instance, Hammond speaks of preaching and hearing as a Christian duty, and of prayer as an "elicit act", of the essence of worship. A View of the New Directory Works I, p. 384.

3. In this season, the second advent of Christ is anticipated. Thus the collect for the first Sunday in Advent pleads for grace "that in the last day, when he shall come again in his glorious majesty to judge both the quick and the dead, we may rise to life immortal..."; and the collect for the third Sunday is similar.

the clause about "useful heads of the sermon") appear in prayer-form in the fourth evening service of the 1860 PS&F. In later editions, they are transformed beyond recognition.

Both the pre- and post-sermon prayers are repeated in somewhat paraphrased and condensed form by Pardovan in his redaction of the Directory (1).

(f) The Prayer of Approach (In section "Of the Assembling of the Congregation")

The liturgies of the FP/BCO corpus do not contain a prayer of approach, nor do the orders for Morning and Evening Prayer in the BCP. In both instances the service begins with the confession of sin, prefaced in the BCO by an exhortation to penitence and in the BCP with a verse of scripture and exhortation. The nearest parallel to this is the opening of the Anglican Communion service, which was intended to be the normal Sunday diet. In the 1552 and 1559 versions, this service begins with familiar collect: (2).

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open,
all desires known, and from whom no secrets
are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts
by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that

-
1. Collections and Observations, pp. 112-6.
 2. The 1549 Prayer Book, and again the 1604, and subsequent versions, begin the Communion order with the Lord's Prayer, immediately followed by this collect.

we may perfectly love thee, and worthily
magnify thy holy name, through Christ
our Lord.

This contains the main ideas of the Invocation in the Directory: an implied confession of unworthiness, a plea for cleansing, and for inspiration to worship aright. It omits the particular petition for a blessing upon the word to be read.

The modern Scottish Presbyterian service books all commend an opening prayer of approach or invocation. On the whole, there is little or no emphasis in them on the "vileness and unworthiness" and the "utter inability" of the worshippers, but the supplications expressed in the latter part of the Directory invocation are present, though there is no evidence of direct borrowing.

(g) Prayer at the Service "of Public Solemn Fasting".

By comparison with those in the order for Sunday service, this "prayer" is a mere outline. Headings only are given, and the provision of sub-headings and particulars is left to the minister. It is interesting to reflect that the divines might have been as brief as this throughout the Directory, had they not been so concerned to provide "some help and furniture" for the clergy.

The dominant features of this prayer follow

approximately the same sequence as those in the prayers of the BCO Order of the General Fast (1) They are: a "confessing of sins", "justifying God's righteous judgments", "imploring his mercy and grace", and "applying by faith for pardon, help and deliverance". Excerpts from the prayer in the BCO will indicate the likeness:

We do confess...that we have transgressed thy whole law, and have offended thy godly majesty...and so most justly mayest thou pour forth on us all plagues....But, Lord, thy mercy and the truth of thy promises abideth forever....Thou hast promised to show mercy on the most grievous offenders whensoever they repent.

There are, however, as many dissimilarities between these two prayers as similarities.

The four occasional prayers in the BCP, to be said in times of various public catastrophes, all, explicitly or implicitly, confess sin and acknowledge God's just punishment in the particular affliction, and plead mercy and deliverance.

3. Some Notes on the Rubrics

(a) Prayer by Preacher.

The rubrical insistence that the prayers be led by "the minister who is to preach" illustrates the

L. It was first incorporated into the BCO in 1556, and was probably written by Knox. Its text varies in subsequent editions. Sprott, BCO, p. 205, note 18. It does not appear in WALD and MIDD

Westminster Divines' concept of worship. The Church's worship has a functional unity, and the unifying principle is the proclamation of the Word. Therefore, that there be no atomizing of the service and that the prayers usurp not the central place, they must be held subordinate to, and dependent upon, the preaching. There can be no such thing as the old Scottish Reader's Service which separated the functions of prayer and preaching. Since preaching is the integrating principle, all aspects of worship are the exclusive domain of the preacher (1)

(b) Length of Prayers

By modern standards, the prayers set forth in the Directory for Sunday worship are excessively long. Reading time, simply as they stand, runs to thirteen minutes. Ministerial amplification of even half the headings and sub-headings would surely treble the time. In addition, there are the directives "to mourn over such other sins as the

1. cf. the Form of Church Government: it belongs to the office of pastor "to pray for and with his flock, as the mouth of the people unto God, Acts, vi, 2.3.4, and xx.36, where preaching and prayer are joined as several parts of the same office". Dr. Leishman suggests that the rubric might have been directed particularly at the Independents who, according to Baillie, were in the habit of having "one to pray, and another to preach, a third to prophesy, and a fourth to dismiss with a blessing". Westminster Directory, p. 97; and Baillie, Dissuasive, p. 117

congregation is particularly guilty of" in the Confession, and "to turn the chief heads of the sermon into some few petitions" in the post-sermon prayer. Further, there is the somewhat confused rubric (following that on the Lord's Prayer) which seems to commend special petitions being made as the times dictate, not only on sacramental occasions and days of fasting or thanksgiving, but at the regular service

as at this time it is our duty to pray for a blessing upon the Assembly of Divines, the armies by sea and land, for the defence of the King, Parliament and Kingdom.

All of which, in the hands of an articulate minister, could easily total an hour's praying. The Divines themselves, set an impressive example in the duration of their prayers. Baillie reports that on a day of fasting the Assembly held its own exercises "and spent from nine till five very graciously".

He continues,

After Dr. Twisse had begun with a briefe prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed two houres, most divinellie, confessing the sins of the members of the Assemblie, in a wonderfullie pathetick and prudent way. After, Mr. Arrowsmith preached one houre, then a psalme; thereafter, Mr. Vines prayed near two houres, and Mr. Palmer preached one houre, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two houres, then a psalme....(1)

1. Letters & Journals, II, p. 184. It is interesting that "the minister who is to preach" did not lead the prayers.

This serves as an indication of the length of Puritan prayers, and Baillie's evident approval suggests it met the Scottish ideal. It might be noted that the prayers for Sunday service in the BCO, WALD and MIDD which were inherited from the FP are about half the length of those added to the tradition in Scotland and which found their way into the English books. A Puritan criticism of the Prayer Book liturgy was that it was "tedious". The tedium of the Prayer Book could not have been in the verbosity of its prayers.

(c) The Arrangement of Prayers

We judge this to be a convenient order, in the ordinary Public Prayers: yet so as the minister may defer (as in prudence he shall think meet) some of these Petitions till after his Sermon, or offer up to God some of the Thanksgivings hereafter appointed, in his Prayer before his Sermon.
(Rubric at conclusion of "Public Prayer before Sermon").

As the prayers are divided in the Directory, they represent Puritan practice. It is contrary to both Anglican and Reformed usage. In the Eucharist liturgy of the BCP, the sermon or homily precedes the intercessory prayers(1). And, as we have seen, the

1. Morning and Evening Prayer provided no rubrical instruction whatever for a sermon. The probable Puritan practice of appending a sermon to Matins might have been the origin of their service structure.

intercessions follow the sermon in the BCO, WALD, and MIDD. This was the use in Scotland at the time of Westminster, according to Alexander Henderson. In the first prayer of "the preaching... the minister having prefaced a little for quickening and lifting up the hearts of the people, first maketh a prayer for the remission of sin, sanctification, and all things needful, joining also confession of sins, thanksgivings, with special relation to the hearers". After a psalm there was "a prayer for a blessing upon the preaching of the Word". And

after sermon he praiseth God, and prayeth again for a blessing, joyning earnest petitions for the Church Universall, and for the coming of the Kingdom of Christ, for all the afflicted, for the Churches in his majesty's Dominions, for the Church of Scotland, Ministry and people, for the king, the queen, the prince, and their whole royall progeny, for all the members of that particular congregation, as well absent in their lawfull affairs as present, for all that are afflicted among them in body, minde or means(1).

It was under Scottish pressure that this rubric, which would permit the Scots to continue in their accustomed manner, was inserted into the Directory (2). According to Dr. Sprott, this continued to be the

-
1. Government and Order, pp. 15-7
 2. cf. Baillie, Letters and Journals, II, p. 123; Leishman in Story, The Church of Scotland, Past and Present, V, p. 383

the predominant usage in the Scottish Church to 1863, the date of his writing(1). However, the Scottish service books dating from this period onward, reveal an inconsistency of practice. In 1901 Dr. Leishman^{Max} deploras the tendency in the Kirk to "give up what (Baillie) and his brethren succeeded in saving for us"(2). The twentieth century has seen the almost universal abandonment of the old arrangement, and the adoption of the structure of the Directory both in the service books and in actual practice.

(d). The Lord's Prayer

And because the Prayer which Christ taught His disciples is not only a pattern of prayer, but itself a most comprehensive prayer, we recommend it so to be used in the Prayers of the church.

(Rubric following the Post-sermon Prayer)

Baillie wrote of the Independents,

They make all set prayer, the very Lord's Prayer it self used Prayer-wise, not only to be inconvenient and unlawfull, but to be Idolatry, and the worship of the Devil(3)

If by Baillie's time, doubts were being expressed among some Scots, too, about the "prayer-wise" use of the Lord's Prayer, these scruples had had a long

1. The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland, p. 12.

2. Westminster Directory, p. 98.

3. Dissuasive, p. 29.

history in England. In two of the three main post-sermon prayers in the Scottish BCO, the Lord's Prayer is used, and in the other a lengthy paraphrase of the Prayer is to be found. However, both WALD and MIDD, which share with the BCO these three prayers, omit the Lord's Prayer and include only the paraphrase (1). Apparently then, even among conservative Puritans, there were misgivings about its use as early as the 1580's (2). The BCO witnesses to its use in Scotland, and McMillan says that "the practice of repeating the Lord's Prayer

1. But it must be observed that Cartwright's Directory calls for the use of the Lord's Prayer after each of the two main prayers in the service. Neal, History of the Puritans, V, App.4. On the other hand, Davies quotes Cartwright's Second Admonition, I, p. 219 as criticizing the BCP for its numerous repetitions of the Lord's Prayer "one on the neck of the other". The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 69. The Lord's Prayer appears in the Baptismal Order of WALD and MIDD, as it does in the BCO.

2. "In the hotly disputed controversy", writes Davies, "the teaching of our Lord was the centre of operations. Apologists chiefly determined their views or sought confirmation for them in their interpretation of St. Matthew's words: 'After this manner therefore pray ye' (Mat.vi.9). Was this Dominical imperative to be interpreted as giving the disciples a set form of prayer? Or was it simply a model on which they were to build their individual prayers? The history of the discussion tends to show that the more radical Puritans and Separatists regarded the Lord's Prayer as a pattern and held that it was not intended that it should be repeated. The Anglicans interpreted it as a literal command for the repetition of that particular prayer. The Presbyterians combined both views and therefore held themselves free to repeat it and to model their extemporary prayers on it." op. cit., p. 99.

with the Minister which became the Scots rule was in vogue at Frankfort when Knox was Minister there" (1). It is noteworthy that though the Lord's Prayer appears twice in Morning and Evening Prayer in the BCP, as well as in the Litany and the Communion order, not until the 1662 version were the people permitted to join with the minister in its repetition.

The Lord's Prayer was one of the traditional features of Scottish worship which the west country Puritans called into question, and, like the Doxology, it fell into disuse(2) and attempts to revive it under the Second Episcopacy only served to give its use a party stigma. Presbyterian attempts at revival in the early eighteenth century met with controversy and failure (3). In 1707, Pardovan

1. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1558-1638, p. 374.

2. G.D.Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, pp. 102-3

3. There is an interesting story centred in the act of the General Assembly of 1705 which "seriously recommends...the due observance of the Directory...approved by the General Assembly of the year 1645". Acts, p. 387. After considerable agitation by one Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder for the restoration of the Lord's Prayer in the Kirk, a committee was appointed to consider the matter and ultimately the Assembly had to come to some decision. It decided that an explicit recommendation of the Lord's Prayer would be unpopular, and the upshot was the Assembly's act (cf. McCrie, The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, pp 275-6). Sir Hugh had had reason to believe that the 1649 Assembly agreed to give up the use of the Prayer, and only refrained from official pronouncement for fear of offending the continental churches. Hence Sir Hugh's oft
(footnote cont. on next page)

writes, with reference to the rubric.

I do think there are no public Prayers used in our Church, wherein the Petitions of the Lord's Prayer, are not expressed throughout these prayers; though perhaps neither at the Beginning, or Conclusion, or all at once by way of Form. But if any, notwithstanding, think fit likewise to say it all at once, the most proper time, for that, some think, would be immediately before the other Form used for the Ministerial Benediction (1)

This watering-down of the rubric was obviously in deference to the contemporary practice. As late as 1816 the use of the Lord's Prayer was being condemned by responsible Scots churchmen (2), but this was possibly in reaction to a move toward its recovery. The first official prayer book of the Church of Scotland after the Directory, PS&F, 1858, restored the Lord's Prayer, as did Dr. Lee's first book a year earlier, and Euchologion in 1867; and all subsequent

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 quoted words, "As the General Assembly laid aside the Lord's Prayer, so our Lord, who composed and commanded the use of that prayer, laid aside the General Assembly", (G.D.Henderson, op. cit., p. 102; Leishman in Story, op. cit., p. 387). On the strength of the act, John Anderson of Dumbarton reintroduced the Prayer into his church and this resulted in a prolonged wrangle both within the congregation and in the courts of the Church. Anderson, however, persisted. (James Cooper, (ed) "Disquisition by the Rev. John Anderson", Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, I, (1903-6) pp.168-9). In 1758 "Blacksmith" appealed to the authority of the Directory in the same cause. "I cannot help observing with regret that where our directory directs well, there our clergy have despised our directory; for instance, it recommends that the Lord's Prayer be used in our public worship" which recommendation "is neglected by most". Letter from Blacksmith, pp.22,69.

1. Collections and Observations, p. 112
2. For example, Andrew Thomson of St. George's, Edinburgh. cf. James Cooper (ed), op. cit., p. 165.

service books commend its use.

4. Summary Statement

The influences of the FP/BCO and BCP liturgical traditions upon the prayers of the Westminster Directory are slight. It is well to remember that the governing principle in the composition of the Directory was not traditional usage, but the authority of Scripture. Nevertheless, whether or not the Divines were always conscious of it, they were in part guided by past and contemporary usages and the liturgical formulation behind these usages. On the whole, the prayers of the Directory reflect more the FP/BCO tradition than that of the BCP in their language, thought-forms and theological emphases. But with regard to the historical fact that the Directory was written in reaction to the Prayer Book, the extent of the latter's influence, particularly on the structure of the prayers, is quite remarkable.

There is very little structural similarity between the Directory and the BCO. The nearest observed is in the prayer in the fasting day service and even this likeness is only partial. But certain salient characteristics of FP/BCO tradition are in evidence in the Directory. Among these are the emphasis on sin, its enormity and particular manifestations, and on the wrath and

judgment of God; prayers for the Reformed Church abroad; and prayers, both before and after, directly related to the sermon. Another common characteristic is the great length of the prayers. However, no verbal similarities are observed.

While two verbal echoes of Prayer Book phrasing are discerned in these prayers, the chief influence of the Anglican liturgy lies in the sequence of ideas. This is seen in the Confession, Prayer for Pardon and for Assurance sequence, and in the structure of the Intercessions. Also noteworthy is the opening Invocation, reminiscent of the BCP Communion order.

In addition, there are certain features in the prayers of the Directory which have no liturgical precedent whatever. Six of these are noted and among them are the prayer for Parliament, for the right use of ordinances, and a general thanksgiving.

The possible influence of the Directory prayers upon subsequent usage is rather more difficult to assess. It has been observed that unbridled freedom, verging on chaos, prevailed in the Scottish Church's public prayers for generations after Westminster, and while there is no way of knowing, it is doubtful if the Directory was often consulted in the preparation of prayers.

It is interesting to speculate that the intercession for "the High Court of Parliament" and the General Thanksgiving which appeared in the 1662 Prayer Book were put there after the example of the Directory.

Certain sections of the prayers of the Directory which combine literary merit with devotional feeling, are incorporated into at least two modern Scottish service books. But the selections are limited, and, in the relatively great mass of prayer material included in both these books, they occupy no predominant place.

If, as was said at the outset of this chapter, the "prayers" of the Directory are, in one respect, its most distinguishing feature, they do not make a very distinguishable contribution to the worship usages of Presbyterians.

CHAPTER VThe Sacrament of Baptism1. The Structure of the Order.

The order in the Directory for the administration of the sacrament of Baptism bears, in its structure, a close resemblance to that in the service books of the FP/BCO tradition, and little likeness to the Anglican form.

Thus:

<u>FP, BCO, WALD & MIDD</u>	Directory
Presentation of child	Presentation of child
Exhortation, & charge to sponsors	Exhortation, & charge to parent
Profession of faith by father	Promise by father
Exposition of creed (BCO only)	Word of Institution
Prayer for blessing on sacrament	Prayer for blessing on sacrament
Baptism	Baptism
Thanksgiving	Thanksgiving

The simplicity of this order is in marked contrast to the complex and un-clear movement of the BCP service. In both form and content it owes little to the Prayer Book and much to the Reformed Liturgy. The original draft was the work of the Scots commissioners to the Assembly (1) who were obviously informed by their own usage (2). Modern

1. Baillie, Letters & Journals, II, pp.140, 148.

2. Alexander Henderson's description of Scottish practice follows a similar outline:

Prayer
 Instruction of parent
 Confession of faith and promise by parent
 Baptism
 Thanksgiving (and normal post-sermon prayers)

Presbyterian formulae follow the same general sequence of items.

While the rite was to be observed at the normal diet of the Church's worship "in the face of the congregation", at what exact point in the service is nowhere laid down. The Reformed service books place it "after the sermon", as does Henderson. Cartwright's Directory, too, calls for the observance "after the preaching of the word", reflecting, like WALD, and MIDD, English Presbyterian practice. Over the period between the Reformation and Westminster, Scottish custom varied in this regard, but normally the rite was observed only when there was preaching (on Sundays or weekdays) and usually following the sermon (1). In its Act supplementary to that adopting the Directory the 1645 General Assembly ordered "that it be administered after the Sermon and before the Blessing".(2). The BCP prescribes that the godparents and children "must be ready at the font immediately after the last Lesson" at Morning or Evening Prayer.

2. The Preliminary Rubrics

(a) When and by Whom Administered

-
1. cf. McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp. 256-60.
 2. Rec Kirk, p. 421.

Baptism, as it is not unnecessarily to be delayed, so it is not to be administered in any case by any private person, but by a Minister of Christ, called to be a steward of the mysteries of God.

Although the Divines maintained, in keeping with Reformed doctrine, that "grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto (Baptism), as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it"(1), they nevertheless were averse to a careless delay in the administration. The FP/BCO order has nothing to say in this matter, but W.D. Maxwell asserts that "it was a cardinal principle of the Reformed Church that Baptism should be administered as soon as possible after the birth of the child".(2). Of the Scottish practice at the time of Westminster, Henderson reports that "it useth not to be hastened before some day of the publike meeting of the Congregation, not delayed after, but upon necessary impediments" (3). However, the only liturgical precedent to this rubric is found in the BCP:

The pastors and curates shall often admonish the people that they defer not the baptism any longer than the Sunday or the holy day next after the child is born unless upon a great and reasonable cause declared to the curate and by him approved (4)

-
1. The Confession of Faith, XXVIII, v.
 2. John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 113.
 3. op. cit., p. 18.
 4. Rubric preceding the order for Private Baptism.

Yet while prescribing early baptism, the Directory immediately qualifies the prescription with the assertion that only ordained person^s may administer it (1). This rule follows from two Reformed tenets: Baptism is not essential to salvation (therefore lay-administration is never "necessary"), and the sacraments are tied to the ministry of the Word (therefore ought to be administered by preachers of the Word only) (2). The FP/BCO order reads:

Forasmuch as it is not permitted that women (or any private person) (3) should preach or minister the sacraments....

The ordained ministry is not mentioned, but the rubric goes on to insist that Baptism is "necessarily annexed to God's Word" and ministerial administration is thereby implied. McMillan cites many instances of breaches of the regulation, but it is obvious

1. Neither sacrament "may be dispensed by any but a minister of the word, lawfully ordained". Confession of Faith, XXVII, iv.

2. Calvin wrote on the subject: "It is done amiss if private men take upon themselves the administration of baptism....Christ did not commend women, nor yet every sort of men, that they should baptize; but whom he hath ordained his apostles, to them he gave this commandment." Of cases of alleged "necessity", he said, "God pronounceth that he adopteth our infants to be his own before they are born....Neither shall any man dare to be reproachful against God, to deny that his promise is of itself sufficient to work the effect thereof." A Treatise on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, pp. 56-7.

3. Words in brackets are in WALD and MIDD only.

that this was the official policy of the Kirk (1). Alexander Henderson thus states the contemporary Scottish rule: "No other but the pastor who preacheth the word hath power of Ministration of the Sacraments" (2). Cartwright's Directory probably represents English Presbyterian opinion in ordering that "only a minister of the word, that is, a preacher (shall) minister the sacraments".

The BCP, in its first three versions (1549, 1552 and 1559), left the matter open. It assumed clerical ministration, of course, in the order for public Baptism. But in the private services, the rubric reads,

And then one of them shall name the child,
and dip him in the water, or pour water
upon him, saying these words.

"One of them" meant anyone of the company present. But arising out of the Millenary Petition of 1603 and the subsequent Hampton Court Conference, alterations were made in the liturgy and with the 1604 version of the Prayer Book, a "lawful Minister" only could officiate. To all appearances, however, that there was at issue here no principle of the

1. cf. McMillan, op.cit., pp.263-5. The General Assembly in 1583 "declared that baptism by lay persons, and such as had no ordinary function in the ministry, was no baptism, and that those so baptized should be baptized anew". B.U.K. p. 276.

2. op. cit., p. 18.

Word annexed to the Sacrament, else private administration would have been abandoned. Expediency more than doctrinal considerations probably motivated the change (1).

Lightfoot reports that Alexander Henderson would have had this Directory rubric narrowed further. His wish was that the words "the minister" should stand in the place of "a minister of Christ"(2). The parish minister and no other should be permitted to baptize. This was according to Presbyterian policy (3), a safeguard to parish discipline. The 1662 Prayer Book had precisely this kind of regulation, though with typical Anglican flexibility, it permitted exceptions:

Let the Minister of the Parish, (or in his absence, any other lawful Minister than can be procured)....

(b) Where Administered.

Nor is it to be administered in private places, or privately, but in the place of Public Worship, and in the face of the Congregation, where the people may most conveniently see and hear; and not in

1. cf. Proctor & Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 136 ff. It is noteworthy that the extent of the Puritan demand at this time was simply that baptism by women be disallowed. The bishops appear to have broadened the issue to the whole question of lay baptism in preparing the agenda for Hampton Court.

2. Journal of Proceedings, p. 297.

3. cf. McMillan, op. cit., pp 254-5.

the places where fonts, in the time of Popery, were unfitly and superstitiously placed.

The rule that Baptism be administered only in the presence of the congregation was a true Reformed dictum. It must be annexed to the preaching of the Word, and like the preaching of the Word, demanded the presence of the people. It was an act of the Church and not of private persons. The relevant rubric in the FP and BCO reads:

It is evident that the sacraments are not ordained of God to be used in private corners, as charms or sorceries, but left to the congregation and necessarily annexed to God's word as seals of the same(1).

The First Book of Discipline gives as the reason for this insistence,

Partly to remove this grosse errour, by which many are deceived, thinking that children be damned if they die without Baptism; and partly to make the people have greater reverence to the administration of the Sacraments then they have.(2).

The relaxation of this rule under the First Episcopacy and the passing of the Perth Articles which permitted private baptism under extenuating circumstances served to confirm the principle among

1. The rubric in WALD and MIDD is slightly different in wording, but its intent is clearly the same.

2. Bks Disc, p. 58.

rigid Presbyterians (1). Alexander Henderson describes of contemporary practices with the flat statement that it is "never administered in private houses" but "after sermon on weekdays and after sermon in the afternoon on the Lord's day"(2)

The English Puritans took a similar position from quite early times. In their admonition to Parliament in 1572, one of the petitions was for the abolition of private sacraments. Cartwright's document directs that neither sacrament shall be administered "in any other place than in the publick assemblies of the church". While public Baptism remained a Puritan standard (3), it was not so central as to be among the issues raised at Hampton Court (4).

The Anglican book strongly favoured public administration. The opening rubric in the order

1. cf. McMillan, op. cit., p. 256. "Cowper's" liturgy, though an Episcopal compilation, and following closely the BCP in this order, does not, like the Prayer Book, provide an order for private baptism. However, it does permit the practice: "if necessitie so require, the minister is not to refuse baptisme at any time or in any place, according to the late ordinance of the Church..." (As in an early draft). This was in reference to the 1618 Perth Articles. G.W. Sprott, Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, p. 72.

2. Government and Order, pp. 187-9.

3. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, pp. 69-70.

4. Proctor and Frere, op. cit., pp. 136 ff.

for Public Baptism reads,

The people are to be admonished, that it is most convenient that Baptism should not be ministered, but upon Sundays and other holy-days, when the most number of the people may come together: as well for that the congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly Baptized into the number of Christ's Church, as also because in the Baptism of Infants, every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his Baptism. Nevertheless (if necessity so require) children may at all times be baptized at home.

While private baptism is permissible, the BCP does not lose sight of the corporate nature of the act. Thus the order for private administration again warns that it should be observed only "when great need shall compel them to do so", and adds the further rubric.

If the child, which is after this sort Baptized, do afterward live, it is expedient that it be brought into the Church, to the intent that if the Minister of the same Parish did himself Baptize the child, the Congregation may be certified of the true form of Baptism, by him privately before used: Or if the child were baptized by any other lawful Minister, that then the Minister of the Parish... shall examine and try whether the child be lawfully baptized, or no. (1)

And there follows an order to be used in the Church which contains all the elements of the order for Public Baptism except the actual baptism.

1. As in the 1604 version.

If the situation in London at the same time as the Assembly may be regarded as indicative of the prevailing practice in England, it must be concluded that the high standard of the Prayer Book and the higher standard of the Puritans were never met. Said Mr. Calamy to the Divines, "I confesse a great abuse in the citty in 2 or 3 yeares none baptized in the church (;) the ministers could not get the people to bring them" (1)

In a long debate in the Assembly, while most members admitted their preferences for public baptism, there was disagreement about biblical warrant for declaring the private observances unlawful (2) -- "whether your rule bee not stricter than the gospel calls for" (3). The Scots were among those holding the stricter view (4)

The General Assembly reaffirmed the strict

1. MS Minutes II, p.244; cf. Baillie, Letters & Journals, II, pp.204-5.
2. MS Minutes, pp. 244 ff.
3. Mr. Marshall. "(The) reasons a man may give (are) many why (it should be) in the public congregation, but (there is no) instance of it in the new testament." ibid., pp.244-5.
4. To the proposition that infirmity should permit private baptism, Gillespie applied the Reformed argument: "This should rather to me be an argument to the contrary. The fostering of an opinion of the necessity of bapt(ism) may prove more dangerous than the want of it when it is not through neglect." MS Minutes II, p. 246. cf. Lightfoot, Journals of Proceedings, pp. 297-8.

Reformed position in 1690 (1) after the restoration of Presbytery. Bishop Burnet indicates that Presbyterians had held to the rule during the Second Episcopacy (2), and a writer of Episcopal persuasion in 1711 complains that "there are Instances to be given...of their letting Infants die without their Baptism, rather than sprinkle them out of a Church". However, this writer observes, too, some inconsistency among the Presbyterian clergy in the matter. (3). The eighteenth century saw the complete relaxation of the rule. "Whatever the causes", writes Leishman, "the result has been that over a great part of Scotland public baptism is a ceremony almost unknown(4). With the liturgical revival in the later nineteenth century came an endeavour to recover Baptism as an act of the whole congregation. The service books of the worship societies of the three major branches

1. "By allowing the private use of (the sacraments) in pretended cases of necessity, the superstitious opinion is nourished that they are necessary to salvation....Therefore the Assembly...do discharge the administration of Baptism in private, that is, in any place, or at any time, when the congregation is not orderly called together to wait on the dispensing of the Word". Acts. pp.226-7

2. A Modest and Free Conference, (1669) pp.78-9.

3. Strange News from Scotland, (1712), p.10.

In noting the exceptions, the anonymous writer says, "Now and then in Compliment of some of their particular Friends" some of them "do sprinkle in a private House".

4. "The Ritual of the Church of Scotland" in Story (ed), The Church of Scotland, Past and Present V, pp.407-8.

of Scottish Presbyterianism all reflect this enlivened concern. The editors of Euchologion (1857), in a note prefacing the Baptismal order, write, "It is assumed...that the Baptism takes place in the Church as the Directory requires". NDPW (1898) makes the same assumption and appeals to the same authority. And PFS (1894) places the order for Baptism in the context of public worship as if it were a matter of course. There are no provisions in any for private administration.

The stricture against administration "in places where fonts...were unfitly and superstitiously placed" is an attack on "Popish ceremonies" -- the place of the font was normally at the west door, symbolizing entry into the Church, and not "in the face of the congregation". The tendency in Scotland after the Reformation had been to replace the font with a basin attached to the pulpit or placed on it, so that the sacrament could be administered from the place of preaching (1). Henderson describes the minister

1. McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp. 251-3. This writer observes that there was a tendency in the same direction in certain quarters, undoubtedly Puritan, of the English Church late in the sixteenth century.

remaining at the same place where he hath preached, and having water in a large basin provided, with a linen cloth, in a convenient place, and in a decent manner....(1)

Some urged a more rigid ruling by the Divines. They would have all fonts entirely demolished but had to compromise for their mere removal from church doors (2). In Pardovan's version of the Directory Hnederson's above quoted words are interpolated verbally into the text. (3).

(c) Sponsors

The Child to be Baptized, after notice given to the Minister the day before, is to be presented by the Father, or (in case of necessary absence) by some Christian friend in his place, professing his earnest desire that the Child may be Baptized.

The clause about giving notice to the minister was inserted into a late draft of the order at the instigation of Lightfoot, he himself informs us, in express imitation of the Prayer Book (4). The

-
1. op. cit., p. 19.
 2. "About the place of the font...it was resolved it should be in what place the people could best see and hear. The Scots urged hard to have it at the pulpit....Some called to have them to be demolished: but this was cried against: only the Scots desired that the place of it might be altered; viz. removed from the church door. At last a vote was passed that the superstitious place of the font should be altered." Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, p. 315.
 3. Collections and Observations, p. 127.
 4. op. cit., pp. 325-6.

BCP rubric reads,

The parent shall give knowledge overnight, or in the morning, afore the beginning of Morning Prayer (1).

There is no such rule in the books of the FP/BCO tradition; however, Henderson's picture of Scottish practice reveals that

notice is given thereof in due time to the Pastor, and that by the father of the child, if he be not justly hindered, that a word may be spoken to him in season. (2).

The concern here is the pastoral one of preparing the parent for his part in the sacrament.

The second clause in this rubric concerns sponsorship. The mention of godparents is conspicuous by its absence. All the liturgies of the FP/BCO corpus prescribe or permit godfathers, though not, like the BCP, godmothers. The FP and BCO require that the infant shall be "accompanied with the father and godfather". WALD and MIDD permit more than one godfather, "as the Church shall think convenient" (in WALD) or "as the Eldership of that congregation shall think convenient" (in MIDD). Participation of godfathers in the Baptismal rite was evidently accepted practice both in the English congregation at Geneva (3) and in the post-Reformation

-
1. The same rubric appears in "Cowper's" liturgy.
 2. Government and Order, p. 18.
 3. Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, pp.114-5.

Scottish Church, (1). Indeed, the letter of the rubric in the BCO was often ignored and any number of godfathers might be called to stand with the father. (2). "In later times," writes Sprott, "while some continued to regard godfathers as additional sponsors, others looked upon them merely as witnesses," (3). The relevant rubric in "Cowper's" order, which is otherwise similar to that in the BCP, varies from the Anglican form in calling for "fathers and godfathers" in conformity with the Scots usage.

English Puritans from Elizabethan times onward had repudiated the participation of godparents in Baptism (4). A child's right to baptism, they maintained, was by virtue of his birth of Christian parents. "The promises of God are made to the faithful and their seed, children inherit them in virtue of the election to grace of their parents. These alone, therefore, must stand as sponsors for them and not any godparents or other substitutes"(5). To be sure, this is not entirely borne out by WALD

-
1. McMillan, op. cit., pp. 248 ff.
 2. *ibid*, pp. 248-9.
 3. Sprott, BCO, p. xxxvii.
 4. It was the early English Puritan radical, Robert Brown, who first publicly raised the question in Scotland in 1564.
 5. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans pp.69-70.

and MIDD; but Cartwright's Directory stipulates:

Women only may not offer unto baptism those that are to be baptized, but the father of it may be, or in his name some other.

This takes the same position as the Westminster Directory. The matter seems not to have been a major point of controversy in the Assembly (1).

A problem inherent in the strict view was the sponsorship of orphans and children whose parents were, for reasons of ignorance or scandal deprived of the sacraments. If, on the one hand, it was held that a child had a right to Baptism on the strength of Christian parentage, it was felt, on the other, that the parents' apostasy must not deprive an infant of this seal of God's covenant since he (as most did) came of Christian ancestry. The clause in parenthesis in the rubric seems designed to meet such adverse circumstances, though this is by no means clear. (2). Measures were eventually taken in the Church of Scotland to deal with the problem. A General Assembly ruling in 1712 states:

1. However, Baillie reports some debates on the point and reveals a very unpuritan practice as prevalent in the English Church. "We have carried the parents presenting of his child, and not their midwives, as was their universall custom." Letters and Journals, II, pp.204-5.

2. Henderson's account, similar to the Directory, furnishes no clue, op. cit., p.19.

It being the duty of Christian parents to dedicate their children to God in baptism, and to covenant for their education in the faith of Christ, no other sponsor is to be taken, unless the parents be dead, or absent, or grossly ignorant, or under scandal, or contumacious to discipline; such being unfit to stand as sponsors in transacting a covenant with God. In which cases, the immediate parent who is in such circumstances is to be required to provide some fit person; and if it can be, one related to the parent of the child, should be sponsor; but if either of the parents...give evidence...of their repentance...the suspension they were under...should be taken off...and the penitent parent should be allowed to present the child. In case of children exposed, whose baptism, after inquiry, cannot be known, the Kirk-session is to order the presenting of the child to baptism, and to see to the Christian education thereof; and it is recommended to the parish to take care of the maintenance of the child (1).

This regulation is , in effect, an elaboration of the Directory rubric and is entirely consistent with it. The principle of the substitute sponsor speaking in the name of the parent and not that of the child is retained. In the case of "exposed" children, the Kirk-session is called upon to fulfil the practical functions of a godparent, but, again, not the sacramental function (in the Anglican sense) of

1. Acts, p. 462. This was not entirely new in 1712. Pardovan, whose work was published in 1709, records regulations similar to these. *op. cit.*, p. 124.

making vows in the name of the children. The session is to be parent rather than godparent. The latter regulation also emphasizes the corporate responsibility of the Church for all children, born within its compass.

The third clause in the rubric pertains to the parent's profession of his desire that the child receive Baptism. Presumably the question that appears in the orders of the FP/BCO tradition is to be asked and answered:

Do you present this child to be baptized, earnestly desiring that he be ingrafted in the mystical body of Jesus Christ?

The Answer.

Yea, we require the same. (1).

For both the Reformers and the Westminster Divines parental consent was a normal prerequisite to a child's baptism. It was a sign of the father's election and faith and of his intention to fulfil his

1. Its position, in the Directory and in the FP/BCO orders, is of interest. Maxwell informs us that "this question (in the FP) stands in its normal Catholic place according to Continental usage". op. cit., p.115. In the BCP the question is not put. Rather, the minister is directed to "ask whether the children be baptized or no". "Cowper's" liturgy here again diverges from the Prayer Book pattern by inserting the BCO question and answer. The question is somewhat amplified; it reads:

Doe you presant this childe to be baptized, earnestly desiring that he may be received in the fellowship of Chryst's mysticall bodie, which is his church, and be marked with the mark of Christians, that is Baptisme.

responsibility to the child. It is noteworthy that WALD and MIDD omit the second half of the question. Apparently the editors would not admit of Baptism as meaning entry into the "mystical body" but, like the Divines, into the "visible" body only (See below).

3. Instruction and Exhortation

(a) General Instruction

Before Baptism, the Minister is to use some words of instruction, touching the institution, nature, use and ends of this Sacrament, showing....

While the general address in the Directory and that in the BCO do not conform to each other in structure, they are similar in function. The Scottish influence is apparent in this rubric which is almost identical to the words of Alexander Henderson when he writes,

Some words of instruction touching the Author, nature, use and ends of this Sacrament.....(1)

However, the address in the Directory is the more fully developed. For instance, the BCO implies but does not articulate the concept of "federal holiness" -- the holiness of a child by virtue of birth within the Church. The BCO speaks of God's promise

1. Government and Order, p. 19.

which is most evident in St. Paul, who pronounceth the children begotten and born (either of the parents being faithful) to be clean and holy.

Admittedly, there was some confusion among the Divines themselves as to what was meant by "federal holiness". The distinction that was being sought after was one between an inherited holiness and "reall and inherent holynesse" -- between a holiness which permitted Baptism and one which was a sign and assurance of election and salvation. (1). Another distinctive mark (as over against the ECO) was, as already observed, the assertion "that children, by baptism, are solemnly received into the bosom of the visible church". The Independents were not prepared to go so far, and the statement

1. There was a lengthy debate over this in the Assembly. Brief excerpts from speeches by Rutherford, Marshall and Goodwin are illustrative: Rutherford: "I do not think to heare that reall and federall holynesse are one and the same....Where ther is reall and inherent holynesse ther must be a seeing of god, and being in a state of salvation.... The lord hath election and reprobation amongst Infants noe lesse than those of age....If this (federal holiness) be sufficient to put them into a state of salvation, I see not how any of them shall be lost or how the lords decree of election and Reprobation can stand amongst them...." Marshall: "Of the party to be baptized I am not only to judge but believe that they are holy with the holynesse there spoken of (federal), but I am not bound to believe that he is holy with any real holynesse." Goodwin: "If you make (federal holiness) any other holynesse (than real) then baptisme is a seale of some other holynesse than the holynesse of salvation." MS Minutes, II, pp.256-61.

was included over their objections. As Baillie reports, they did

esteem not baptized infants to be members of the Church before they have entered into their covenant; till then they hold them from the Lord's Table, and all the acts of discipline, as people without the Church and not members of it (1).

Finally, this address is distinct from its parallel in the BCO in that, as a presentation of the meaning of the sacrament, it is more systematic. For example, the passage, "That the water.... resurrection of Christ", about the significance of the element and its use in this sacrament, says little that is not said in the paragraph on the subject in the BCO. But its two heads, each with two sub-heads, lend clarity to the teaching.

As is well known, the theological assumptions implicit in the BCP Baptismal order are quite different from those in the Directory, and the salient features of this address do not appear there. There is no suggestion in the Prayer Book of "federal" or any other kind of holiness in the child before the act of Baptism. There is the clear implication that the descent of the Spirit, regeneration, and reception into the Church (with no distinction between "visible" and "invisible")

1. Dissuasive, p. 120.

all happen at the point of Baptism. There are, of course, certain biblical phrases common to both orders, and there is the echo of the Prayer Book in the Directory clause,

all who are baptized in the name of Christ, do renounce and by their baptism are bound to fight against the devil, the world and the flesh. (1).

The rubric following the general address gives liberty to the minister to amplify or modify the talk as occasion demands. In Lee'58, where the Baptismal order is drawn from the Directory, the address itself is not given, but this rubric, in a slightly paraphrased form, stands in place of it.

(b) The Retrospective Admonition.

The exhortation addressed to the people "to look back to their baptism" has a distinct precedent in the FP/BCO liturgies where the congregation is told that

it much profiteth oft to be present at the ministration...that we being put in mind of the league and covenant between God and us...may have occasion...to try our lives past, our present conversation, and to prove ourselves whether we stand fast....

And it goes on to speak of "the loving promises of our heavenly Father" analagous to the words of the

1. These the godparents, in the name of the children, are asked to renounce; in the Anglican order. And there follows the prayer that they may "triumph against the Devil, the world and the flesh".

Directory, "to stir up their faith...." The BCP, in its opening rubric, gives as one of the reasons for the public administration of the sacrament that

in the baptism of infants every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession to God in Baptism.

Unlike the Reformed liturgies and the Directory, the reminder here is of the individual's profession and promises to God, and not of the covenanted promises of God set forth and sealed in Baptism (1).

4. The Responsibility and Promise of the Parent.

He is to exhort the parent, To consider the great mercy of God to him and to his Child; to bring up the Child in the knowledge of the grounds of the Christian religion, and in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and to let him know the nature of God's wrath to himself and the Child, if he be negligent: Requiring his solemn promise for the performance of his duty.

(a) The Parental Obligation

The three ideas of this admonition to the parent have a direct parallel in words directed to parents generally in the FP/BCO order:

1. Moreover, ye that be fathers and mothers may take hereby most singular comfort, to see your children thus received into the bosom of Christ's congregation, 2. whereby ye are daily admonished, that ye bring up your children of God's favour and mercy....

1. However, the BCP ritual does include a thanksgiving to God "that thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of thy grace, and faith in thee," and a supplication to increase this knowledge and confirm this faith in us evermore".

So ought it make you diligent and careful to nurture and instruct them in the true knowledge and fear of God, 3. wherin if ye be negligent ye do not only injury to your own children...but also heap damnation upon yourselves.

There is a charge to the godparents in the Anglican order to train the child in Christian doctrine and lead him in the Christian way, but there are no warnings of the consequences should the obligation be neglected.

(b) The Parent's Promise.

Neither the FP/BCO nor the BCP Baptismal order require the verbal promise of parent or sponsor to fulfil the duties that are respectively set forth. On the other hand, all liturgies in both traditions, with the exception of WALD, require assent to the Apostles' Creed. The BCO demands that it be recited "by the father, or in his absence, the godfather" and takes this profession to mean "consent to the performance" of the parental duties it outlines. In the BCP the godparents assent to the Creed in the name of the infant but this seems not to have the connotation of a promise to bring up the child in this faith. "Cowper's" alone among the pre-Westminster liturgical documents requires of the father and godfathers the verbal "promise to bring up this chylde in the knowledge" of the faith in which he is baptized. That it was inserted into

what was virtually an Anglican order suggests that it was an accepted requirement in Scottish usage if not of the BCO. Henderson confirms this:

He that presenteth the childe, maketh confession of the faith into which the childe is to be baptized, and promiseth to bring up the childe in that faith and in the fear of God. (1)

The absence from the Directory of a parental profession of faith is new. Such a profession was intended by the Assembly, and its absence from the version finally authorized and printed remains something of a mystery. There was a lengthy debate in the Assembly as to the propriety and lawfulness of a confession of faith by the parent, the Independents and some few others being vigorously opposed, the Scots favour, chiefly in the interests of uniformity with the Reformed churches abroad and the Church of Scotland (2). The upshot was a vote

-
1. Government and Order, p. 19.
 2. cf. MS Minutes II, pp.479-92; Gillespie, Notes, pp 89-91; Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, pp 314-5. Henderson was strongly in favour of some form of confession of faith and apparently had the support of Baillie who, though he was silent in debate, reports that while he, personally, should have preferred the use of the Apostles' Creed, there was a compromise and "we gott the Assemblie to equivalent interrogatories, much against the mind of the Independents". (Letters and Journals II, p. 258) Rutherford was opposed to a confession being made binding, but argued, with Gillespie, for the practice in the interests of uniformity with the continental and Scottish churches. (footnote cont. on next page)

in favour of the use and the agreed formula was inserted in the place of the last clause of the rubric under discussion. It was as follows:

It is recommended that he make a profession of his faith, by answering to these or the like questions, Dost thou Believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Dost thou hold thyself obliged to observe all that Christ hath commanded you? And wilt thou endeavour so to do? Dost thou desire this child to be baptized into the faith and profession of Jesus Christ? (1)

This formula remained in the Directory throughout the passage of the service book through both houses of Parliament in January 1644/5. But it was removed by consent of Parliament on 5th March of the same year. Part of the available evidence suggests that the removal was at the instigation of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. But this is by no means certain (2). A.F. Mitchell, who accepts

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 (MS Minutes II, p. 486; Gillespie, Notes, p. 90)
 In view of subsequent events, this Scottish position is of interest. What was probably the most cogent argument against the use was put forward by Mr. Bridge: "If you ty this profession to the sacrament of baptisme it will argue that federal holynesse of the parent is not the grounds of baptizing....Either you intend to deny (baptism) if (the parent) do not answer." MS Minutes II, p. 480.

1. Gillespie, Notes, p. 91. cf. Lords Journals VII, p. 264, where the interrogatories also appear. The last of the four questions would have been redundant had the rubric at the beginning of the order calling for such a question also stood. Whether it did or did not is not clear.

2. The evidence is conflicting. On 3rd February, "the General Assembly having most seriously considered, revised and examined the Directory,..do unanimously, and without contrary voice, Agree to and Approve the
 (footnote cont. on next page)

the theory that the Scots Assembly was responsible, gropes for a reason. He suggests that the "striking out of the very vague questions the southern divines had permitted" was "that they might be at liberty to retain the practice sanctioned by the Book of Common Order and various Acts of Assembly by exacting a fuller profession of faith". (1).

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 following Directory, in all the heads thereof, together with the preface set before it". (Acts, p.116). In a letter to the Divines (13th February), while referring to certain reservations it had regarding the Communion order, the General Assembly makes known its acceptance of the Directory, referring to no other exceptions (Acts, pp.131-2). Baillie makes no reference to any alterations in the Directory in reporting its passage through the General Assembly (Letters & Journals II, pp.258-60). On 27th February, the House of Lords was informed of the acceptance of the Directory by the Scottish Assembly and Parliament "without any alterations" (Lords Journals VII, p 253). Later (9th April) Gillespie, on his return from Scotland, reported the same personally to the Divines (Mitchell, Minutes, p.77). On the other hand, there is the following minute in the Commons Journals IV, p.70, for 5th March: "Mr. Tate reported, from the Assembly, some few alterations, desired by the Church of Scotland, to be made in the Directory for Public Worship: The which were read; and, upon the question assented to; and carried to the Lords for their concurrence, by Mr. Tate." What the alterations were are not mentioned. The Lords Journals, VII, p. 264, for the same date, record the alterations agreed upon and these are revealed to be the removal of the interrogatories and a small change in the Marriage service. The minute makes no reference to Mr. Tate or to the Church of Scotland, but the coincidence of date makes it obvious that the Lords were dealing with same matter as the Commons. The Assembly minutes are exceedingly sparse at this point; there is but a reference to "debate about alterations in the Directory last made" on 6th March (Mitchell, Minutes, p.68). The weight of the evidence is against the General Assembly's responsibility for this change.

1. The Westminster Assembly, It's History & Standards, p. 222.

Whether or not the Scots were responsible for the deletion of the interrogatories, and for whatever reason if they were, the use of the Creed fell into decline. Dr. Leishman, commenting of Mitchell's theory, writes,

If the intention was to save the Creed, it utterly failed, for through the growing power of the party of innovation it shared the fate of the Lord's Prayer, Doxology, and other distinctive features of the national worship"(1).

The use of the Creed in Baptism was among the practices that the Second Episcopacy attempted to revive (2). In 1709, Walter Steuart of Pardovan set out what were presumed to be the official standards of the Church of Scotland, and his account of the parental "engagement" at Baptism is interesting if somewhat startling:

In the Baptismal Engagement the Parent or Sponsor, is, in the Name of the Child, to Renounce the Devil and all his Works, the vain Pomp and Glory of this Wicked World, and all the Sinful Lusts of Flesh; He is to Promise to Bring up the Child in the Knowledge of the Grounds of the Christian Religion as they are contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament: And, lastly, He is to Bring up the Child in that Holy Life and Practice which

-
1. Westminster Directory, p. 112; cf. Sprott, BCO, p. xxxi. On the other hand, W.D. Maxwell flatly states, "The Creed was at first omitted from it (the Directory) but in Scotland was immediately subjoined to it". The Book of Common Prayer and the Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches, p. 10.
 2. cf. McCrie, C.G., The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, p. 230.

God hath Comanded in His Word. The Engagements to be given in the Name of Children at Baptism, should be Exprest in these or the like general Terms, conform to the Directory for Worship, Approven by the General Assembly, Feb, 7. 1645." (1)

Pardovan cites no authority for this remarkable statement, Nevertheless, even here there is no mention of the Creed. G.D. Henderson quotes an Episcopalian critic in Queen Anne's time as saying,

We judge it an insufferable usurpation to have the Westminster Confession foisted in at Baptism in lieu of the Apostles' Creed, and so our children instead of being entered into the Christian religion are made proselytes of a faction"(2)

thus reflecting yet another practice.

Of the modern Scottish service books examined, virtually all require an affirmation of faith on the part of parents or sponsors. (3). Lee'64 requires the rehearsal of the Apostles' Creed by the father or sponsor after the minister. Euchologion puts the question of the acceptance of the Creed after the manner of the BCP (4). Later editions of this book,

1. Collections and Observations, p. 126. The "renunciation" is from the Prayer Book, as is the notion that it is made in the name of the child. If it represents "universal custom" (from which Pardovan claims to draw material as well as from authoritative statements) it reveals a remarkable Anglican invasion into Scottish Presbyterian usage.

2. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland p.11.

3. The exception is Lee'58, which is largely drawn from the Directory.

4. Though unlike the BCP, this question is preceded by one about belief "in the Word of God as it is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments".

and also PFS and the 1940 BCO, contain the Creed as an alternative to a briefer summation of the faith. NDPW requires assent to the trinitarian formula. All except Lee'64 require parental promise to bring up the child in the Christian faith.

5 Prayer for the Sanctification of the Ordinance

This being done, Prayer is also to be joined with the Word of Institution, for sanctifying the Water to this spiritual use; and the Minister is to pray to this or like effect:

The reading of the word of institution is new. The words of Matthew 28:19 are cited in prayer in the BCP and in the exhortation in WALD and MIDD, but not in the FP or BCO. And there is only one precedent for an explicit prayer for the sanctifying of the water, that being in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 (1). Whether such an explicit prayer is actually required by this rubric might be questioned. The Divines maintained that the elements in the sacraments are sanctified "by the word and prayer", not necessarily in a specific plea for their sanctification. The prayer following the rubric does not make this petition. However, the Communion order does contain a prayer for the sanctification

1 Such a petition was inserted into the BCP in 1662, though not in the same place as it is in "Laud's".

of the elements and there would be nothing inconsistent about such a prayer here.

The prayer set forth following the rubric was new. Possibly because of its theological precision, it found its way into many modern service books of Scottish Presbyterianism. The greater portion of it appears in Lee'58, Euchologion (1905), and NDPW; and its central petition, that God would "join the inward baptism of his Spirit with the outward baptism of water" is used in Euchologion (1867) and PFS.

6. The Baptism

"Calling the Child by his name", and the Baptism in the triune name, are, of course, universal.

For the manner of doing it, is not only lawful but sufficient, and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child.

About "the manner of doing it" there was a prolonged debate in the Assembly -- an indication of the Divines' concern for ceremonial correctness when the ceremony had biblical warrant. For the most part the debate centred on various scriptural examples and allusions, though the Anabaptist custom of total immersion, or "dipping", fostered a reaction in favour of sprinkling or pouring, and it was an unwillingness to give countenance to this sect that prompted the insertion of the words "but

sufficient" into the rubric. (1). The operative verb in the FP, BCO and WALD is "layeth"(2); in MIDD, "pour" or "wash"; in Cowper's, "pouring"; and in Henderson's account, "sprinkling" (3). The BCP calls for dipping, "so it be discreetly and warily done", but permits pouring "if the child be weak". The effect of Baxter's Savoy liturgy is the same. None of the modern Presbyterian books mention dipping, and most prescribe sprinkling exclusively(4).

The clause, "without any further ceremony", is intended to proscribe the Anglican practice of signing the cross on the forehead of the child immediately after Baptism. English Puritans and Scots Presbyterians were unanimous in their

1. MS Minutes II, pp. 264-75; cf. Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, p. 300.

2. "He taketh water and layeth it upon the child's head".

3. Government and Order, p. 19.

4. McMillans suggests that the prior position of the word "pouring" to "sprinkling" in the Directory rubric could mean that it is the more preferable. He notes the prevalence in the Scottish Church of the period of the vessel known as a laver which might have been used for pouring the water on the infant, the possible inference being that this was the custom of the time. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp. 253-4. The minutes of the Assembly, however, indicate that the Divines were indifferent as to which of the two "manners" ought to be used. It is noteworthy that Calvin preferred dipping, though allowed the lawfulness of the other two. A Treatise on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, pp.55-6.

repudiation of this ceremony. "Crossing", says the First Book of Discipline, "accuseth the perfect institution of Christ Jesus, of imperfection. For it was voyd of all such inventions of men." (1) Not only was the ceremony without dominical authority; it implied, as the Puritans saw it, the ex opere operato functioning of the sacrament and priestly efficacy. (2).

7. The Post-Baptismal Prayer

The source of the post-Baptismal prayer, or the Thanksgiving, is found in the parallel prayer in the liturgies of the FP/BCO corpus. Not only in its structure is it similar to the earlier prayer, its very wording is drawn from this source. Thus:

FP/BCO

We give thee most humble thanks for thine infinite goodness, who hast not only numbered us amongst thy saints, but also of thy free mercy dost call our children unto thee, marking them with this Sacrament as a singular token and badge of thy love....

We beseech thee that thou wilt confirm this

Directory

Acknowledging with all thankfulness;...That He is good and gracious, not only that He numbereth us among His saints, but is pleased also to bestow upon our children this singular token and badge of His love in Christ....

And praying, That the Lord would still

1. The Book also proscribes such other Roman appendages to Baptism as the use of "oyle, salt, waxe, spittle, conjuration". Bks. Disc., p. 23.
2. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 62. Abolition of the practice was an article of the Millenary petition; and at Hampton Court, where Puritan demands were much moderated, it remained a point of protest.

FP/BCO
thy favour more and
more towards us, and
take this infant into
thy tuition and
defence....

...by whose divine
power he may so prevail
against Satan, that in
the end, obtaining the
victory....

Directory
continue and daily
confirm more and more
this His unspeakable
favour: That He would
receive this Infant...
into his fatherly
tuition and defence.
...and so uphold him by
His divine power and
grace that by faith he
may prevail against the
devil, the world and the
flesh, till in the end
he obtain a full and
final victory....

Lightfoot, reporting the passage of this prayer
through the Assembly, gives no hint that its source
was acknowledged there (1).

Versions of the prayer appear in some of the
modern service books: in Lee'58, drawn from the
Directory; and in Lee'64, NDPW, and (a small
portion) in PFS, drawn from the BCO(2).

8. In Summary

The order for the Sacrament of Baptism is clearly
in the Reformed tradition rather than the Anglican.
In substance and spirit it is a document inspired by

-
1. op. cit., p. 301.
 2. This Thanksgiving, says W.D. Maxwell, first
appeared in the FP; it is not found in earlier
Reformed liturgies. John Knox's Genevan Service
Book, p. 120. Despite its merits and its
appearance in both the BCO and the Directory, giving
it a dual claim to a place in the Reformed liturgical
heritage, it is not appropriated in Euchologion or
in the present day BCO of the Church of Scotland.
It has, however, found a place in the Baptismal
order of the BCO of the United Church of Canada .

the Calvinistic understanding of the sacrament. As an intended substitute for the Prayer Book order, it is most revolutionary. By it, its compilers repudiate the Anglican liturgy in almost all its features as well as the concepts which underlie it. The two orders represent two differing beliefs about what happens in Baptism. To the Divines, Baptism is the sign and seal of something which in fact has already happened (if the child be of the elect): his reception into the covenant of grace; and the sign and seal of his regeneration and remission of sins.(1). In the act of Baptism the child is received into the body of the visible Church -- a ratification on earth of what has already taken place in heaven. Therefore the Directory insists that "outward baptism is not so necessary, that, through want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation," and that "the inward grace and virtue of baptism are not tied to the very moment of time wherein it is administered", they reach backward and forward, they were preordained and "the fruit and power thereof reacheth to the

1. cf. Calvin: "It should be a token and proof of our cleansing....Our cleansing (is) not made by Baptism as by a cause, but manifested by it as a sign." "It testifieth to us that we are... grafted into the death and life of Christ." A Treatise on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, pp.36,37,41.

whole of our life".

The BCP liturgy appears to proceed on the presupposition that all are born equal (in sin) and that remission of original sin, regeneration by water and the Spirit, and reception into the Church (militant and triumphant) take place in the act of Baptism. The promise of God appealed to in this order is not, as in the BCO and Directory, the covenant promise that he will be our God and the God and Father of our children, but Christ's promise to answer those who ask, seek and knock. Appeal is made to this promise, that the sacramental act might be made effectual -- that what is done on earth may be ratified in heaven. Baptism therefore becomes necessary to salvation and the inward grace and virtue are very much tied to the outward act and the moment of time in which it occurs.

With such a wide theological disparity between these two views of the sacrament, it is only to be expected that the form and content of the two orders in which these views are respectively expressed should be radically different. By the same token, the close kinship between the BCO and the Directory in their formulae for this ordinance is a reflection of a common understanding held by the Reformers and the Divines.

The foregoing examination of the rite reveals that the influence of the Prayer Book was confined to four incidental and minor points. On the other hand, there is a marked similarity between the Directory and the FP/BCO order which might be in part coincidental, due to a common theology informing both, but which indicates a conscious dependence upon the earlier liturgy by the compilers of the later. In at least nine major features, the two orders are in conformity. And in two further, known Scottish usages not prescribed in the BCO, appear to influence the Directory.

At three points the Directory differs from both of the earlier forms: in requiring the parental promise (1), in the omission of the parental profession of faith, and in prescribing the reading of the word of institution.

The influence of the Directory on the modern service books of Scottish Presbyterianism is limited. Lee'58 provides the only instance in which the order is appropriated to the exclusion of other sources. But the compiler of that book writes, "The Baptismal service in the second edition (Lee'58) I would not reprint: it is very cold and bald, being taken from

1. The promise appears in "Cowper's" form, but this was an unpublished and likely unused liturgy.

the Directory"(1). In consequence, Lee'64 draws its Baptismal service from the BCO. One or both of the two prayers appear in paraphrase in Euchologion and NDPW, and parts of them in PFS. Two precedents established by the Directory, the requiring of the promise of the parents concerning the upbringing of the child, and the reading of the word of institution, are followed in virtually all modern books.

1. In a letter. Story, R.H., Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D. II, p. 78.

CHAPTER VI

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

1. The Structure of the Order

At the heart of any book of Christian worship is the order for the celebration of Holy Communion. For the observance of this sacrament is not only the highest act of the Church's corporate worship, it is, or ought to be, the norm of all her lesser acts of devotion. By reason of the word proclaimed in this act -- the word of the Gospel -- and by reason of the sheer physical nature of the act, the Church is here more directly related to the Incarnation than anywhere else. Therefore the lesser acts draw their meaning from this central one. The order for this sacrament in the Directory demands careful attention.

The simplicity and integrity of the structure of the order is noteworthy. It is important also to observe that the celebration is conjoined with the normal preaching service so that the two, the "Liturgy of the Word" and the "Liturgy of the Upper Room", are two parts of one continuous offering of worship. The outline for this full service as prescribed in the Directory and as intended to be practised in Scotland (1) is as follows:

-
1. In Scotland, as we have seen, the Intercessions came after the sermon, a practice permitted by the Directory; and on Communion Sunday, they were left
(footnote cont. on next page)

The Word

Invocation
 Psalm
 Chapter from Old Testament
 Chapter from New Testament
 Prayers for Confession, for Pardon and
 for Grace
 The Sermon.

The Sacrament

Exhortation (Fencing and Invitation)
 The Sanctification of the Elements:
 The Word of Institution
 The Communion Prayer
 The Administration of the Elements:
 Fraction and Delivery of Bread
 Taking of Cup and Delivery
 Post-Communion Exhortation
 Prayers:
 Thanksgiving and Prayer for Grace
 Intercessions for Church, state, etc.
 Psalm
 The Blessing

However barren of the traditional liturgical details
 this service might be, it contains most, if not all,
 of the essentials of a full sacramental observance,
 and they are set forth with clarity and order.

In this chapter we are concerned with the
 second half of this service: the directory "of the
 Celebration of the Communion, or the Sacrament of the

(Footnote cont. from previous page)
 until after the administration (see section 7 (b) in
 this chapter). And if the Intercessions were
 delayed, it is safe to assume that the psalm and
 blessing which followed them and closed the service
 followed here, too. This is explicitly confirmed by
 Henderson, who helped compile the order (Government
 & Order, p.24) and Pardovan, who sets it forth as
 the Church's standard half a century later
 (Collections and Observations, p.142).

Lord's Supper". (1)

2. The Preliminary Rubrics

(a) Frequency of Celebration

English Puritans and Scots Presbyterians differed radically on the question of frequency, and the rubric finally arrived at by the Divines was necessarily indefinite (2). The FP/BCO liturgy is slightly more specific in stating that administration "commonly is used once a month, or so oft as the congregation shall think expedient". But while this might have represented the practice in Geneva (3), it had no force in Scotland. Even Scottish legislation for quarterly Communion had

1. It is unfortunate that so little information about the Assembly debates in the Communion order is available. The regular scribe (Byfield?) appears to have been absent during the greater part of the period (June and July 1644) and his substitute has left to posterity in the MS Minutes only his indecipherable shorthand. Gillespie's Notes, omit proceedings from 10th May to 4th September. Lightfoot, who was often absent to attend to his pastoral duties at Munden missed some of the most crucial debates. (Of the week in which were debated the manner of distribution of the elements, the order of reception and the words of delivery, he writes, "I was at Munden because of the fast").
2. "To avoid this debate of time, it was added in the beginning, The Lord's Supper is to be administered frequently". Gillespie in report of committee debates, Notes, p. 102.
3. Maxwell says of Calvin's practice in Geneva: "Against his will and opinion, first monthly, then quarterly Communion, was forced upon Calvin. In every case it was civil (magisterial) interference which prevented him from restoring and maintaining the primitive Christian practice of weekly Communion". John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 203.

little effect. Writes MacMillan, "the Church...had decided in 1562 just after the Reformation that the Sacrament should be ministered four times a year in Burghs and twice a year elsewhere, but there is no doubt that the Acts both of the Assembly and of Parliament were disregarded".(1) Once or twice a year became and remained the established Scottish custom from the outset of the new era.(2). Alexander Henderson, in his account of contemporary Scottish usage is as vague as the rubric in the Directory which he appears to have inspired. He writes,

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is more frequently ministered in some congregations, then in others, according to the number of communicants, and the proficiency of the people in the way of Christ, and in some places upon one Sabbath, in other places upon two or three Sabbaths, as it may be done most conveniently, which is determined by the minister and the eldership of the Church (3).

The mention of "two or three Sabbaths" is a reference to the custom in some larger congregations of extending the Communion season over two or three consecutive Sundays to accommodate everyone.

The BCP contains no rubrical instruction as to

1. The Episcopal Assembly of 1616 reiterated the rule, but to no apparent avail. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 194.
2. For a full account of "hours and seasons of Communion", see MacMillan, op. cit. pp 190 ff.
3. Government and Order, p. 21.

frequency of celebration. However, the book assumes that the Communion order will constitute the Sunday diet, as Morning and Evening Prayer, the daily. Hence it provides "Epistles and Gospels" (the lections for the Eucharist) for each Sunday of the year, as well as for the feast days. This was not the actual practice. Lathbury says that the normal Sunday diet "ever since the Book of Common Prayer was compiled" until "the time of the Long Parliament" was Matins with sermon, plus the Litany, followed by "the Communion office as far as the prayer for the Church militant" (1) -- the ante-Communion. But seemingly the administration of the sacrament itself was infrequent. Hutton asserts that "in most of the cathedral churches the holy communion was celebrated every Sunday and saint's day. In many of the parish churches the celebration was at least once a month" (2). But he goes on the report that "the Ordination Articles of the bishops are careful to inquire whether there was communion at least at the three great festivals", which low standard suggests relative infrequency. (3).

1. A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, p. 492.

2. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Queen Anne, p. 103.

3. ibid., p. 104. Frere credits the Catholic movement in the Church with an increased frequency late in the reign of James I. It "taught men to be no longer content with three communions in a year". The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 388.

The FP rubric, which was retained in WALD and MIDD, was more diligently adhered to among the English Puritans, according to Maxwell, than among the Scots. Monthly observances "seems to have become the settled practice, as it was in the Church of England itself", he writes (1). In Northampton, a Presbyterian stronghold, the custom, circa 1571, was monthly celebration (2). Weekly administration was the accepted practice among the Independents at the time of Westminster, and it was the conflict between this extreme on the one hand and the Scottish on the other that resulted in the indefinite ruling of the Directory(3)

In prescribing that the Lord's Supper "is frequently to be administered" the Directory was of no more effect in Scotland than the prescription of the BCO had been. In the years following Westminster, the Communion was, if anything, less frequent than in the earlier period. There were two factors militating against frequency of observance. One was the disruptive effects of the

-
1. op. cit., pp.204-5. Cartwright's Directory, dating from the same period as WALD and MIDD, in prescribing eight days' notice "that the congregation may prepare themselves", suggests relative infrequency of observance.
 2. Frere, op. cit., p. 169.
 3. Baillie, Dissuasive, p. 29; Letters & Journals II, pp.148-9; Gillespie, Notes, p. 102.

political and ecclesiastical upheavals of the time by which the Kirk was divided into bitterly opposed parties. Large segments of the Church were literally out of communion with each other and the result was a neglect of the communion table altogether (1). Nor did matters improve during the bitter years of the Second Episcopacy. Glasgow is reported to have had only two services of Holy Communion during the entire twenty-eight years of episcopacy.(2).

The second factor was not unrelated to the first, but its effects lasted longer. This was the evolution of what came to be known as the "Communion Occasion", the two chief characteristics of which were its duration (up to five days) and its inter-parish nature. The annual or semi-annual Occasion brought to the parish kirk ministers and members from the neighbouring parishes for a prolonged

1. cf. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 236; Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland, pp.152-3. For example, a meeting of the six sessions of Edinburgh in 1562 declared that the Lord's Supper "cannot convenientlie be celebrate, as is now thought, till there be a lawfull judicatorie of the kirk to determine anent the present course of defection carried amongst us anent the Covenant, and what censure it deserves". The General Assembly of the same year (the lawfulness of which court was questioned) formulated a ruling but it proved to be too moderate for the Protesters. Edgar, op. cit., pp.152-3.

2. Leishman, "The Ritual of the Church" in Story, (ed.), The Church of Scotland Past and Present, V, p. 394.

series of services centred around the Sunday administration. If it was not initiated, the practice was greatly stimulated, by the Protesters who gathered from wide areas to communicate under ministers and with members of their own party (1). It became such a major feature in the parish year, and so burdensome an event, that one or at the most two in twelve months was considered enough. But the inter-parish nature of the Occasion provided the devout with several opportunities a year to communicate(2).

-
1. "When the Protesters were able to celebrate Communion, it was not only for their own people, but for their adherents from all parishes within journeying distance. Great crowds implied multiplied services and many preachers, and a system hitherto unknown in Scotland was established". (Leishman in Story (ed,) op. cit., p. 390). "It is to these Protesters we owe our sacramental fasts; for such days of fasting were unknown before their time....On such occasions eight or ten ministers were brought together, and the services of all were required. The people flocked in crowds from the neighbouring parishes till the church could not hold them, and they were compelled to meet in the churchyard." (Cunningham, J., The Church History of Scotland, II, p. 171). There is some suggestion, however, that the custom had its origins during the First Episcopacy when, in reaction to the 1618 kneeling rule, people gathered at churches where the Perth Articles were ignored. See Edgar, op.cit., pp.172-3; McMillan, op.cit., pp196-7.
2. Of course the system was abused. Episcopalian criticism and ridicule could not have been entirely unfounded. Bishop Sage claimed that these "hundreds ... , strangers to one another," could not all have attended out of the purest motives but "for novelty, curiosity, for intrigues...for a thousand such sinister ends" (in Edgar, op.cit., p 172); and "Blacksmith" likens the communicants to "papists who make their pilgrimage the occasion for "drunkenness, lust and idleness" (Letter from a Blacksmith, p.10). Burns derided the sacramental Occasion in "The Holy Fair".

Early in the eighteenth century the General Assembly several times urged more frequent observance of the sacrament (1) but with little effect.

Referring to the BCO, the Directory and the recent declaration of the Assembly Pardovan in 1709 writes,

These recommendations seem to be treated with little regard among us, for as yet, as far as I know, not one Parish hath celebrate it once more than ordinary on their account.

But he sees the great Communion gathering as a solution to, rather than an aggravation of, the problem:

I'm sure if they will have it but once a year, yet Parishes in the neighbourhood may so correspond as to have it in that bounds all the months of the year, which will supply the want of its frequency in one Parish, at least unto such as may well travel unto their neighbours churches (2).

1. In 1701, 1711, 1712, 1724 and 1751. Acts, pp. 311, 451, 471-2, 586, 705. The 1712 act enjoins Presbyteries to discipline ministers who do not celebrate the Lord's Supper at least once a year. It is noteworthy that two of these declarations refer to problems created by the thronged Occasions. The 1701 Act deplores the fact that some congregations are bereft of Sunday services while their ministers are assisting at Communion elsewhere; the 1724 enactment refers to the disorders attendant upon the Occasions. Infrequency of celebration and the large Communion gatherings were obviously related problems.

2. Collections & Observations, p.143. Later in the same century (1763), John Erskine pleaded before the Synod of Lothian for more frequent celebrations and saw "our manner of dispensing that ordinance" as "one chief hindrance of its frequency". Quoted with approval by G.W. Spratt, who, writing a century later, makes the same appeal and sees the same obstacles. He suggests that the "season" be shortened, retaining only the day of fasting, and that "this would... make frequent communion a delight instead of a burden". The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland, p.40.

Only since the decline of this custom, a decline which began in the latter half of the nineteenth century, has a more frequent observance than yearly been general in the Scottish churches.

It is worth noting that nothing is said in this rubric or elsewhere forbidding private administration(1).

(b) Admittance to the Table

The ignorant and the scandalous are not fit to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

This is an attenuated version of the rubric the Divines intended. Lightfoot gives the original as follows:

1. Robert Lee fell back on the silence of the Directory on this point in defending before Synod, in 1864, his private celebrations. He further claimed that there is no prohibition of private Communion in the Confession of Faith. (R.H. Story, Life and Remains of Robert Lee, II, pp.68-9) The Confession forbids the administration of the elements to any "who are not then present in the congregation", and "private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest or any other alone". (Chapter XXIX, iii, and iv) Neither of these prohibitions excludes a celebration where there are more than one person present. But in view of the Scottish antipathy towards the Episcopalian private celebrations (witness the reaction to the Perth Articles), which was reaffirmed after the fall of the Second Episcopacy by the General Assembly (Acts, pp.226-7), and the persistence of the Puritan refutation of the use, from at least as early as the 1572 Admonition to Parliament (Frere, op.cit., pp.178-9), there can be little doubt that the Westminster Divines intended the Lord's Supper to be administered only in the congregation "after the ...sermon". The first Scottish Presbyterian service book to make provision for private Communion is the 1940 BCO which contains a "Short Order...for use when sickness or other circumstances make it desirable to use a shortened form".

None to be admitted, but such as, being baptized, are found upon careful examination by the ministers before the officers, to have a competent measure of knowledge of the grounds of religion, and ability to examine themselves, and who profess their willingness and promise to submit themselves to all the ordinances of Christ. Or thus, Who give just grounds in the judgment of charity, to conceive that there is faith and regeneration wrought in them. The ignorant, scandalous, &c. not to be admitted, nor strangers unless they be well known (sic) (1).

But the rubric was shorn of its detail by Parliament(2).

Dr. Leishman has pointed out that Parliament was very jealous of any legislation except its own on the powers and conditions of admittance to the sacrament (3). This was but one facet of the struggle between the Erastian Parliament and the Presbyterians in the Assembly for control of the Church.

The Act of the 1645 General Assembly, supplementary to that adopting the Directory, stipulated "that the congregations will still be tried and examined

-
1. Journal of Proceedings, pp. 279-80. This is mainly Henderson's work. It is almost identical to his description in Government and Order, (pp.20-1) and according to Gillespie who reports a committee debate (Notes, p.102), such modification as there was, was made by Henderson and Marshall. This was the addition of the sentence "Who gives just grounds... in them", a guard against too legalistic a debarring of persons on moral grounds. The change was made to appease Mr. Goodwin who maintained that Calvin, who "played at bowls on the Lord's day" would have been fenced from the table if they took a stringent line.
 2. Commons Journals III, p. 705.
 3. Westminster Directory, p. 117.

before the Communion, according to the bygone practice of the Kirk" (1), thus providing what the rubric was deemed to have lacked. The FP/BCO Communion order contains no such article, though certainly, as the above-quoted Act indicates, a close control was maintained by the ministry and eldership over the right of access to the Communion table. Since this is more a matter of Church discipline than Church worship, it need not detain us here. It should be observed, however, that the BCP contains a lengthy rubric instructing the curate to "advertise" any "open and notorious liver" "not to presume to the Lord's Table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented, and amended his former naughty life", and another directing that "those betwixt whom...malice and hatred...reign" shall not be admitted to the Communion until penitence is professed and reconciliation attempted. But while there is this "fence" against the "scandalous", there is no rubrical warning against participation by the "ignorant". Presumably the requirements of Confirmation were considered an adequate guarantee that communicants would be in possession of

1. Rec.Kirk, p. 421.

salvation truths (1).

This rubric in the Directory, or rather, the disciplinary ideal which lay behind it, was a factor in the failure of the Directory to find a place in English usage, though it was the legally established service book. "In their disappointment at the

1. It will be observed that the Directory makes no provision for the confirmation of the baptized or any form of admittance of first communicants. The deleted rubric above quoted might have been construed as requiring some form of reception, but since even this was lost, there is no suggestion of such a service in the Directory. The Puritans repudiated Episcopal Confirmation because it savoured of a third sacrament and implied spiritual superiority of the bishop over the minister of Word and Sacrament. (cf. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 74) The First Book of Discipline established the Scottish practice: "None are to be admitted to this mystery who cannot formally say the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the belief, nor declare the sum of the Law." This might have meant that the first communicants were to be examined publicly, but it enjoins no formal reception or confirmation service. Henderson suggests something of the sort when he says of Scottish procedure that communicants must be examined in their knowledge of the faith, "profess themselves willing to examine themselves, and to renew their covenant made with God in baptisme, promising to walk as becometh Christians, and to submit themselves to all the ordinances of Christ". (Government and Order, pp.20-1) But the circumstances under which such professions and promises are made are not described. The General Assembly of 1706 urged ministers to be zealous in the instruction of first communicants "and to charge upon their consciences the obligations they lie under from their baptismal covenant and seriously exhort them to renew the same". (Acts, p. 394) Upon this, Pardovan comments: "This fully answers the end that any Protestant Bishop can have in ministering of Confirmation or laying on of hands upon those that are baptized and come to years of discretion. Neither doth it savour of any superstition...." (op. cit., p. 134)

non-success of their Church system," writes W.A. Shaw, "the Presbyterian clergy almost in a body made up their minds not to administer the sacrament at all where they could not administer it in the way they wished. Their system required that the sacrament should be guarded from the ignorant and scandalous by means of the eldership".(1). But in most places there was no eldership and little interest in electing one.(2). Since it is a safe assumption that neither Independents nor Anglicans were inclined to use the Directory Communion order, and since the Presbyterians tied it to an almost non-existent discipline, its use in England must have been very limited.

(c) Preparation

There follows now the rubric ordering that a week's notice be given, "where this sacrament cannot with convenience be frequently administered", and that some form of preparatory service take place on either the preceding Sunday "or some other day of that week". This appears to have been a concession to the Scots. While Scottish custom at the time

-
1. A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth, II, p. 142.
 2. Henson, H.H., Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century, p. 111.

did not involve as many services in the Communion season as it did a few years later, it was the habit to have a preparatory service during the week, usually on Saturday (1). Henderson describes the prevailing rule thus:

The Sabbath next before the Communion shall be celebrated, publike warning is made thereof by the pastor, and of the doctrine of preparation to be taught the last day of the week, or at least toward the end of the week; that the communicants may be better prepared, by the use of the means, both in private and publike (2).

WALD and MIDD, like the BCO, do not allude to a preparatory service, or to the necessity of serving notice of Communion, but Cartwright's Directory might express the early English Presbyterian rule when it says,

Let the time of celebrating the communion be made known eight days before, that the congregation may prepare themselves, and that the elders may do their duty in going to and visiting whom they ought.

-
1. cf. McMillan, op. cit., pp 223 ff. The preparatory service evolved over the eighty years following the Reformation, sometimes associated with a fast, sometimes not; in its earliest manifestations, it was in the nature of a meeting for trying communicants in their knowledge of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Commandments. There is no mention of it in the BCO
 2. Government and Order, p. 21. The literal similarity between this and the rubric once again reveal Henderson's hand at work in shaping the Directory.

The Independents were among those to whom the rubric did not apply; theirs were congregations where the sacrament could "with conveniency be frequently administered", and was. Baillie was scandalized at their seeming callousness in the matter of preparation (1). The service of preparation being neither an English Presbyterian, Independent nor Anglican use, it appears to have been distinctively Scottish.

The compromising terms of the rubric were unsatisfactory to the General Assembly and in the supplementary Act of 1645 it ruled "that there be one Sermon of Preparation delivered in the ordinary place of public worship, upon the day immediately preceding" (2). As already indicated, the Communion observances which evolved during the ensuing decades and which remained the Scots custom for several generations are quite different from what is envisaged in either the rubric or the qualifying Act. The sacramental Occasions involved several services and much preaching, and were usually associated with a day or days of fasting. (The Directory says nothing about pre-Communion fasting).

1. See Letters and Journals II, pp. 148-9, 195; Dissuasive, p. 29.

2. Rec. Kirk, p. 421.

Pardovan, in his description of these services, shows how, in their very nature, they defeat what is to him the purpose of the preparatory service:

By the present practice, the Thursday, or some other day of the week, preceeding the Communion, is kept as a Fast-day, on which there are three sermons delivered by so many neighbouring ministers; which does to some seem not very proper: for the design of that day being a congregational fast, on which the sins of the Parish are to be mourned over before the Lord, no other Minister can have such particular knowledge thereof, as he who labours and travels among them (1)

The BCP prior to 1662 contained no rubrical instruction about serving notice of Communion (2); however, perhaps on the precedent of the Directory, the version of that year has the following rubric after the prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church:

When the Minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion (which he shall always do upon the Sunday, or some Holy-day immediately preceding) after the Sermon or Homily ended, he shall read this Exhortation following.

And there follows what is, in effect, a preparatory homily.

-
1. Collections & Observations, p. 140. The same passage says that "intimation of the celebration of the Supper is made two and three Sabbathsbefore".
 2. The 1549 version has an exhortation to be read when "the people be negligent to come to the Communion" which serves notice of ensuing Communion. But this was for occasional use only.

It is noteworthy that though the Directory prescribes a preparatory service in conjunction with the Communion feast, there is no provision for a service of thanksgiving. Here the Scots failed to incorporate into the order what was to them an integral part of the Communion season -- the Sunday afternoon thanksgiving (1). Again the supplementary Act supplied the wanting rubric:

In the same Kirk there be one Sermon of Thanksgiving after the Communion is ended (2).

"The custom of having the thanksgiving on Monday did not...become general until well into the Covenanting period"(3). The Monday observance was a part of the Communion Occasion pattern which emerged after 1650(4).

3. The Exhortation

(a) The Rubric (5)

The rubric clearly places the celebration of the

1. Henderson, op.cit., pp.24-5; McMillan, op.cit., p. 228. That the Independents observed no such custom was deplored by Baillie. Dissuasive, p. 29; Letters and Journals, pp.148-9.

2. Rec. Kirk, p. 421.

3. McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1560-1638, p. 229.

4. Pardovan continues in the description quoted above: "Upon the Lord's Day there are in some Churches two Action sermons, beside the Thanksgiving in the afternoon; And on the Monday, there are two Thanksgiving sermons." op. cit., p. 140.

5. Pardovan has a psalm between the post-sermon prayer and the exhortation. ibid. p. 140.

Supper in its proper liturgical context -- it is annexed to the preaching of the Word, in accordance with the Reformed principle (1). The FP/BCO Communion order does not mention this, but there is no doubt whatever that it was assumed and that it was the practice in Scotland as well as among the English Puritans. In the Scottish kirks the sermon subject was normally related to the "action" (2), but this could hardly have been the practice among those English Puritans who celebrated weekly. The Prayer Book prescribes a sermon or homily, but only the 1549 version requires that it be related to the sacrament (or that the Communion exhortation be used in its place).

(b) The Exhortation

Communion exhortations, with their stern warnings and gracious invitations, are a peculiar feature in Protestant liturgies, and it would be strange indeed if one did not appear in the Directory. By comparison with those of the BCP and FP/BCO traditions, the exhortation here seems brief. But it consists of mere headings which required and

-
1. Calvin: "They would first begin with public prayers, then a Sermon should be made; then the Minister having bread and wine...." Institutes IV xvii, 43, (in Davies, op. cit., p. 43)
2. Henderson, op.cit., pp. 24-5.

doubtless received amplification. It is, in fact, the outline for a discourse of considerable length. It shares its fundamental ideas with the Exhortations in the earlier liturgies (1), but on the whole, is better organized and more comprehensive (2). All cite the danger of eating and drinking unworthily and all exercise a "fencing" function. In the FP, WALD, MIDD and the BCP the unworthy are enjoined to

come not to this holy table; lest after taking of that holy sacrament, the devil enter into you as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul.

The BCO, which draws its "debarration" passage from Calvin's Genevan liturgy (3), is more forthright. After referring to St. Paul's warning about unworthy participation in the body and blood, the minister is to say:

And therefore, in the name and authority of the eternal God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, I excommunicate from this table all blasphemers of God, all idolaters,

1. Which themselves have much in common, for a large portion of the BCP Exhortation was taken into the FP (and from there into WALD and MIDD) and a portion of this passed into the BCO
2. "The materials of the preliminary exhortation supply the outlines of one of the most complete and impressive addresses to be found in any Reformed Agenda; and feelingly expanded...could not fail to be most refreshing...." Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 234.
3. Sprott, BCO, p. 203; Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 130.

all...; charging them that as they will answer in the presence of him who is the righteous Judge, that they presume not to profane this most holy Table.

And all issue an invitation, though not all do so as explicitly as the Directory. The BCO follows the above quoted words with,

And yet this I pronounce not, to seclude any penitent person, how grievous so ever his sins before have been, so that he feel in his heart unfeigned repentance of the same.

And further along, with the FP, WALD and MIDD, it reads,

We may be now right well assured, that those defaults and manifold imperfections in us shall be no hindrance at all against us, to cause him not to accept and impute us worthy to come to his spiritual table.

The BCP Invitation is familiar:

You that do truly and earnestly repent...;
Draw near, and take this holy Sacrament
to your comfort....

It is worth observing that the Directory, unlike its predecessors, "fences" the table against the "ignorant as well as the impenitent sinner"⁽¹⁾ The question was raised in the Assembly of Divines as to whether the terms of fencing were not too harsh with respect to the ignorant -- "whether the word 'grose' or some such word should be put in,

1. cf. Henderson's account: "The Pastor useth an exhortation, and debarreth from the table all ignorant, prophane, and scandalous persons...." op. cit., pp. 21-2.

lest poor tender consciences might here...take offence" (1). Evidently the majority were prepared to take the risk, so impressed were they with the necessity of the communicants' possession of doctrinal knowledge and understanding.

The Exhortation before Communion, or the "fencing of tables" as it was commonly called, survived in Scottish sacramental usage until relatively recent times. Sprott in 1863 defends the principle if not the contemporary practice when he writes,

I have heard it said by some Scottish clergymen -- who were wearied, and no wonder, with the long fencing in common use, consisting of an exposition of the Ten Commandments or of the Beatitudes -- that they did not see any reason for such a service at all, as people's minds were already made up. But this line of argument would cut down all services and solemnities, and I am sure that if those clergymen had been better acquainted with the exhortation (fencing is not a happy word) given in the old forms (that is the BCO and Directory), they would have thought differently. (2).

The compilers of Euchologion followed Sprott's advice and paraphrased the BCO Exhortation. NDPW contains two "specimen forms", adaptations of the BCO and Directory respectively. However, there is but the vaguest memory of the fencing in one of the

-
1. Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, p. 286.
 2. The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland, p. 41.

orders for the celebration of Holy Communion in the 1940 BCO. A brief address in that order reads in part,

It is necessary that we come with knowledge, faith, repentance and love, not holding fellowship with evil, or cherishing pride or self-righteousness....

4. The Table: "About it, or At it"

After this exhortation, warning, and invitation, the Table before being decently covered, and so conveniently placed that the Communicants may orderly sit about it, or at it, the Minister is to begin the Action with sanctifying and blessing the Elements of Bread and Wine set before him, (the Bread in comely and convenient vessels, so prepared that being broken by him and given, it may be distributed amongst the Communicants, the Wine also in large cups)....

While the question of the communicants' position at the reception of the elements cost the Assembly "not only some time, but also heat, especially betwixt the Scots' commissioners and the Independents" (1), the argument was not that which had vexed the life of the Church in both kingdoms for several decades: the propriety or lawfulness of kneeling at Communion. (2). Sitting at the reception of the elements had been Scottish practice

1. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 289.

2. This was debated, however. The Independent Mr. Nye, for instance, "pleaded for liberty of posture" (ibid., p. 286) for while he was averse to kneeling, he thought such a question of ceremonial to be indifferent.

since the Reformation (1) and when James and the Episcopal party attempted, in 1618, to enforce kneeling the popular reaction to this particular clause was more bitter than to the other four Perth Articles (2). English Puritans came to the Assembly with a prejudice against the practice as emotionally conditioned by years of struggle as the Scots. From as early as 1565 they had advocated, and used where they could the sitting position at the Lord's Table (3), and in the Bill for the Reformation of the Prayer Book proposed to Parliament in 1571, the abolition of kneeling at Communion was among the

1. "Plaine it is, that at the Supper Christ Jesus sate with his Disciples, and therefore we judge that sitting at a table is the most convenient to the holy action." The First Book of Discipline, Bks. Disc. p. 25.

2. "The Article (of Perth) against which most repugnance was felt was that which enjoined the kneeling posture at Communion. To do this savoured of superstition, it was to recognize a supernatural change in the elements, which Rome taught but which Knox and the body of Scottish Christians vehemently repudiated." R.L.Orr, Alexander Henderson, Churchman & Statesman, p. 45. cf. Sprott, Scottish Liturgies in the Reign of James VI, p. xxxiii. It should be carefully noted, however, that the objection was not to kneeling in prayer, even at the Lord's Table. Explained Henderson to the Divines: "The table full... the people either sit or kneel at prayer-time indifferently, but are sure to sit in the act of receiving." Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

3. In Queen Elizabeth's investigation into the worship usages of the Church, 1565, carried out by her bishops, kneeling, standing and sitting for reception of the sacrament were all reported. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 115.

reforms in the liturgy. (1). Abolition of the practice was one of the Puritan demands in the Millenary Petition and at Hampton Court (2), and it remained an issue with them down to the time of Westminster and after.

The question in the Assembly was not whether communicants should kneel or sit, but where they should sit. The Independent custom differed from the Scots in this. There was "no coming up to any table; but a carrying of the elements to all their seats athort the church" (3). To most of the English Divines, the communicants' position with respect to the table was a matter of indifference; but the Scots were insistent upon making their own custom the requirement of the Directory. Thus Baillie reports:

They are content of sitting, albeit not as a rite institute; but to come out of their pews to a table, they deny the necessity of it; we affirm it necessare, and will stand to it. (4).

-
1. ibid., p. 161. And in an admonition to Parliament about the same time, the Puritans compare what they conceive to be the New Testament usage with that prescribed in the BCP, thus stating the basis of their objection to the Anglican practice: "They received it sitting; we kneeling according to Honorious decree". From Frere and Douglas, Puritan Manifestoes (1907), p. 134, in Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 71.
 2. Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 139.
 3. Baillie, Letters and Journals, II, p. 195.
 4. ibid., p. 148.

The question turned on the "necessity" of the use. But here the Scots were careful to make a distinction: when it was argued by Marshall that "it would be hard to determine it as an Institution, an Integrall part of the sacrament", Rutherford retorted that they "do not reason from a divine institution to prove a table (that is, sitting at a table) but other things are necessary that are not of sacramental necessity"(1) After approximately a week's debate (2) and

we were overtoyled...we were forced to leave all these things, and take us to general expressions, which, by benigne exposition, would infer our church-practices, which most promised to follow....(3)

The formula arrived at was: "that the communicants may sit about it, or at it as in the Church of Scotland". But the reference to the Scottish Church was deleted by Parliament (4). In its Act establishing the Directory, the General Assembly incorporated the proviso

that the clause in the Directory, of the administration of the Lord's Supper, which mentioneth the communicants sitting about the table, or at it, be not interpreted as if in the judgement of this Kirk it were indifferent and free for any

-
1. MS Minutes II, pp.210-11. Mr. Nye protested that "ceremonies may as well be pleaded for". Lightfoot, Journals of Proceedings, p. 286.
 2. MS Minutes II, pp.207-11, 216-242.
 3. Baillie, op. cit., p. 204.
 4. Commons Journals, III, p. 705, 26th November, 1644.

of the communicants not to come and receive at the table. (1)

The tradition was retained in Scotland (2) until relatively recent times. (3). Euchologion, 1867 assumes the historic usage with successive tables, (4).

1. Acts, p. 116
2. Including through the Second Episcopacy. Leishman in Story, The Church of Scotland, Past and Present, p. 394
3. The books of specimen services published in the first half of the nineteenth century take the usage for granted.
4. "Successive tables" were of course a necessary accompaniment to this method of communicating, since the average or large congregation could not be accommodated at one sitting. The thronged Communion Occasions of the post-Westminster era in Scotland necessitated many successive tables at every celebration. "Blacksmith" satirically (and probably unfairly) describes the confusion this could produce. The communicant, he says, "is forced to wrestle through a crowd, to push and be pushed, stunned with a general hubub, the seats rattling, the galleries sounding, the people singing, the communicants justling one another in the crowded passages, some falling, some fainting, in all corners of the church, hurry, confusion and noise. I never see our tables filled up, but it gives me an idea of the distraction of Babel...." (Letter from a Blacksmith, p. 20). The table or tables were normally constructed for the occasion in the body of the church. (cf., McMillan, op. cit., pp. 233 ff; Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland, pp 137-8) The table constructed down the body of the church was a not uncommon arrangement in England, too, during the pre-Westminster period (though the people might communicate standing at the table or sitting in pews). Until the height of Archbishop Laud's power the position of the table at Communion, whether it be altar-wise or in the east-west position in chancel or nave, appears to have been a matter of indifference. (Leishman in Story, op. cit., p. 384; Frere, op. cit., pp 115, 169; Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Queen Anne, p. 83) The 1640 Canons called for the permanent altar-wise position, but were careful to add, "We declare that the situation of the holy table doth not imply that
(footnote cont. on next page).

though a footnote is added containing this suggestion: "The practice of simultaneous Communion in pews or otherwise presents many advantages." Nevertheless, down to and including the 1913 edition, the older is the accepted manner. NDPW provides for both methods, while its successor, DFPW (1909), clearly assumes that the people will receive the elements in their pews. PDS (1923), the BCO of 1928 and the 1940 BCO all make the same assumption (1). Dr. Lee's liturgy is ambiguous on the point.

Of the elements, it is sufficient to observe that the bread was probably meant to be ordinary and not unleavened as in the Anglican use, (2) and that there

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar whereon Christ is again really sacrificed" (Lathbury A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, p 252); and there is the further qualification, "saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by law during the time of the administration of the Holy Communion". (Hutton, op. cit., p. 83) Maxwell says of eighteenth century English Dissenters' practice (there were about a thousand congregations, half of which were Presbyterian) that the table was placed along the main axis and that the "people came forward and sat at the Communion Table". (The Book of Common Prayer and the Non-Anglican Churches, p. 31)

1. The 1940 BCO contains an "Order which may be used at a Second Table" but this is not meant in the old "successive tables" sense. Rather, it refers to a second service. The old custom of reception while seated at the table is said still to prevail in remote quarters of the Highlands, and the writer has communicated at one such service in a church in Edinburgh where the use has been revived.

2. It was an early Puritan contention that the New Testament Church "ministered the Sacrament with common and usual bread; now we with wafer cakes" and accordingly urged a return to the scriptural usage. (Davies, op. cit., p.71) McMillan shows that while unleavened bread was not unknown in the post-Reformation Scots
 (footnote cont. on next page)

is no indication in the rubrics as to when or by whom the elements are to be placed on the table. On the second point, Baxter's Savoy liturgy has the following rubric:

Here let the Bread be brought to the Minister, and received by him, and set upon the Table; and then the Wine in like manner: or if they be set there before, however let him bless them, praying....

This accommodates the two practices common among the Puritans and probably the silence of the Directory is intended to do the same. The BCO says nothing about the matter, but Mitchell asserts that the Scots practice was to have the elements carried in (the "Great Entrance") during the psalm following the Creed, that is, at the end of the preaching service (1).

5. The Sanctification of the Elements

(a) The Rubric: "Word of Institution and Prayer"

After this exhortation, warning and invitation...the Minister is to begin the Action with sanctifying and blessing the Elements of Bread and Wine set before him... having first in a few words, showed, That those Elements, otherwise common, are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use, by the Word of Institution and Prayer.

The words "having first", it should be noted, refer back to "begin the action" and the order prescribed here is as follows:

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 Church, it was not used generally. Pardevan, though citing no authority, says "ordinary bread is not to be used, and it is most decent if it be leavened wheat bread". Collections & Observations, p. 132.
 1. John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 133.

The Word of Institution
 The Prayer
 The "few words"
 The "Action"

The point of significance in the rubric is its statement of the means of the "sanctifying and blessing"¹ the elements: the Word of Institution and prayer. The Confession of Faith repeats and amplifies this as follows:

The Lord Jesus hath, in his ordinance, appointed his ministers to declare his word of institution to the people, to pray and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use (Chapter XXIX, iii) (2)

Behind this statement is the doctrine expressed in the Confession thus:

The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution;

-
1. There was some disagreement in the Assembly about terminology. Thus Lightfoot reports: "Then was the word 'sanctification' excepted at as something uncouth; and so did I scruple at it, saying it was a Hebraism ---and "consecrating" which was tendered by some, a Romanism; therefore, I should think 'setting apart' to be a medium, which received some debate." Journal of Proceedings, p. 288.
 2. The Larger Catechism is slightly different: "Christ hath appointed the ministers of his word... to set apart the bread and wine from common use, by the word of institution, thanksgiving, and prayer." Answer to Q.169.

which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers. (Chapter XXVII, iii) (1)

It is clear that the sanctification of the elements and the efficacy of the sacrament do not lie in the simple declaration that the elements "are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use". Ultimately it appears to rest on the work of the Holy Spirit and, on man's side, the reading of the Word of Institution, wherein is the warrant for the ordinance and the promise of its benefits, and prayers of thanksgiving and petition for the descent of the Spirit.

(b) The Word of Institution

The reading of the Word of Institution to the congregation is characteristically Reformed. In the Anglican order (as in the Canon of the Mass) the narrative of the institution is recited in the Prayer of Consecration. Its rehearsal there "asserts before man and pleads before God the authority of our Lord for that holy action in which we are engaged" (2), and is an integral part of that prayer

1. Again the Larger Catechism gives a modified statement: "The sacraments become effectual means of salvation not by any power in themselves...but by the working of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing of Christ, by whom they are instituted." Answer to Question 161.

2. Scudamore, quoted by J.H. Srawley, "The Holy Communion Service" in Clarke and Harris, Liturgy and Worship, p. 341.

together with the preceding petition "that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood". There being no Epiclesis, the implication seems to be that the words are not only the warrant for the action, but are effective in the actual consecration of the elements, analagous to the Roman liturgy where they are held to effect the miracle of transubstantiation.(1).

That the Word of Institution was transferred, in the FP/BCO liturgy, from this position to the beginning of the order suggests that the Reformers viewed the narrative as a warrant for what was about to be done and no more. However, Maxwell says that it "may have had some significance in the Augustinian sense of the Word being required to be joined with the symbol to make a valid sacrament" (2). What is of

-
1. Srawley, however, holds that the prayer in the BCP "avoids the expression of any particular theory of consecration either by the operation of the Holy Spirit or by the word of Christ; and considered in itself, apart from the language of other prayers in the service, it is patient of a receptionist view of the sacrament" (ibid., p. 343) that is, the view that the efficacy of the sacrament is entirely dependent upon the faith of the recipient -- neither a Calvinist nor a Catholic view but Zwinglian. Proctor and Frere refer to the narrative as "an introduction, expressing the means and object of the rite". op. cit., p. 491.
 2. op. cit., p. 129. Calvin held this view, though in his Treatise on the Sacraments (pp 3-5) he broadens the idea of the Word to mean not merely the narrative of the institution, but the preaching of the Word -- enunciating the Reformed principle of the necessary conjunction of preaching and sacrament.

interest here is that ^{the} Directory brings the Word of Institution back into the very heart of the service, conjoins it with the prayer of consecration, and makes it abundantly clear, both before the reading of the Word and at the conclusion of the prayer, that the elements are sanctified by Word and prayer. For the Word of Institution "contains together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers" (the Confession), which promise is appealed to in the reading. In this restoration of the narrative to the centre of the service, the Directory comes much closer to the BCP than to the BCO, although, as we shall see, in the prayer it advances beyond both.

It is interesting that Cowper's liturgy represents a compromise. Like the BCO it opens with a reading of the Word of Institution, and then, following the Prayer of Consecration, the reading is repeated, with manual acts prescribed (1), addressed again to the congregation. What is more interesting is the rubric preceding this second reading and the correction of the same by a second hand:

The prayer ended, the Minister shall repeat the words of the institution for consecrating the elements, and say....

1. Not a fraction or elevation, merely a laying of hands on bread and cup.

The correction reads:

Then shall the Minister pray after this manner and read the words of the Institution (1).

The correction, by turning the narrative into prayer, brings the order into line with the Anglican liturgy; yet, curiously, it withdraws the statement of the consecrating effect of the words (2). Henderson has the Word of Institution immediately before the prayer, as in the Directory, and sums up these two acts with the words: "The Elements thus being sanctified by Word and prayer...." (3)

The suggestion in the Directory that "the minister may, when he seeth requisite, explain and apply" the Word of Institution finds a partial precedent in the BCO where the Exhortation (which follows the Word) is based partly on that passage (4). This apparently was Scottish usage for Henderson

1. Sprott (ed.), Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, p. 94.

2. Gillespie writes of Scots usage: "Besides the common blessing of the elements, we give thanks also in the several actions of distribution, saying after this or like manner: The Lord Jesus, the same night ...took bread; and when he had given thanks, as we also give thanks to God...brake it...(and the cup) as we also give thanks to God...." English Popish Ceremonies, p. 200. Remarks Sprott, "This form shows that the words of institution are to be recited as a prayer." (BCO, p.xxxix) This is very doubtful. The meaning seems to be that they are used as words of delivery.

3. Government and Order, p. 22.

4. But it (the BCO) also contains the "fencing" etc.

writes,

He first readeth, and shortly expoundeth the words of Institution, shewing the nature, use and end of the Sacrament, and the duties of the communicants; next he useth a prayer....(1)

(c) The Communion Prayer

A comparison of the Communion prayers in the BCP, FP/BCO and the Directory is of interest:

<u>BCP</u>	<u>FP/BCO</u>	Directory
Narrative of Redemption	Praise for creation and redemption	Thanksgiving for redemption & means of grace
Petition to make communicants partakers in body and blood	Narrative of Redemption	Profession of faith in High-priesthood of Christ
Word of Institution.	Oblation through High-priesthood of Christ,	Epiclesis
-----	Doxology	
Oblation		
Lord's Prayer		

Like the Prayer Book, the FP/BCO tradition commits itself to no theory of the sanctification of the elements. There is in the prayer neither an Epiclesis nor a rehearsal of the Word of Institution. However, the rubric preceding it strongly suggests that the intention of this prayer is the blessing of the bread:

Then he taketh the bread and giveth thanks, either in these words following, or like in effect. (2).

"The prayer is indubitably eucharistic," writes

-
1. op. cit., p. 22.
 2. WALD and MIDD omit prescription of the manual act.

Maxwell (1), in other words, it is a prayer of thanksgiving, which, as the New Testament implies and the Directory clearly articulates, is synonymous with the blessing of the bread (2).

As can be seen in the foregoing comparison, the Communion Prayer in the Directory has, in most of its features, an approximate parallel in the BCO. The second paragraph, that which is called here a profession of faith in the high priesthood of Christ, is very similar in wording to the prayer of oblation in the BCO. Thus:

We present ourselves to this his table...to declare and witness before the world that by him we have received liberty and life...that by him alone we have entrance to the throne of thy grace, that by him alone we are possessed in our spiritual kingdom to eat and drink at his table....

Directory

To profess, that there is no name under heaven by which we can be saved, but the Name of Jesus Christ, by whom alone we receive liberty and life, have access to the throne of grace, are admitted to eat and drink at His own Table.

-
1. John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 134.
 2. cf. Mt.26:26,27, "He took bread, and blessed it....And he took the cup and gave thanks"; also, Mk.14:22,23. The Directory rubric preceding the prayer reads: "Let the prayer, thanksgiving, or blessing of the bread and wine, be to this effect". The Confession and Catechism also use the terms synonymously, thus: Confession: "to pray and bless the elements of bread and wine"; Catechism: "to set apart the elements by the word of institution, thanksgiving and prayer". It might be noticed in passing that the Independent Puritans took the accounts in Matthew and Mark to authorize a "double consecration", that is, a separate prayer over each element. This was their practice (Baillie, Letters & Journals II,p.149) and for this they contended in the debates in the Assembly(MS Minutes II,pp.198-202).

But the very similarity in these two passages emphasizes the difference: the Directory prayer contains no oblation, a peculiar omission from a Eucharist prayer.

The most significant feature of the Communion Prayer in the Directory is its inclusion of an Epiclesis -- an invocation of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the elements "that we may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ". Such an invocation appeared in the first Edwardian Prayer Book (1549) (1) but under Bucer's influence (2) it was omitted from the 1552 revision and has never reappeared in the authorized liturgy of the Church of England. An Epiclesis was included however in

1. "With thy holy spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ". Srawley comments, "The prayer in this form was a combination of Western and Eastern views of consecration. While retaining the Western (Roman) position of the invocation before the recital of the institution, instead of after as in the Eastern rites (and as in the Directory), it included, in the Eastern manner, a reference to the Holy Spirit as the agent...; but it also includes a further reference to the 'word', by which Cramner appears to have meant the words of institution, the recital of which, according to the Western view, constituted the 'form' of the Sacrament." In Clarke & Harris, op. cit. p342.

2. Its removal was among the numerous changes resulting from Bucer's Censura -- a critique of the 1549 book. Bucer objected to all blessing or consecration of inanimate things, probably in reaction to the Roman theory of transubstantiation. cf. *ibid.*; Proctor and Frere, op.cit., p. 74.

the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637. Gordon Donaldson lists this among the "puritan" influences in the shaping of that book (1). It reads:

Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, so that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood: who in the night....(2).

Henderson's description of the contemporary Scottish usage shows a marked similarity to the thanksgiving in the Directory Communion Prayer, but the "Epiclesis" he gives falls short of a verbal invocation of the Spirit:

Next he useth a prayer, where in he both giveth thanks, especially for the inestimable benefit of Redemption, and for the means of the Word and Sacraments, particularly for this Sacrament, and prayeth earnestly to God for his powerfull presence, and effectual working, to accompany his own ordinance to the comfort of his people now to communicate. (3).

1. "The lack of an invocation in the Knoxian Communion Office had been criticised by such a presbyterian as Row, while Calderwood, Henderson and Gillespie made it clear that the prescribed order was commonly supplemented in this respect." The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, pp. 67-8.

2. Donaldson remarks that "this phraseology gives no countenance to any doctrine at variance with either the Scots Confession of 1560 or the Westminster formulae". *ibid.*, p. 68. Note the similarity between the opening clause and the Westminster Confession when it declared that the sacrament's efficacy depends "upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution".

3. Government and Order, p. 22.

The Savoy liturgy contains a prayer for the sanctification of the elements though it does not literally invoke the Holy Spirit. As in the Directory order, the prayer is in close conjunction with the Word of Institution (1).

(d) The Mode of Sanctification in Modern Presbyterian Books

The twelve modern Scottish Presbyterian service books, dating from 1858 to 1940, which have been examined (2), reveal a great variety of approach to the sanctification of the elements. All except one (3) include the reading of the Word of Institution, but only in some is it so integrated into the service as to suggest its sanctifying as well as authorizing function. This usage would appear to have been brought into the present liturgy through the United Presbyterian tradition: it appears first in PFS, then in DFPW of the United Free Church and then the BCO of 1928 and the BCO of 1940 (as well as in the Church of Scotland's first official book of modern times, PDS, 1923). All books, as would be expected, contain thanksgivings

1. The Word may either immediately precede or follow the blessing of the elements in the Savoy order.

2. Lee'58, Lee'63; PFS(1894), NDPW(1909); Euchologion (1867, 1905, 1913, 1924); PDS (1923), BCO (1928), BCO (1940).

3. Lee'58, but there is reason to believe that its reading was assumed.

in their Eucharistic prayers, although they vary considerably in scope. The invocations of the Holy Spirit, where they appear, do not always constitute Epicleses in the technical sense. Some, for instance, invoke the Spirit upon the communicants but not on the elements (1). Proper Epicleses appear in one of the two orders in DFPW, in all versions and editions of Euchologion, and in PDS and two BCO's (2). It is noteworthy that in DFPW and Euchologion the supplication is for the sanctification of the elements by "Word and Spirit". The separate blessing of each element, or "double consecration" associated at Westminster with the English Independents, seems to have been another First Secession or United Presbyterian tradition. Such is the usage in the first order of PFS and in the alternative form in DFPW.

6. The Administration

(a) "The Minister Being at the Table"

This is the first reference to the minister's

1. For example, the first of two alternative Communion prayers in NDPW is drawn from the Directory, almost literally, but diverges from its parent form at the point of the Epiclesis, where it beseeches the entrance of the Holy Spirit into the worshippers' hearts, and prays for a blessing upon the ordinance, but studiously avoids the suggestion that the bread and wine might be blessed.

2. Except in the two alternative forms of the 1928 BCO.

position. The rubrics do not stipulate the exact point in the service at which he is to take the table position. Most likely he was intended to do so after the Exhortation and before the Word of Institution. The rubric at that point directs that "the Minister is to begin the Action with sanctifying and blessing the Elements...set before him". This would be in accordance with the precedent of the FP and BCO, where the minister "cometh down from the Pulpit and sitteth at the Table" after the exhortation, to give the Communion prayer (1) WALD and MIDD alter the order by postponing the descent to the table until after the prayer. Henderson's description conforms to that implied in the Directory: both Word and prayer are from the table. There is a ceremonial integrity about this which is lacking in all the FP/BCO orders: the total "action", from the sanctifying by Word and prayer onward is centred at the table.

(b) The Manner of Administration

(i) The Minister's Communion

There the Minister, who is himself to communicate, is to take the Bread, and give it to the Communicants.

The direction here as to the order of

1. However, he has already read the Word of Institution.

communicating is not clear. A natural reading would suggest that the minister's Communion is to precede the people's, but other constructions are possible. The FF/BCO order, in all versions, is silent on this point. Continental Reformed practice, if not entirely consistent, favoured the precedence of the minister's Communion (1) and Maxwell asserts that in Scotland, at least from the beginning of the seventeenth century, the kirk "is all at one" in following this procedure "and it likely also represents what had been customary from the beginning"(2). Cowper's draft might have been simply conforming to the BCP or it might have represented contemporary Scottish usage when it prescribes the following:

Then shall the Minister first receive the communion in both kyndes himself, and next delyver it unto other ministers (if anie be there present) that they may help the chiefe minister, and after to the people....

The clear implication of this, incidentally, is that no minister, even though he be but an assistant in the celebration, can rightly administer that which he has not first received. Henderson indicates that the Scots minister in his time "breaketh the

-
1. Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book pp. 206 ff.
 2. *ibid.*, p. 208.

bread, taketh and eateth himself, and delivereth to the people" (1). Pardovan, who closely follows the Directory order, interpolates the following clause here:

If the minister have no other brethren assisting him in the Administration, from whom he is rather to take the Communion at the next Table, he is to communicate at the first breaking of the bread and distributing of the cup.(2).

The inference here is that it is preferable that the minister not communicate before the people, rather, he is to wait for a second table and communicate with the people at the hands of another minister. On the other hand, the Savoy liturgy probably represents English conservative or Presbyterian usage in prescribing that the minister partake of each element before he deliver it to the people (3).

ii Fraction and Delivery

The manual act of breaking the bread is a Reformed use. It appears in all versions of the FP/BCO liturgy. There is no rubrical instruction for a fraction in the Prayer Book before the 1662

1. Government and Order, p. 22. Maxwell observes that the Covenanters made no objection to this particular prescription in "Laud's" Prayer Book, though there was so much else to which they did object. *op. cit.*, p. 208.

2. Collections and Observations, p. 141.

3. It is remarkable that Baxter is so explicit on this point, when most of his rubrics are discretionary.

version. The 1549 BCP and "Laud's" (1) direct the minister to take the bread and wine in his hands at the appropriate point in the Consecration Prayer where the narrative of the institution is being rehearsed, but not until the Restoration Prayer Book was direction for the fraction inserted. This insertion arose out of the Savoy Conference at which the Presbyterians had complained of the BCP that "the minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned". (2) Baxter's order, presented to the same conference, directs the minister to "take the Bread and break it in the sight of the people" (3). Even when the fraction was included in the Anglican liturgy it was in the Prayer of Consecration and therefore not "in the sight of the people" as in the Reformed use and one should think that its symbolical power was reduced considerably thereby.

The postponement of the "taking" of the bread until after the giving of thanks (the Communion Prayer) is, for the Directory, remarkably unbiblical. The FP and BCO follow the scriptural pattern: "Then taketh bread, and giveth thanks...." (4).

-
1. Also Cowper's draft.
 2. Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 179.
 3. Also he is to "pour out the wine in the sight of the Congregation".
 4. cf. I Cor. 11:23,24, "The Lord Jesus...took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat...."

The Directory does not say how the minister is to "give it to the communicants". He may administer the bread and wine individually to each, or to elders and deacons who might deliver them individually to each, or he may simply hand the bread and cup to those nearest him to be passed among the people, whether they be in the pews or at the table. The FP/BCO tradition is explicit on the manner of delivery:

The Minister breaketh the bread, and delivereth it to the people, who distribute and divide the same among themselves, according to our Saviour Christ's commandment, and likewise the cup.

This very likely was the Scottish practice throughout the period between the Reformation and 1645 (as it continued to be afterward). WALD and MIDD witness to its being the accepted use among the English Presbyterians of the late sixteenth century.

Henderson's account says that

those that are nearest the minister having received the bread do divide it from hand to hand amongst themselves.

And further,

All this time, the elders in competent number, and in a grave and reverent manner, do attend about the table, that all who are admitted to the table, may have the bread and wine in their own place and order of setting (1)

1. op. cit., pp.22,23. The procedure here described was evidently not universal. Spalding, in 1641, is scandalized at what he deemed to be an innovation.
(footnote cont. on next page)

Almost seventy years later Pardovan confirms this function of the elders (and deacons) in the customary Scottish manner of distribution using Henderson's words (as above) to do so. (1). It is interesting that the Directory makes no mention of the function of the eldership in the Lord's Supper. The form of Church Government, though it was not completed at the time of the formulation of the Directory, gives to the "ruling officers" only a disciplinary function in the congregation. The Divines conceived of no ordained eldership with a special role in the administration of the sacraments. What is more significant is the fact that, in spite of Scottish practice in which the elder was apparently involved in the administration, the supplementary Act of the General Assembly which clarified the method and distribution intended, does not mention the

(footnote cont. from previous page)

He describes the minister as serving only those on each side, after which "the bassein and braid lifted by an elder, and ilk man tak his sacrament with his own hand. Not done as wes befoir, for the minister gave ilk person communicating the blessed sacrament out of his own hand, and to ilk person the coup". Edgar, who quotes this passage suggests, that Spalding, accustomed to the Episcopal method (in Aberdeen), mistakenly assumed that this had always been the manner in the Kirk. (Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland, p. 167). But the very fact of the existence of the "Episcopal method" and of Spalding's apparent surprise at any other is of interest. It is noteworthy too, that in his description of the "innovation", the elders appear to deliver the elements to each individual communicant.

1. He interjects after "attend about the table" the clause "to see that none be admitted without tokens". Collections and Observations, p. 141.

eldership. (1)

The English Puritan method of distribution, according to Davies, was for the "people to receive the elements in their pews from the hands of the Minister" (2). Although this general statement must be qualified (3), it was undoubtedly the prevalence in England of this mode of administration, so sharply opposed to the Scottish, which made necessary an indefinite rubric. As we shall see, however, the words of delivery suggest that the Scottish method was intended.

(c) The Words of Administration

According to the holy institution, command and example of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this Bread, and having given thanks, break it, and give it unto

-
1. The Act ruled that "distribution of the Elements among the Communicants be universally used: And for that effect, that the bread be so prepared that the Communicants may divide it among themselves, after the Minister hath broken and delivered it to the nearest". Rec. Kirk, p. 421.
 2. The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 137.
 3. As already noted, WALD and MIDD prescribe the Genevan-Scottish method. And Davies himself cites an account of a Barrowist Communion in which "the Pastor delivereth the Cupp unto one and he to another, and see from one to another till had all drunken". ibid., p. 83. And yet another method is described by Frere in his account of the Communion observance of the Northampton Presbyterians, c 1571: "The holy Table stood in the body of the church, having three ministers, one in the middle to deliver the bread, and the other two at either end for the cup." The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 169.

you.... Take ye, eat ye; this is the Body of Christ which is broken for you: do this in remembrance of Him.

According to the institution, command and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, I take this Cup, and give it unto you.... This Cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many: drink ye all of it.

No words of delivery are given in the FP or BCO, but Maxwell thinks that some such words as appeared in the English versions (WALD and MIDD), almost identical to the Directory, were used by the English congregations at Geneva and that the usage passed into Scotland (1). The First Book of Discipline is not clear as to exactly what words are to be used, when it orders that after the prayer is said,

distribution made and commandment given that the bread should be taken and eaten, and all likewise should drink of the cup of wine with declaration of what both one and the other is" (2).

Whether the intention here is that the scriptural words of Christ should be used verbatim ("Take ye, eat ye, this is my body...") or that our Lord should be quoted indirectly as in the Directory ("Take ye, eat ye, this is the body of Christ...") is not indicated. Either use would answer the requirement.

-
1. op. cit., p. 138.
 2. in McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 174.

Calderwood in his Altare Damascenum describes the use of the direct quotation in the words of delivery(1). The General Assembly in 1617 enjoined the use of words very similar to those in the Directory:

Take, eat: this is the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was broken for you, do this in remembrance of Him....
 Drink, this is the blood of Jesus Christ shed for you; do this in remembrance of Him.(2)

Henderson's words, too, are of this nature, though he adds to the delivery of the wine,

...for as often as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come (3).

It is a "high" doctrine of the Sacrament that is proclaimed in the words "This is the body of Christ" -- a doctrine somewhat weakened, oddly, when as in most of the modern service books, the direct use of the words of the institution is made at the point of delivery (4). Gordon Donaldson writes of the words

1. "The blessing or thanksgiving being finished, he says, 'Our Lord in that night in which he was betrayed took bread and gave thanks as we have now done, and brake so I now also break bread, and gave it to His disciples, saying (then he hands to those nearest on the right and on the left) "This is my Body," etc.' He adds nothing to the words of Christ, changes nothing, omits nothing....In like manner the minister delivers the cup to those nearest, repeating the words of Christ...." McMillan's translation, op. cit., p. 172.

2. In Sprott, Scottish Liturgies in the Reign of James VI, p. xxix.

3. This note of eschatological anticipation is missing from the Directory Communion order.

4. Whether anything is lost or gained in a verbal change from indirect to direct quotation of Christ's
 (footnote cont. on next page)

of delivery in the Directory that they are "actually stronger" than the form in the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book (1) which is as follows:

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.
The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. (2)

The theological meaning given by the Westminster Divines to the words of delivery is set forth in the Confession of Faith:

There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass, that the names and

(footnote cont. from previous page.)
words is no doubt debatable. The latter use has its absolute fidelity to the Word of Institution to commend it. And it serves as a second reminder of the authority for, indeed, the Author of, the institution. On the other hand, the Word of Institution has already been read and the "action" is the Church's response in faith to that Word. The Church therefore declares of the bread and wine which it sets forth, "This is the body of Christ" and "This cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ" in a sublime act of faith. This use (as in the Directory) rightly or wrongly, gives the minister the dual function of articulating the Church's faith ("This is the body of Christ") and of uttering the command of Christ to the Church ("Take ye, eat ye").

1. The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637
p. 69.

2. This is a reversion to the 1549 BCP, the 1552 formula (which is conjoined with the earlier form from 1559 onward), by itself suggesting a receptionist or Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper, being deleted. The omission was made at the instigation of the Scot, James Wedderburn, dean of the chapel royal.
ibid., p. 52.

effects of the one are attributed to the other (1)

But, as we have seen, "the efficacy of a sacrament" or of this " sacramental union", depends "upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution"(2).

Therefore

the outward elements...duly set apart and ordained by Christ have such a relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, albeit in substance and nature, they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before(3).

"This is the body of Christ" is to be taken neither literally, nor merely "spiritually". The identity of the bread with the body can only be described as a "sacramental union", analagous to the "sacramental union of the Incarnation.

A further point of interest in the words of administration is that they are addressed to the congregation in general and not, as in the Prayer Book, to each communicant in particular. That the address should be general had long been a contention of the Puritans in their criticism of the BCP (4). The words addressed individually and the

-
1. Chapter XXVII, ii.
 2. Chapter XXVII, iii.
 3. Chapter XXIX, v.
 4. Thus in their Admonition to Parliament, the Elizabethan Puritans, contrasting New Testament usage with contemporary Anglican, said, "Then it was delivered generally and indefinitely", Take ye and eat ye: we particularly and singularly, Take thou
(footnote cont. on next page)

elements administered individually contradicted Christ's example in the Upper Room. (This must have represented conservative Puritan or Presbyterian opinion only, for, as we have already seen, many Puritans favoured individual ministrations, whatever the words of delivery might have been). The Presbyterians at Savoy pressed for a change in both the ceremony and words of the BCP at this point. They asked "that the minister be not required to deliver the bread and wine into every communicant's hands, and to repeat the words to each one also."(1)

There is reflected in this Presbyterian insistence upon a general address and a general delivery not only a difference of view (from the Anglican) as to how closely the New Testament institution ought to be imitated in ceremony and

(footnote cont. from previous page)
and eat thou". (in Davies, op. cit., p. 71) The words of delivery in the Anglican order are as follows: "The body of our Lord Jesu Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life, and take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving. The blood of our Lord Jesu Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life. And drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful" (as in the 1559 version)

1. The bishops answered: "Administration to every particular communicant with the words in the singular number is most requisite, forso much as it is the propriety of Sacraments to make particular oblation to each believer." Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 179.

word, but a different view of the Church. The Anglican method seems to imply that membership in the Body of Christ is contingent upon the individual's unilateral relationship to Christ, which relationship is effected through the direct ministrations of the priest to the member. This view makes private celebration quite permissible, for in a sense, every administration, if not the total celebration, is a private one. The Reformed mode of celebration is a corporate act: the bread and wine are delivered to the Church (Take ye, eat ye, ... Drink ye) and are passed from hand to hand among communicants who are members one of another in Christ. The individual's relationship to the Church's Lord is inextricably bound with his relationship to the Church's membership. The two, indeed, are one relationship. If, on the basis of this understanding, private administration is permissible, it ought to take place only in the context of the corporate celebration when the elements are carried from the Church to the physically isolated individual. (1)

1. This admittedly comes dangerously close to the Roman idea of the "reservation" of the elements against which the Divines were so careful to guard in the Confession (Chapter XXIX, iii and iv). But the significance of the elements so delivered to the sick lies not in their miraculous transubstantiation at the altar, but in their symbolical value as the body and blood of our Lord shared by his members. An interesting corollary of all this might be that laymen (elders or others) ought to be able to carry the elements and minister them to the sick, even as they minister one to another within the four walls of the church.

The express imitation of the Last Supper institution insisted upon by the Reformers and the Westminster Divines is more than a mere enslavement to the literal words of the scripture. It witnesses to their understanding of the meaning of membership in Christ and the corporate nature of the Church.

(d) Administration in the Modern Service Books

The modern service books, dating from 1864 to 1940, prescribe modes of administration widely differing in their details, though recognizably Reformed. The following is a summary of their prescriptions as they relate to those of the Directory discussed in this section.

(i) The Minister at the Table

The significance of the point at which the minister goes to the table is, as already suggested, simply one of the ceremonial integrity (or lack of it) in the rite. Euchologion (all editions) and PDS and BCO's of 1928 and 1940 follow the implied rule of the Directory in having the minister take his place at the table before the action proper begins -- that is, before the consecration of the elements by Word of Institution and Prayer. The earlier service books of the dissenting bodies, PFS, NDPW and DFPW, follow the FP/BCO tradition by opening with the biblical warrant read from the pulpit, the minister not going to the table until

immediately before the Communion Prayer (1).

ii. Order of Reception

Some of the books are ambiguous on this point, but by no means all. Lee'64 uses the words of the Directory and implies thereby ministerial priority. Euchologion (1867) and PDS clearly prescribe the sequence of reception as minister, elders, people; and later editions of Euchologion, like the 1940 BCO, omit mention of the elders. The role of the elder as a functionary in the administration of the sacrament is given greater emphasis in the liturgies of the free churches. They either do not stipulate priority or, like NDPW, are careful to prescribe that two elders be served first and that they, in turn, serve the minister. Indefiniteness as to priority of reception (as between minister and elders) is a mark also of the 1928 BCO. As we have observed, neither the FP/BCO nor the Directory liturgy makes any mention of elders.

iii. Manual Acts

All the modern liturgies with the exception of NDPW prescribe the fraction and "taking" the cup with the second reading of the Word of Institution. An additional act, not in the Directory, which gives

1. Lee'64, though not clear, seems to require that even this prayer be offered from the pulpit.

ceremonial coherence to the rite is the setting apart of the elements (requiring the placing of the hand upon them) immediately prior to the Eucharistic prayer. This appears in Euchologion (1905 ff), the first order of the 1928 BCO and in both main orders of the present book.

(iv) Words of Administration

The words of delivery in early Presbyterian usage, that is, those prescribed in the Directory, were, if one may judge by the modern service books, lost to the Church until the publication of the 1940 BCO. (Lee'64 is an exception; in its prescriptions for the administration of the elements it follows the Directory almost verbatim). All books until 1940 require, rather the second reading of the narrative of the institution with the administration accompanying these words. The 1940 BCO combines the old and the new. The Word of Institution is rehearsed with the manual acts of breaking the bread and raising the cup. Then, after the Agnus Dei, the words of delivery as in the Directory are said with the giving of the elements to the people (1).

1. This is also the method of the BCO (1930) of the United Church of Canada, with this modification that the words of delivery of the Prayer Book are offered as an alternative to those of the Directory.

7. The Post-Communion Exhortation and Prayer

(a) "A Few Words"

The post-Communion address has no liturgical precedent in either English or Scottish traditions. However, that it was in vogue in Scotland at the time is attested to by Henderson who writes,

After the last company hath received, the minister rising from the table, goeth to the pulpit, where, after a short speech tending toward thanksgiving....

Almost all of the modern service books examined down to the 1928 BCO (in which it is optional) prescribe a brief exhortation following the administration.

The only exception is the NDPW which, instead, instructs the minister to give a table address (1).

1. The "Table Address", while not mentioned in the Directory, appears to have been universal Scottish usage from the time of Westminster down at least to the late nineteenth century. Combined with the practice of having successive tables, at each of which an address was given, this made for an excessively long and prolix service. Baillie reports that the table address was not Puritan use (Letters and Journals II, pp.148-9, Dissuasive, p. 121) and there was a strenuous debate in the Assembly over the question. Lightfoot indicates the nature of the rubric proposed by the committee: "As the communicants are to exercise their faith, &c. so is the pastor, by some short sentences, by intervals, to stir up their affections thereunto." (Journals of Proceedings, p.289) After the lengthy debate (MS Minutes II, pp 212-5) the Scots were forced to yield the point but the omission was repaired by the supplementary Act of the General Assembly which enjoined "that there be no reading during the time of communicating (in contravention of the FP/BCO order) but the Minister, making a short exhortation at every table, that thereafter there be silence during the time of the Communicants' receiving, except onely when the Minister expresseth a few short sentences suitable to
(footnote cont. on next page)

It was originally prescribed in the Directory that the minister should go to the pulpit for this exhortation, but such "shifting of places was much spoken against" by the Divines (1). The Puritan mind had a deeply rooted aversion to any unnecessary "shifting" by the minister. Pardovan, however, has him going to the pulpit for this address (2).

(b) The Post-Communion Prayer

This consists of a brief offering of thanksgiving, a petition for pardon for the defects of the service, and a plea for grace to walk "as becometh those who have received so great pledges of salvation". There is a similar Thanksgiving in the FP/BCO liturgy, though it omits the matter of "defects" and possesses

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 the condition of the Communicants in the receiving, that they may be excited and quickened in their Meditation in the Action". (Rec. Kirk, p.421) (It was also ordered that provision be made for the concurrent exhortation by another minister of those unable to get into the church "in some convenient place appointed" until such time as they could come to the table). In practice the address amounted to more than "a few short sentences" though apparently its length varied. Sometimes it was continuous, beginning before the distribution and ending after it, sometimes broken for a period of silence during the reception. A different talk was given at each successive table. (See Edgar, Old Church Life in Scotland, pp.169-70; also the various specimen communion services published during the first half of the nineteenth century by individual ministers).

1. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 291.
2. Pardovan, Collections and Observations, p. 142. The Scottish Presbyterian mind seemed possessed with a similar kind of aversion to the minister's being out of the pulpit any more than necessary.

no verbal similarity to the Directory. The Prayer Book contains two alternative post-Communion prayers, the one, an oblation of worship and worshippers (which traditionally belongs to the Eucharist prayer, and was contained therein in the 1549 version), and the other, a thanksgiving and supplication for grace to "do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in". The second is akin to the Directory prayer.

Probably the intention for this prayer, so far as its Scottish usage is concerned, was that it be prefixed to or incorporated into the normal post-sermon thanksgivings and intercessions. Henderson describes the common post-Communion procedure thus:

After a short speech tending to thanksgiving, he doth againe give thanks unto God for so great a mercy, and prayeth as on other Sabbaths.(1)

And Pardovan confirms this in his account of the normal Communion practice in 1707. He appends to the Directory prayer the clause, "and then concludes with the usual petitions in the publick prayers of the Church" (2). This compensates for the apparent deficiency in the Directory Communion order in that

1. Government and Order, p. 24. Baillie complains of the Independents that they had no prayer whatever after the administration of the Supper. Letters & Journals II, p. 149.

2. op. cit., p. 142.

it has no prayer for "the whole estate of Christ's Church" or other intercessions. It also serves to integrate the "Preaching" and the "Communion" into one service. Thus it is a reminder of the Reformed ideal (as articulated by Calvin but never practised in Geneva nor in Scotland) that the full and proper diet of worship for the Lord's Day consists of the Word and Sacrament. (1)

All the modern Presbyterian post-Communion prayers (DFPW excepted) include explicit thanksgiving for the sacrament, and all include some form of prayer for grace to live lives appropriate to so great a favour. In some instances the petition for grace is joined to an act of oblation or self-dedication. All except PDS include intercessions for the whole Church, remember with praise the Church triumphant, and make some eschatological reference. Some, notably PFS, PDS and the 1928 BCO make the plea for pardon, commended by the Directory, for the defects of the service -- "for the sin that has mingled with

1. W.D. Maxwell has pointed out that the Reformed order of Sunday worship (as in the FP/BCO tradition) is constructed on the pattern of the Mass, that is, on the full pattern of the Word and Sacrament. This is why the great intercessions follow the sermon: they belong to the second half of the service. The Divines at Westminster ignored this norm in placing the Intercessions before the sermon, but the Scots, consciously or not, were conforming to this two-fold norm in insisting that the Intercessions may be postponed until after the sermon.

it".

It is noteworthy that while the Directory does not call for a psalm, the modern books, without exception, adhere to the FP/BCO tradition of recommending the singing of the 103rd Psalm either before or after the post-Communion prayer.

8. The Offerings

Collections for the poor had for some time been associated with the Communion service in Scotland, though the BCO makes no mention of it. McMillan has gathered such evidence as there is (1) which reveals that despite the General Assembly's 1573 act to the contrary, collections for the poor were in some places taken at the Communion table. The Directory rubric in effect reaffirms the 1573 act which sought to separate the collection from the administration of the sacrament (and, indeed, from the preaching service). The Prayer Book Communion order places the poor-offering between the Creed and the prayer for the Church (2). The 1549 BCP and the Scottish liturgy of 1637 explicitly associate the collection with the Offertory -- the preparation of

1. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp.220-1.

2. "Then shall the Churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotions of the people, and put the same into the poor man's box".

the elements -- reminiscent of the ancient custom of the people's offering of bread and wine (1). Pardovan, with a purely practical object in mind, suggests a recovery of the elements with the money offerings. Since the cost of the elements was apparently a factor in the infrequency of celebration, he advocates an offering after the manner of the ancient oblation of bread and wine in order to defray expenses. He appeals to the ancient practice for its utilitarian rather than sacramental value, but it would be a mistake to draw a sharp distinction between the two (2). It is unfortunate that the Divines saw the collection as a hindrance to worship rather than an intrinsic part of it, particularly in the context of the Lord's

1. The Scottish Book reads: "And when all have offered, he (the Deacon or Churchwarden) shall reverently bring the said bason 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. And the Presbyter shall offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for the Service". This was in the Catholic tradition and Maxwell informs us that Calvin carried the same tradition, less the elements, into the normal Sunday worship of the French Church at Strasburg. The practice was "to collect the alms before the Great Prayer, thus retaining the collection of the offering in the old Catholic position, and it is very probable that this also represents both his Genevan practice and the practice of the English congregation which used the FP". John Knox's Genevan Service Book, pp.100-1. This suggests the possible "sacramental" significance of the money offerings in both the Communion and the ordinary services of the Church.
2. Collections and Observations, pp 143-4.

Supper, and more particularly since it was an offering for the poor.

In the modern Scottish service books, the money offerings of the people are not integrated into the sacramental observances proper, though in PDS they immediately precede the "Great Entrance" when the elements are carried in and placed upon the table. The association of the offerings and the elements is possible, but less obvious, in the 1940 BCO. In most of the earlier (modern) service books, the collection comes before the sermon.

9. The Summary

If neither the Prayer Book nor the FP/BCO liturgy commits itself to a particular theory of the sacrament, the Directory order, by both its explicit statements and its very construction, does. This gives the order its integrity and coherence. Its main movements are determined by well defined theological presuppositions and are therefore simple and precise: Exhortation, Sanctification, Administration, Thanksgiving. The rubrical ambiguities, especially regarding the order of reception and manner of distribution, are unfortunate and detract somewhat from the wholeness of the order. But these are the only weaknesses in the order as it stands and as far as it goes.

But whatever its inner consistency, the order is deficient. The Communion Prayer is wanting in what is traditionally called the "Oblation" -- an offering of worship and worshippers in and through the perfect offering of Christ here being memorialized and celebrated. To be sure, such an oblation might be implied in the very act of observing the sacrament, but the point of a rite is that such things be given words.

By modern standards the service is too didactic. The liturgy permits three addresses (in addition to the sermon and exclusive of the table addresses of Scottish usage): the fencing and invitation, the optional exposition of the Word of Institution, and the post-Communion exhortation. This exaggerates the lack of balance already observed in the order -- the emphasis on receiving as against "oblation". The communicants receive not only the Communion, they are the recipients of a great many words. This verbosity is due largely to a disproportionate application of the Reformed principle that preaching must accompany sacrament. But it is further the result of the great stress laid upon religious training and ethical responsibility of Christians. Where such is emphasized, theological exposition and moral exhortation tend to permeate even the sacramental observances. And while this guards against

superstition and moral indifference in the celebration of the sacrament, its tendency is to divest the rite of its mystery and its power to evoke the devotion of the whole man.

On the other hand, this near loss is offset by the implicit power in the action itself. Whatever the force of the drama of the Mass, the simple re-enactment of the Last Supper bears its own dramatic power. Of the Reformed sacramental usage, D.H. Hislop writes,

In the service of Holy Communion the attempt is made to reproduce and to represent the circumstances and the situation of the first Supper. The Roman priest at no point in the service is anything but the offerer of the sacrifice; in the Calvinist service the presbyter at certain points represents and personifies our Lord himself. Something of the mystery drama is here.(1)

It is all the more powerful because it is not a contrived drama -- there is no striving after effect. Words and ceremony are, as near as can be, a scrupulous repetition of the words and acts of the Upper Room event as reported in scripture. And this, by the work of the Holy Spirit, may have a force beyond all exhortation, and an impact as great as the most imaginative and splendid ceremonial.

The short-coming of this literal limitation of word and action to the Last Supper narrative is that

1. Our Heritage in Public Worship, p. 190.

it tends to isolate the events of the Passion from the total "drama of redemption" and thus narrow the meaning of the Communion. The Confession of Faith says,

The outward elements of the sacrament... have such a relation to him crucified, as that...they are sometimes called... the body and blood of Christ. (XXIX,v.)

Communion is had with "him crucified", but neither in the Confession nor in the Directory order is there any suggestion of participation in Christ risen and exalted (1). Nor is there any anticipation of his coming again. These are serious deficiencies in the Reformed sacramental usage, and it is doubtful if they are yet fully recovered.

The liturgical influences of the Prayer Book upon the Directory to all appearances are few. It is possible to attribute the integration of the Word of Institution into the Consecration to the BCP, and the Epiclesis to the first Edwardian or the Scottish Prayer Book; and if this is correct then the Prayer Book influences though few are highly significant. The Directory is akin to the FP/BCO tradition in spirit and ceremonial (notably

1. A Puritan objection to Anglican use was the prescription of celebration at Easter "since the Communion commemorates the Lord's death, while Easter celebrates his resurrection from the dead". Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 71.

the fraction) but only one instance of direct verbal dependence is discernible. On the whole, the Directory is more systematic and less prolix than the older Reformed order.

The distinctive features of the Directory find only partial use in the modern service books examined. An Epiclesis is found in most, as is the integration of the Word of Institution into the order as a part of the Sanctification of the elements. The Words of Administration did not appear in any Scottish liturgy after the Directory until 1940. Finally, one of the ironies of the history of Scottish worship is that the use for which the Scots commissioners at Westminster fought so vigorously, reception at the table, ultimately disappeared in favour of the practice of the seventeenth century English Independents.

CHAPTER VIIOccasional Services

Being an examination of the Sections entitled:

- "The Solemnization of Marriage"
- "Concerning Visitation of the Sick"
- "Concerning Burial of the Dead"

1. Marriage

(a) The Rationale of the Order

The opening paragraph of this section seeks to state the justification for a religious service to solemnize the marriage contract. The Divines were not wont to take traditional assumption and usages for granted and a rationale for a marriage rite had to be wrought out anew in the Assembly. In the end the position arrived at was not far from that taken by the whole western Church.

The radical Puritans took the view that marriage was purely a civil matter and that if the minister had anything to do with it, it was to act merely as a deputy for the civil magistrate.(1). At the other

1. Davies observes that this extreme Puritan view of marriage as a civil and not an ecclesiastical concern was a "most striking departure from Reformed tradition". The Worship of the English Puritans, p.44. In summing up their position he writes, "The New Testament gave no example of a marriage being performed by our Lord or the Apostles. It seemed therefore...that the Church had no right to exert its power in the civil sphere, into which marriage clearly fell." *ibid.*, p. 84.

extreme there were those like Alexander Henderson who saw marriage not as "a mere carnal contract: it is a covenant with God....(A) civil contract may be dissolved with the consent of parties" (1). The debate was prolonged and, if erudite, was also confusing.(2). Rutherford assisted in bringing about a resolution when he pleaded for a recognition of the traditional distinction between marriage and the solemnization of marriage and insisted that the "formality and essentiality of marriage consists" not in the religious rite but "in the consent of the parties....The directory concerns the solemnization ;...The vow (the covenant with God) belongs to this, but is not the formality of the marriage itself; for then they that are married without any vow or oath of God as amongst the heathen are not lawful

1. This Henderson put forth in objection to a clause in the original draft which stated that marriage is "no part of the service of God". (Mitchell, Minutes, p. 7) despite the fact that an identical clause appears in his own account of Scottish practice. Government and Order, p. 26.

2. "The discussions are not very intelligible" is Leishman's masterful understatement. (Westminster Directory, p. 135). At one point in the debate the practical piety of a layman was given voice by the Earl of Pembroke who, while protesting that he would not "meddle in the learned part", begged the Divines "to take care of the manner of doing it; it is of great consequence....I would be sorry any child of mine should be married but by a minister." MS Minutes III, i f 6. The Divines continued with the "learned part" apparently indifferent to the layman's home truth.

mariadges" (1). This distinction underlies the opening paragraph in the order which says in effect that while marriage is "common to mankind", Christians, at this juncture in their lives, ought to receive both God's blessing and instruction from his Word; therefore "it is expedient that marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister". The consent of the parties constitutes the marriage; the solemnization is a matter of expediency for Christians (2).

It is a typical Reformed tenet that the married persons ought to receive not only the blessing of the Church but the Church's "instruction, exhortation and direction".

-
1. MS Minutes III, 1, f 6.
 2. The principle of marriage by consent has its roots in Roman civil law. It was very early adopted by the western Church. (See Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 873). Duchesne asserts that "no ecclesiastical law...obliged Christians to seek a blessing on their marriage. The benediction was a matter of custom or propriety, and although it subsequently became the rule, it was never a condition of validity. The marriage is independent of the rite." (Christian Worship, p. 428) The principle was accepted in England and underlies the Prayer Book marriage rite (see Clarke, "The Solemnization of Matrimony" in Clarke & Harris, Liturgy and Worship, pp. 460 ff) as it does the order of the FP/BCO tradition. In Scotland, "Forbes on the Episcopalian side and Gillespie on the Presbyterian agreed that blessing by the Pastor...was simply a laudable custom, and not necessary to the validity of the Marriage". (McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 278) This "is still the basis of the law of marriage in Scotland". (ibid., p. 267)

(b) Conditions of Marriage

Six brief paragraphs concerning the requisite conditions of marriage follow. Monogamy, the Biblical rules of consanguinity, the age of consent, the publication of banns and parental consent are the subjects dealt with. Apart from the regulations concerning the banns, these non-liturgical matters are not mentioned in either the BCP of the FP/BCO (1). The stipulations are vague and since they transgress on what is properly the ground of civil law they need not detain us here. Of the publishing of banns it might be observed that the Directory follows both its predecessors in requiring three readings, though unlike them, specifies "three several sabbath-days". The FP/BCO stipulates merely "three several days" and the Prayer Book, "three several Sundays, or holydays", both permitting thereby proclamation at weekday services and a possible shortening of the period of waiting (2).

1. The table in the BCP concerning the prohibited degrees of marriage "is bound up with the Prayer Book, in the same way as the Thirty-nine Articles" but is not a part of the Prayer Book proper. Clarke in Clarke & Harris, op. cit., p. 470.

2. The term "banns" is used only in the BCP and the FP. The BCO, WALD & MIDD speak rather of the "contract" and the Directory of "the purpose of marriage".

(c) Place and Time of Marriage(1) The Place

The minister "is to publickly solemnize it in the place appointed by authority for publick worship, before a competent number of credible witnesses". This rubric earlier had read "in the place of the publick meeting of the congregation, in some church or chapel", the latter clause having been inserted by the Commons (1). The final change was made in March 1644/5 by Parliament at the same time as the interrogatories were deleted from the Baptismal order and under the same ambiguous circumstances. Leishman, who accepted the contention that both alterations were made at the instigation of the Scottish General Assembly (2), suggests that this was "to exclude places of worship not acknowledged by the then ruling powers" (3), though it is difficult to imagine just what places in 1645 Scotland these would be. In any case, the significant point of this rubric is that marriage should be public and in the church. The FP/BCO marriage order implies this in its prescription that the rite be observed at the

-
1. Commons Journals III, p. 713.
 2. See above, p²⁵², n. 2, for a presentation of the evidence for and against this proposition.
 3. Westminster Directory, p. 136. cf. Mitchell, Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, p. 219, on whom Leishman depends for this suggestion.

normal worship of the Church:

The parties assembled at the beginning of the sermon, and the minister, at time convenient, sayeth....

Here marriage, like the sacraments, was appended to the preaching service. This was almost universal custom in Scotland from the Reformation down to the time of Westminster, marriage being celebrated either at the Sunday morning worship or at a weekday preaching service. (1). Henderson says "they are solemnly married in the face of the congregation"(2). The Directory at this point reflects English rather than Scots usage. The Prayer Book rubric reads simply,

At the day appointed for solemnization of matrimony, the persons to be married shall come into the body of the church, with their friends and neighbours, and there the priest shall say thus.(3).

WALD and MIDD, with the same rubric as the BCO, and Catwright's Directory, with its clause "marriages may be solemnized on any ordinary day of publick prayer", imply that early English Presbyterian practice was as that of the Scots. But while the Westminster

-
1. McMillan (op. cit., pp. 272-7) has amassed a great deal of evidence which reveals that in official legislation and in actual practice marriage in the presence of the congregation at a preaching service was taken for granted. cf. Spratt, BCO, p. 204; cf., Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 149.
 2. Government and Order, p. 26.
 3. However, "Canon 62 of 1603 presupposes it will be 'at Divine Service'". Clarke & Harris, p. 464.

Divines debated the question of public marriage and the general opinion was in its favour, the notion that it ought to take place at the normal diet of worship was apparently urged by no one. (1) "A competent number of credible witnesses" suggests more than the "friends and neighbours" of the BCP than the Sunday congregation of the FP/BCO .

(ii) The Time

...at some convenient hour of the day,
at any time of the year except on a
day of publick humiliation. And we
advise that it be not on the Lord's
Day.

The question of the time of marriage is tied to that of place, and they were debated together in the Assembly. The vague expression, "at some convenient hour of the day" is almost deliberately casual. It was intended to repudiate the Roman rule that marriage be solemnized between eight o'clock and noon in order that Mass might be celebrated (2). The rule was carried into Anglican Canon Law (3). Doubtless the

1. MS Minutes III, i, f 6b, ff. Baillie reports: "Thanks to God we have gotten the Independents satisfied, and an unanimous consent of all the Assemblies, that marriage shall be celebrated only by the minister, and that in the church, after our fashion." (Letters and Journals II, p. 243). If "our fashion" was as Henderson describes it, then the rubric means, or so Baillie assumes, marriage at the normal service of the Church. But the Directory certainly does not suggest this, whatever the assumptions of those who accepted the rubric.

2. Mitchell, Minutes, pp. 11-12.

3. Canon 62, 1603. Clarke and Harris, op. cit., p. 464.

clause, "any time of the year", equally as casual, was meant as a renunciation of the Roman and Anglican rule forbidding marriage during Advent and Lent (1). The exception of days of public humiliation was inserted because the festivities which normally accompanied marriage were inappropriate to such days, and the advice against Sunday marriage was inspired by the same concern. Sunday marriages were the Reformed custom on the continent (2), and, as we have seen, also in Scotland (3) and among the early English Presbyterians. The General Assembly in 1579 gave permission for marriage on a "Ferial Day" (4) as well, but to that date Sunday marriage was the rule. The Directory restriction against weddings on fasting days was of Scottish origin.

(iii) Place and Time in Subsequent Scottish Usage

Pardovan witnesses to a new custom in Scottish marriages which emerged at least as early as the turn of the eighteenth century. He writes,

After Banns have been proclaimed, and none found objecting against the Marriage,

-
1. *ibid.*
 2. Maxwell, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
 3. *ibid.*, pp. 149-50; McMillan, pp. 272-7. Knox was married on Palm Sunday in St. Giles. The First Book of Discipline sets marriage in the context of Sunday morning worship: "Before noone must the word be preached, the Sacraments ministered, as also marriage solemnized, if occasion offer." Bks. Disc., p. 58.
 4. McMillan, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

the same may thereafter be celebrate in private Houses, before Witnesses, as the Custom is now become, upon any Week-day, not being a Fast-day. (1).

Here the Directory regulation as to time is scrupulously adhered to and its stipulation about place expressly repudiated. Sprott, referring to the eighteenth century as the sad era "when religion was with too many simply a code of ethics...and when baptism was administered out of the family punch-bowl", describes the new trend thus:

The higher classes began the custom of marriage solemnized at home; it was a distinction for a while in their favour, but the fashion has changed again. The older practice has never been given up in some parts of Scotland. (2).

But evidently the "older practice" was not very prevalent, and while church weddings may now have become "fashionable" in Sprott's time (mid-nineteenth century) they were not customary. The editors of Euchologion, 1867, complain that "the recommendation of the Directory with regard to the place in which marriage is to be solemnized" is "in the practice of the clergy, almost universally neglected" (3). As in most things, the modern service books were in advance of actual usage and all except Dr. Lee's

-
1. Collections and Observations, p. 150.
 2. The Worship Rites and Ceremonies of the Church OF Scotland, p. 45.
 3. p. xiii, n.

two orders (1) recommend church marriages (NDPW and the 19²⁸ BCO appealing to the authority of the Directory in so recommending)(2). The matter of the time of marriage is not mentioned in any of them.

(d) The Pre-Marriage Prayer.

Reminiscent of the orders for the sacraments, the rubric preceding this prayer reads,

And because all relations are sanctified by the Word and Prayer, the Minister is to pray for a blessing upon them....

And there follows a brief prayer consisting of a confession of sin and unworthiness, and a petition for a blessing upon the persons "who are now to be joined in the honourable estate of Marriage, the covenant of their God", for their sanctification by his Spirit and the graces necessary to live in such an estate "as becometh Christians". The inclusion of the idea of covenant with God is noteworthy, for it is this which, in the eyes of the Divines, gives the religious rite its meaning. The prayer shows no verbal dependence upon the BCP and since the

1. It is known, however, that Dr. Lee did celebrate marriage in the Kirk of the Grayfriars and scandalized many thereby.

2. "In accordance with this instruction (in the Directory) it is assumed that the service will be in the Church." BCO, 1928. DFPW appeals to "ancient custom". The fact that such appeals as these had to be made to justify church weddings suggests that there must have been considerable popular resistance to the idea even as late as 1928.

FP/BCO marriage order, apart from the blessing contains no prayers whatever, it must be judged to be of the compilers' composition. The prayer merits and has received a place in many of the modern service books of Scottish Presbyterianism. The latter half of it appears in Euchologion (from 1905 onward), NDPW, DPPW and PDS.

(e) The Exhortation

It is convenient that the Minister do briefly declare unto them out of Scripture....

This rubric introduces an exhortation on "the institution, use, and ends of Marriage, with the conjugal duties" (1). It is noteworthy that no specific scripture passages are prescribed in the rubric or alluded to in the exhortation. By contrast, the exhortation in the FP/BCO order on the institution, duties and ends of marriage is largely a paraphrase of biblical passages (2). The Prayer Book rite, in addition to an introductory statement about the institution and ends of marriage, concludes with a selection of scriptural passages (3) concerning

1. Henderson's influences can be seen here. His description of the contemporary Scottish practice mentions "instruction out of God's Word, of the institution, use and ends of marriage, and of the duties of married persons". *op.cit.*, p. 26.

2. Chiefly from Genesis 2, Ephesians 5 and 6, Matthew 19 and I Corinthians 7.

3. From Ephesians 5, Colossians 3 and I Peter 3.

conjugal duties which, "if there be no Sermon, the Minister shall read" (1). The Directory marriage order is singularly lacking in scriptural content. On the other hand, an element in the Directory address to the couple not contained in either of the parent orders is the exhortation "to study the holy word of God...praying much with and for one another".

A general characteristic of the modern books is their inclusion of an explicit statement of the institution and ends of marriage while leaving exhortation concerning the "duties" to the New Testament epistles. Dr. Lee's two orders use direct biblical quotation to the exclusion of any form of address. In the rest the institution of marriage is set forth usually after the manner of the FP/BCO which, at this point, is dependent upon the BCP.

(f) The Charge and the Vows.

i. The Charge

If the Divines down to this point in the rite were dependent upon no previous liturgy, they turned to the older orders for the charge to the man and woman, Thus:

1. In the versions preceding 1662, these are meant to be a part of the post-marriage Communion celebration and are to follow the Gospel.

Directory

FP/BCO and BCP

<p>After solemn charging of the persons to be married, before the great God who searcheth all hearts, and to whom they must give a strict account at the last day, that if either of them know any cause, by precontract or otherwise, why they may not lawfully proceed to marriage, they do now discover it....</p>	<p>I require and charge you as you will answer God at the (1) day of judgment, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed, that if either of you do know any impediment why ye may not be lawfully joined together in Matrimony, that ye confess it. For be ye well assured....</p>
---	--

It is obvious that the charge in the Directory is but a paraphrase of that in the older orders(2). It is interesting that the Divines saw fit to stop short of the last sentence in the charge:

For be ye well assured, that so many as be coupled otherwise than God's word doth allow, are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful.

This perhaps implied too "high" a view of the religious rite for the Independents to whom marriage was a civil and not a religious act. Worth noting too is the fact that there is in this order no charge to the congregation to declare any "just cause" there might be for preventing the marriage. Such a charge appears in both the earlier services, but apparently the compilers thought such a fourth

1. The BCP has here the adjective "dreadful".
2. The FP was dependent upon the BCP for this charge. It originated in the old York use of the pre-Reformation English Church. Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 154; Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer p. 612. n.1.

asking of banns redundant.

ii. The Joining of Hands

The Minister...shall cause first the Man to take the Woman by the right hand, saying these words.

Then the Woman shall take the Man by the right hand, and say these words.

These rubrics are drawn almost verbatim from the Prayer Book. There are no such instructions in the FP/BCO order (1). In the BCP the action of the first rubric is the answer to the question, "Who giveth this woman to be married to this man?"

And the Minister receiving the woman at her father's or friend's hands, shall cause the man to take the woman by the right hand, and so either to give their troth to other, the man first saying.

"The York use" writes Clarke, "makes it clear that the father yields his daughter to the priest, who representing God, gives her to the man, as God gave Eve to Adam" (2). It is surprising that the Divines should prescribe a ceremony with such pre-Reformation associations, however natural in itself.

(iii) The Vows

The vows have more kinship in their verbal forms

1. Of the Fp, Maxwell writes, "It is safe to argue from silence here, and to deduct that it was not mentioned because it was a natural and universal custom, and therefore taken for granted". op.cit., p.157.
2. Clarke and Harris, Liturgy and Worship, p. 466.

and general content with these of the FP/BCO order than with the nuptial vows in the Prayer Book. "In the presence of God, and before this congregation" (1) reflects the FP/BCO clause, "Before God and his holy congregation". Similarly, "faithful husband" is common to both. On the other hand, "until God shall separate us by death" has its counterpart not in the Reformed but in "till death us depart" of the Anglican order. It will be noted that the bride and groom each "promise and covenant", suggesting the dual nature -- civil and religious -- of the vow as the Divines saw it. This is peculiar to the Directory.

The Directory follows the Catholic and Anglican tradition in requiring the parties themselves to repeat the words of the vows. In the FP/BCO service the minister states the content of the vows and the parties are asked merely to give assent, after the manner of the betrothal questions in the Prayer Book(2). Here, as in the joining of hands, the Divines accept a usage from Catholic tradition, there being no specific biblical institution to

1. Pardovan changes this to "these witnesses". Collections and Observations, p. 152.

2. Maxwell points out that the phrase "forsaking all other" in these (FP) vows is taken from the betrothal questions in the BCP. op. cit., p. 155.

guide them. There is wisdom in the use: since marriage consists in the assent of the parties, the vows constitute the "form" of the service. The actual marriage takes place at this point (1). The rite is given considerable force by having the bride and the groom repeat the vows.

(iv) The Charge and Vows in Modern Presbyterian Books

In most of the modern books a charge is addressed to the parties to disclose any impediment to their proposed marriage (2), though verbal dependence upon the Directory is limited. And unlike the Directory, most address a charge to the same effect to the congregation (3). Apart from the Lee liturgies the joining of hands is a recognised ceremony accompanying the vows. It is sometimes referred to as "a seal of the vows" or a "token of the covenant".

Of the vows or questions themselves, all except Lee'64 and Euchologion 1867 use the Directory words

1. This in the Roman Catholic Church is the only one of the seven sacraments in which the participating laymen are the ^{ministers} priest. "The external consent, expressed in words is both matter and form of the sacrament. The ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties." Clarke in Clarke and Harris, op. cit., pp.468-9. Clarke notes, that "in the Roman Codex the priest is said 'matrimonio assistere'". ibid., p. 469, n. 1.

2. The exceptions: Euchologion, 1867, NDPW and BCO 1928.

3. The exceptions: Lee'58, NDPW and BCO 1928.

with only minor variations, However, in most instances the words are put in the form of a question in the manner of the FP/BCO. The vows are said by the bride and groom in Euchologion 1905 (and following) and PDS; and the practice is acknowledged as an alternative method in NDPW and DFPW. Either manner is permitted in the 1940 BCO. It should be observed that the bride's promise of obedience to her husband is retained in the service books associated with the established Church (the Lee orders, the Church Service Society series and PDS) whereas the orders of the dissenting bodies (PFS, NDPW, DFPW and the 1928 BCO) might require a "dutiful" wife (and husband) but never an obedient one. Feminine emancipation was triumphant in the service book of the reunited Church, the 1940 BCO.

(g) The Conclusion of the Rite.

Then, without any further ceremony, the Minister shall, in the face of the Congregation, pronounce them to be Husband and Wife according to God's ordinance; and so conclude the Action with Prayer to this effect.

1. "Without Any Further Ceremony"

If the Divines were able to accept certain usages of the traditional Christian marriage rite the ring was not one of them. "It was not the custom in the early (continental) Reformed Church to use the ring, and therefore the forms of marriage

are all silent concerning it" (1). Accordingly, the ring ceremony is omitted from the FP/BCO service. McMillan indicates that while the evidence is not all of a piece, its weight is in favour of the non-use of the ring in Scottish marriage services (2). Consistent with the Reformed attitude, the English Puritans repudiated the use of the ring as having no biblical authority (3). The Divines therefore were at one in this and there can be no doubt but that their curt phrase, "without any further ceremony", coming where it does in the order, refers to the ring ceremony in the Anglican service. The BCP, after the nuptial vows calls for the groom to place the ring upon the priest's book (4) and the priest returns it to him to be placed on the bride's finger. This the man does with these words:

With this ring I thee wed: with my body
I thee worship, and with all my worldly
goods I thee endow (5). In the name

-
1. Maxwell, op. cit., p. 156.
 2. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp.268-9. There is no mention of it in Cowper's draft.
 3. It was among the three ceremonies against which the Puritans most vigorously protested -- the others being the cross in Baptism and kneeling at Communion. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, pp 63-4; Proctor and Frere, op.cit., p.136. Baxter's Savoy service omits the ring ceremony.
 4. "as an acknowledgement that all worldly goods belong to God and are entrusted to us by Him". Clarke in Clarke and Harris, op.cit., p. 466.
 5. The ring was earlier associated with the dowry and was given at the betrothal which was a separate service preceding the espousal. Duchesne, Christian Worship, pp.429-30.

of the Father &c.

With the single exception of Dr. Lee's first marriage order (1858), the modern Scottish Presbyterian marriage orders examined ignore the Directory stricture against "further ceremonies" and use the ring (1). It is spoken of as a pledge, seal or token of the covenant or the vows of the marriage.

ii. Declaration of Marriage.

The pronouncement that the man and woman are now husband and wife is simply a declaration of the marriage which has taken place. In no sense does it effect the union. It does not appear in the FP/BCO order, nor in that book's continental predecessors (2). Neither was it a Catholic usage. The Divines drew it from the BCP. Of its inclusion in the Prayer Book rite Clarke observes that it was "a novelty in 1549" (3). It comes from the German Hermann's Consultation (4).

1. It is optional in Euchologion 1867.
2. Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, pp 157.
3. Clarke and Harris, op. cit., p. 467.
4. In Hermann it reads: "I the minister of Christ and the congregation pronounce that they be joined together in Christian Matrimony, and I confirm their Marriage in the name of the Father &c." (translation in Proctor and Frere, p. 616, n.l.) The point here seems to be that the minister pronounces a Christian marriage and confirms it in the triune name. So also in the Directory: the minister pronounces the couple "to be husband and wife according to God's ordinance".

The declaration of the marriage is an accepted practice in all the modern service books reviewed here. Excepting the two Lee orders, it is made in the triune name, a formula to which the Divines would not commit themselves lest the rite be regarded as a sacrament.

iii. The Post-Marriage Prayer.

The order concludes with a brief prayer for a blessing upon the ordinance and upon the married persons, "particularly with the comforts and fruits of marriage". As already noted the FP/BCO order contains no prayers, apart from the brief benediction following the post-marriage exhortation (1). Included in the BCP is a prayer for the bride and groom that

as thou didst send thy blessing upon
Abraham and Sara, to their great
comfort: so vouchsafe to send thy
blessing upon these thy servants,

and a collect beseeching "that they may be fruitful in the procreation of children". It is evident that the compilers of the Directory were influenced by the Prayer Book in these petitions. On the other hand, the first clause, that God would "accompany his own ordinance with his blessing", is peculiar to the Directory and reminiscent of similar petitions in the

1. BCP An abbreviated version of the blessing in the

orders for the sacraments.

The post-marriage prayers in the modern orders only partially conform to that in the Directory, Victorian delicacy prevents most of them from making an explicit petition for a fruitful marriage, or even the veiled suggestion of such a petition. However, modesty is discarded in favour of a recognition of one of the cardinal functions of marriage in the prayer in Euchologion 1905, wherein appears the petition: "Give them a lasting posterity, and bless them in their children". Later editions substitute for this the euphemistic clause, "Let them see their children's children and peace upon Israel". To the credit of its editors, the 1940 BCO recovers the earlier Euchologion expression(1).

(h) In Summary

Structurally, the marriage order is simple and direct. In so far as there is an inevitable sequence of the main features in any Christian marriage order, it bears structural similarity to both its predecessors, though the Anglican order is much fuller and the Reformed briefer. At four significant points the Directory draws on the Prayer Book: the presence

1. In all instances this clause, or its substitute, is rightly set within square brackets, since there are occasions when its use would be inappropriate. It would be unfortunate, however, if the parentheses were taken to mean that the clause might be omitted in the interests of modesty.

only of "witnesses" rather than the normal congregation, the ceremonial joining of hands, the requirement that the parties to the marriage recite the vows, and the declaration of marriage. The wording of the charge to the parties might also be attributed to the Prayer Book since the same charge in the FP/BCO service was of Anglican origin. The similarities of the Directory rite to that of the FP/BCO are more in what is omitted -- notably the ring ceremony -- than in what is included. Peculiar to the Directory are the content of the first prayer, the covenant idea in prayer and vows, and the lack of scriptural content, as well as the opening rationale and outline of the conditions of marriage.

Very little is discernible in the modern services that might be exclusively attributed to the Directory. The joining of hands and the declaration find their Presbyterian authority in the Directory, as does their recommendation that the rite be celebrated in the church. A part of the pre-marriage prayer appears in four of the modern books. On the other hand, the modern orders almost unanimously ignore the stricture against the ring ceremony.

2. The Visitation of the Sick

(a) The Introductory Rubrics

The inclusion of a section "concerning the visitation of the sick" seems to have been incidental

to the insertion of that on the burial of the dead. The Assembly minute recording a motion to recommit the latter section for revision suggests apparently as an after-thought, that the committee might also prepare something "in the close of the Directory (for burial) for the visiting of the sick" (1). The order accordingly drawn up and submitted passed through the Assembly with relative ease. Both the BCP and BCO must have been consulted, for both leave their mark on this order.

The two opening paragraphs provide the larger background against which the order is set. They speak of the general pastoral function: the cure of souls. The third paragraph seeks to articulate the special challenge and opportunity presented to the pastor in the presence of sickness and admonishes him to repair to the sick and "apply himself, with all tenderness and love, to administer some spiritual good" to the patient's soul.

(b) The Exhortation

There follows material for a lengthy exhortation. It begins with a discussion of the meaning of illness. This is succeeded by advice (to the minister) to give instruction in the faith should there be evident ignorance, to encourage self-examination on the part

1. Mitchell, Minutes, p. 14.

of the sick person, to answer his doubts, to issue warning if he be impenitent and give comfort if he be penitent. It concludes with two qualifying footnotes, as it were, advising the pastor to be neither too easy with the complacent nor too severe with the disturbed (1).

The FP/BCO order provides less guidance and leaves more

to the discretion of the godly and prudent minister, who, according as he seeth the patient afflicted, either may lift him up with the sweet promises of God's mercy... or, contrawise, may beat him down with God's justice; evermore like a skilful physician, framing his medicine according as the disease requireth.

The BCP, while providing a form of exhortation, gives the clergyman freedom to use "this form or other like" and prevails upon him to use the second and longer half of it only at his discretion.(2).

The opening paragraph of the exhortation (on the meaning of sickness) is reminiscent of the

1. Pardovan, in his condensation of this material, takes care to incorporate the latter "footnote" into the text at the appropriate point. Collections and Observations, p. 154.

2. Canon LXVII (1603) permits even greater freedom. It provides that the minister shall "instruct and comfort" the sick "according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no preacher; or if he be a preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient". Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 662, n.3.

Prayer Book. Thus:

Directory.

BCP

Diseases come not by chance ...but by the wise and orderly guidance of the good hand of God....And... whether it be laid upon him out of displeasure for sin, or for his correction and amendment or for trial and exercise of his graces, or for other special and excellent ends, all his sufferings shall turn to his profit, and work together for his good, and if he sincerely labour to make a sanctified use of God's visitation, neither despising his chastening, nor waxing weary of his correction,

Wherefore, whatsoever your sickness is, know you certainly that it is God's visitation. And for what cause so ever this sickness is sent unto you: whether it be to try your patience for the example of other and that your faith may be found in the day of the Lord laudable, glorious and honourable....Or else it be sent unto you to correct and amend in you whatsoever doth offend the eyes of our heavenly Father; know you certainly, that if you truly repent and bear your sickness patiently...and render thanks unto him... submitting yourself... it shall turn to your profit.

The salient ideas here are found also in the prayer in the BCO order for the visitation of the sick.

They represent the then prevailing notion that a given illness is the will of the sovereign God.

Hence the appeal is made for resignation to the sickness as an act of submission to God's will.

By contrast, earlier Christian orders appear to have taken the view that illness, like sin, to which it was related, was contrary to God's will; and the appeal for submission to God's will and grace was a

part of an ordinance of healing (1).

The second and third paragraphs of the exhortation, concerning knowledge of the faith and self examination, have their parallels in the BCP where the patient is reminded of the faith wherein he was baptized by being asked to give assent to the creed as his godparents had done on his behalf, and is then examined "whether he be in charity with all the world". The suggestion that the minister answer his doubts and scruples is peculiar to the Directory.

(c) The Prayer

There follows now a prayer to be offered by the minister in the presence and on behalf of the sick person. It opens with a confession of sin, "original and actual", which is succeeded by a plea for mercy, light (that he may know the "cause why God smiteth him") and for the gift of the Holy Spirit that he might be able to withstand and make good use of the visitation. There follow two petitions: one for recovery and the other, "if God have determined to finish his days", for the assurance of mercy and the strengthening of his faith, "that he may behold death without fear". In its spirit and content, though not its structure or verbal expressions, this prayer is akin to that in the BCO. (2). A certain

1. The Visitation of the Sick was usually accompanied by the observance of Unction (an anointing with oil) or the laying on of hands. See Harris, in Clarke and Harris op. cit., pp 475 ff.

2. This very long prayer is not in the FP, WALD or MIDD.

structural similarity to the BCP prayer is apparent: as the Directory follows the exhortation, in which doctrinal instruction and self-examination is urged, with prayer of confession and for pardon, so the Prayer Book follows exhortation, creed and personal examination with auricular confession (1), pronouncement of absolution and prayer for pardon. Beyond this point, however, the two orders diverge in their sequence of ideas.

The petition for the recovery of the patient, albeit guarded by the clause "if God shall please to add to his days", has no counterpart in the older orders. The BCO negatively pleads "that thou wilt not extend thy rigorous judgment against him", but this could not have the same psychological value as the positive supplication in the Directory "to bless and sanctify all means of his recovery; to remove the disease, renew his strength...." The 1549 BCP contains a precatory statement of healing with the ceremony of anointing with oil. Both ceremony and statement were removed in the 1552 revision and nothing was put in their place, either then or in subsequent revisions (2).

1. "if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter".

2. The statement reads in part: "As with this visible oil, thy body is outwardly anointed: so our heavenly Father...grant...that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief and gladness. And
(footnote cont. on next page.)

(d) The Concluding Rubrics

The first of the two concluding rubrics appears to have been drawn from the Prayer Book, the other has a partial counterpart in the BCO. The first concerns the advice to be given to the sick person "to set his house in order". The points contained herein are all to be found in the Prayer Book rubric (already mentioned) about the examination of the patient "whether he be in charity with all the world".

The final rubric begins,

Lastly, the Minister may improve the present occasion to exhort those about the sick person....

While the BCO contains no such rubric or exhortation, it includes "those who employ their travel and diligence to the aiding of this sick person" in the two closing paragraphs of the prayer.

The Directory does not, like the BCO, suggest that prayers be made for the sick person in the public worship of the Church. But Pardovan, in his condensation of the Directory, appends a clause to this effect. (1).

(footnote cont. from previous page)
 vouchsafe of his great mercy (if it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health, and strength, to serve him, and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles and diseases, both in body and mind". It is unfortunate that this was not retained at least in prayer form.

(1). Collections and Observations, p. 156.

(e) Visitation of the Sick in the Modern Scottish Service Books

Probably on the assumption that formal prayer and exhortation is in-appropriate to such an immediate and personal ministry as the visitation of the sick, most of the modern service books contain no materials under this head. The two notable exceptions, however, are Euchologion (1905 ff) and PDS. In addition, there is Dr. James C Lee's volume entitled An Order for the Visitation of the Sick, published in 1875, which contains a wealth of exhortatory and prayer materials drawn from many sources. Its editor makes sensitive use of approximately three-quarters of the exhortation in the Directory order, but no direct use of the prayer matter. Neither Euchologion nor PDS contains material for exhortation or counselling, but both provide suggested scripture readings and an abundance of prayers. In both, but especially the earlier book, the prayers reflect the mystery of suffering -- the paradox of ascribing illness alike to the will of God and to the evil that is in man (1). And both are rich in supplications

1. Thus the third prayer in Euchologion reads: "When it hath pleased thee to visit with bodily affliction and disease....Enable him,..to yield himself...to thy righteous judgments." Again, the fourth: "Teach him to submit with meekness to thy will"; and the eighth: "When it hath pleased thee to try with long-continued sickness...." This note is not so obvious in PDS except in the fifth prayer:

(footnote cont. on next page)

for the healing of the body, mind and spirit, (1) often, like the Directory, including an invocation of blessing upon the means of recovery.

(f) In Summary

On the whole, the Prayer Book order for the visitation of the sick appears to have been more influential in the shaping of this section of the Directory than its counterpart in the BCO, though in its informality the Directory resembles the Scottish book more than the English. Independence of both older books is shown in the introductory paragraphs and in the supplication for healing. And such a supplication is the main feature inherited from the Directory by the two modern books which include orders for sick visitation.

3. The Burial of the Dead.

(a) The Reformed-Puritan Aversion to Burial Rites.

Possibly nowhere else in the Directory as in this

(footnote cont. from previous page).

"Almighty God, who smitest and healest while none can stay thy hand". On the other hand, the fifth prayer in Euchologion refers to illness as what "hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by his own carnal will and frailty". PDS is less inclined to ascribe sickness to either God, man or Satan.

1. Sometimes with the qualifying clause, "if it be thy will", sometimes not. An example of one of the more positive prayers for healing reads in part, "O Lord...physician of our souls and bodies...give him to experience thy healing power and virtue, both in his body and in his soul and spirit". (Euchologion second prayer)

section is there brought into sharper focus both the Reformed-Puritan aversion to what was conceived to be the abuses in Roman Catholic usages, and the lengths to which it was thought necessary to go to avoid them. The two opening paragraphs make it abundantly clear that there ought not to be any religious rites at the burial of the dead and that the reason for this stricture is that "praying, reading, and singing, both in going to and at the grave, have been grossly abused, and are no way beneficial to the dead, and have proved many ways hurtful to the living". So tenacious were the old ideas and superstitions about death that almost a century after the Reformation, the Protestant approach to the rites and customs related to it had still to be essentially negative. Even such thoroughly Protestant exercises as "praying, reading, and singing" were proscribed. The notion that anything on earth could be said or done to affect the destiny of the soul of the departed was Roman superstition and every measure must be taken to eradicate it.

This had been the Reformed attitude from the outset. Thus Bucer's Censura of the 1549 Prayer Book burial order recommended the deletion of the commendation of the soul to God in the interment

formula and any suggestion of prayer for the dead in the service. This was accordingly done in the 1552 revision, including the removal of the special office for the Eucharist at funerals (1). Thus also the FP, which reflected Reformed usage on the continent (2), prescribes for burial only the safest minimum: "some comfortable exhortation to the people, touching death, and resurrection" in the church after the committal has taken place(3).

When the order was taken into Scotland even this was qualified. The minister, says the BCO, "if he be present" may make such an exhortation. But as to the committal itself, the book prescribes that

the corpse is reverently brought to the grave, accompanied with the congregation, without any further ceremony.

And the First Book of Discipline amplifies this with the clause: "without either singing or reading, yea without all kind of ceremony heretofore used"(4).

Funeral sermons are also forbidden by the First Book of Discipline but, according to McMillan's

1. Proctor and Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp.76,82.

2. Though this was not consistent. See Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book, pp.56-7,163-4.

3. And that only if the church "be not far off".

4. Bks. Disc., p. 53; McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 283. In some versions of the Book of Discipline, there is a clause which permitted exceptions to this rule. ibid.; Sprott, BCO, xliv.

survey of burial practices in post-Reformation Scotland, this rule was largely ignored down almost to the time of Westminster.(1). The revolutionary General Assembly of 1638 discharged "funerall sermons as savouring of superstition"(2). And Alexander Henderson claims that they were not preached because they "beget superstition, and tend to flattery" (3). Like the Directory, however, he is careful to point out that though there be no religious rite, civil honours and respects are not thereby precluded.

Early English Puritans principles seem to have been as those of the Scots. The English versions of the FP are even more terse than the parent order and make no reference, positive or negative, to preaching or preacher (4). Similarly, Cartwright's Directory suggests that,

preaching at burials is to be left (given up) as it may be done conveniently; because there is danger that they may nourish the superstition of some, or be abused to pomp and vanity.

There was strenuous objection among the Puritans to the Prayer Book burial order, particularly its words

1. McMillan, op. cit., pp 284 ff. Knox, himself, preached at the funeral of the Regent Moray.
2. Acts, p. 26.
3. Government and Order, p. 28.
4. "The corpse is reverently to be brought to the grave, accompanied with the neighbours in comely manner, without any further ceremony". WALD and MIDD.

of commital which implied the "sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life" for all, regardless of faith or morals (1). There was probably no consistent practice among the Puritans. Davies indicates that the most extreme of them, the Separatists, regarded burial as "essentially civil in character" and interred their dead with no religious observance whatever (2). But the debates in the Assembly suggest that there was no unanimity of opinion or practice among the English Puritans.

(b) In the Assembly

The two main points of debate in the Assembly were the funeral sermon and the graveside rite. The Scots were averse to any funeral dissertation whatever, but the English felt otherwise.(3).

Lightfoot describes the dilemma thus:

-
1. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, pp. 72-3. This was still a Puritan objection at the Savoy Conference. The Bishops replied that "it is better to be charitable and hope the best than rashly to condemn". Proctor & Frere, op. cit., pp 186-7.
 2. op. cit., p. 84.
 3. Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, p. 340. Baillie reports: "Our difference about Funerall sermons seems irreconcilable: As it has been here and every where preached, it is nothing but an abuse of preaching, to serve the humours only of rich people for a reward; our Church discharges (them)...; it's here a good part of the minister's livelyhood; therefore they will not quitt it." Letters and Journals II, p. 245. A year earlier the Scots commissioners to Westminster absented themselves from the funeral of Mr. Pym on the grounds that a sermon was to be preached (by Mr. Marshall).

And here was our difficulty, how to keep funeral sermons in England for fear of danger by alteration, and yet to give content to Scotland, that are averse from them. It was the sense of the Assembly in general that funeral sermons may be made, if a minister be called on for it; and the debate was how to find terms to fit and suit with both parties (1).

The upshot was the formulation of paragraph three of this section which says, with studied casualness, that

the Minister, as upon other occasions, so at this time, if he be present, may put them in remembrance of their duty.

There was less inclination in the Assembly to give countenance to an interment rite. The clause, "without any ceremony" seems final. However, if Lightfoot is to be trusted, "it was conceived by the Assembly that he (the minister) might" use some words of committal "and the words 'without any ceremony more,' do not tie him up from this"(2).

(c) Subsequent Practice in Scotland

Dr. Leishman remarks that in Scotland the prohibition against ceremonies "was read in its more obvious sense" and he adds that

it was not till a century and a half after the Westminster time that a

1. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 340.
2. ibid. Dr. Temple had twice protested that some words might be said at the interment. The Assembly, if Lightfoot reports faithfully, tacitly agreed that such words were not excluded by the clause.

religious service was introduced under the form of asking a blessing on the too liberal entertainment provided for the guests. In time, this made an end of the excesses which had made Scottish funerals a byword, though it was, at least, as much at variance with the Directory as service at the grave or in the church could be. (1).

Reference is here made to the social occasion which grew up around the funeral observances at least as early as the eighteenth century and which seems to have had its origins in the Medieval "likewake", a custom which itself survived the Reformation by at least a century.(2). The eighteenth century Scottish funeral was an all day function centred in the house of the deceased, which, according to Edgar, was marked by eating, drinking and a blessing or grace before and after the feast. The grace was normally offered by a layman (3). By the nineteenth century this role was assumed by the minister and A.R. Bonar, writing in 1858, describes the contemporary practice thus:

The Westminster Directory and the practice of the Church of Scotland are at varianceNo prayer is offered at the grave. No passage of Scripture is read. But it is usual for the assembled mourners to engage in prayer before the body is removed from the house in which the deceased expired; and, if more than one clergyman be present,

-
1. Westminster Directory, pp. 142-3. See also Leishman in Story, The Church of Scotland, Past and Present V, p. 397.
 2. See McMillan, op. cit., pp. 293 ff.
 3. Old Church Life in Scotland II, pp. 233 ff.

two prayers are sometimes offered, -- one before, and the other after the distribution, by the attendants, of the customary refreshment handed around to those who are inclined to partake of it. (1)

And by 1884 graveside rites were being observed in some quarters. In a work published in that year, D.D. Bannerman writes,

The Directory expressly enjoins that no service shall be held at funerals, either in the house or at the grave....The former part of this prohibition has been taken almost from the first...universally disobeyed, and the latter part, especially of late years, very generally. (2).

In sharp contrast to the Directory, the modern service books of Scottish Presbyterianism devote many pages (3) to scriptural prayer materials for funerals. And most contain some form for committal. None of the orders prescribes a sermon or dissertation. The possibility of a public service in the church in lieu of a private house service is allowed for in most (4), though the implied preference is the latter. (5).

-
1. Presbyterian Liturgies, Pt.III, p. 35.
 2. The Worship of the Presbyterian Church, pp.41-2.
 3. For example, PDS, 45 pages; Euchologion (1887), 32 pages.
 4. The 1928 BCO is an exception. It provides for services at the house and graveside only. Lee's liturgy is ambiguous, though probably at that early date (1858 ff) the house service was taken for granted.
 5. The 1940 BCO, however, entitles the first part of the order, "Service in the Church or House" and seems by implication to favour a church service.

CHAPTER VIIIDays, Places & Congregational Behaviour

Being an examination of the section entitled:

"Of the Sanctification of the Lord's Day"
 "Concerning Public Solemn Fasting"
 "Concerning the Observation of Days of
 Public Thanksgiving"
 "An Appendix, Touching Days and Places for
 Public Worship"

1. The Sabbath

There is no day commended to be kept holy under the Gospel but the Lord's Day, which is the Christian Sabbath.
 ("An Appendix")

The principle enunciated here was taken with the utmost seriousness -- in both its positive and its negative aspects -- by Scots and English Puritans alike. The negative side, concerning the renunciation of the Christian Calendar, will concern us in the following section. As to the Lord's Day, the Directory asserts,

The whole day is to be celebrated as holy to the Lord, both in public and private, as being the Christian Sabbath. To which end, it is requisite, that there be a holy cessation or resting all that day from all unnecessary labours; and an abstaining not only from all sports and pastimes, but also from all worldly words and thoughts.
 ("Of the Sanctification of the Lord's Day", paragraph two).

The stringency of this rule is noteworthy (1). It is

1. Some in the Assembly had misgivings about the last clause. "This was scrupulous, whether we should not be a scorn, to go about to bind men's thoughts, but at last it was concluded to be added, both for more piety, and for the fourth command concludes it."
 Lightfoot, Journal of Proceedings, p. 328

doubtful if it represents the earliest Scottish Reformed practice. The First Book of Discipline has remarkably little to say on the subject and the indications are that a less ascetic view prevailed in Scotland during the post-Reformation decades than that which is expressed here and which came to characterize the "Scottish Sabbath" (1). However, there can be no doubt that a more extreme sabbatarianism came with the inroad of Puritan ideas early in the seventeenth century and that it found fertile soil in Scottish Presbyterianism. a/

From Elizabethan times, the English Puritan party had agitated for a more restrained Sabbath day than that ordinarily observed by their countrymen and permitted by the Anglican hierarchy. Indeed, there was a profound cleavage of opinion between the

1. Writes the historian Andrew Lang, "It appears that the primitive Reformers of the first generation had no idea of making Sunday a day of penitential gloom. Knox did not even, like his descendants, call Sunday 'Sabbath'...." A History of Scotland II, p. 108. This is not to suggest however, that the Reformation did not bring with it a radical change in the attitude and eventually the observance of Sunday. There were legislative efforts to reform the day from holiday to holy day from the outset of the Reformation, though they were not marked by the asceticism of the Directory. See Mackintosh, John, The History of Civilization in Scotland II, pp 247-8. "But it is extremely difficult to change the customs of a people; and in spite of all the efforts of the clergy and the authorities, the observance of Sunday for several generations after the Reformation was far from universal in Scotland." *ibid.*, p. 252.

Puritans and the establishment (civil and ecclesiastical) as to applicability of the Sabbath law of the old dispensation to the Lord's Day of the new. Further, the conflict was not without its political overtones. H.H. Henson sees the sabbatarianism of the Puritans as a device in their "anti-hierarchical crusade".

In truth, their sabbatarian doctrine was double-edged, and with both edges it cut away the authority of the Church. On the one side it denied the authority of the Church to institute holy days....On the other hand, by insisting on the divine institution of the Christian Sabbath, it implicitly repudiated the ecclesiastical claim to the appointment and regulation of the Lord's Day (1)

Clearly the point at issue, whatever its political ramifications, was one of authority. And in this, as in all things pertaining to religion, the Puritans placed above all other the authority of Scripture. To them it was clear (as they later expressed it in

1. Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century, pp 44-5. That the Lord's Day be not profaned was one of the articles of the Millenary Petition presented to James I in 1603. The king, in 1618, issued his "Book of Sport", a declaration which not only tolerated but encouraged the traditions of Sunday sport and festivities inherited from the old era. Charles I reissued the declaration in 1632. Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne, (1625-1714), p.108. In the face of Puritan protest against this act by Charles, Laud appealed to Calvin's warning against "gross and carnal sabbatization" which would "three times outgo the superstition of the Jews". Remarks Henson, "There is something oddly pathetic in the spectacle of Archbishop Laud warning these strong iconoclasts against superstition". op. cit., p. 50.

the Confession) that God

hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week.

And further,

this sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men...do not only observe a holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations; but also are taken up the whole time in the publick and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy (1).

This represents the Puritan view by the time of Westminster and the implications of the position are set forth in the relevant section of the Directory. It will be noted at once that most of the material contained in this section is extra-liturgical in character. Regulations for the whole day are laid down and they concern not only the corporate worship of the Church but private and family observance as well (2). It begins with the assertion that the day "ought so to be remembered before-hand" in order that all impediments to a proper observance of the day may be removed before it arrives (3). This is

-
1. Confession of Faith, XXI, vii, viii.
 2. The question was raised in the Assembly as to "how we may bring in the private duties of the Sabbath in our own families in a Directory for public worship". Lightfoot, pp 327-8. Also, MS Minutes II, pp565-6.
 3. This "remembering before it come", Lightfoot among others objected to "as putting a gloss on the memorandum of the fourth command, never before heard of". op. cit., p. 328.

followed by the general statement already quoted (page 369) about the nature of the day and what is required of Christians. The remaining four paragraphs set forth detailed regulations: concerning food diet (that no person be hindered by necessity of meal preparation from "sanctifying that day"), private and family devotional preparations for public worship, duties related to public worship, and how the time is to be spent when people are not in church. The last includes "reading, meditation, repetition of sermons; especially calling their families to an account of what they have heard" and "prayer for a blessing upon the public ordinances". This, with the earlier advice to pray "for God's assistance of the minister, and for a blessing upon his ministry" and to engage in such exercises as may "dispose them to...communion with God in his public ordinances", indicates the central place in the Divines' conception of Sunday given to the Church's worship, and justifies the inclusion of the section in the Directory.

There is no counterpart to this section in either of the parent liturgies or in the descendant service books of Scottish Presbyterianism. And since the manner of Sunday observances over the centuries following the issue of the Directory has little direct bearing upon actual worship usages in

the Kirk, pursuit of the matter would be irrelevant to our purpose.

2. The Christian Year.

It is characteristic of the Directory, as it is of seventeenth century Puritan and Scottish thought, that this service book contains no Calendar. Rather, it states tersely:

There is no day commanded in Scripture to be kept holy under the gospel but the Lord's Day, which is the Christian Sabbath. Festival days, vulgarly called Holy-days, having no warrant in the Word of God, are not to be continued. ("An Appendix", paragraphs one and two).

This exclusion of a Calendar is in direct contrast to both the BCP and the BCO and a repudiation of Anglican, if not Scottish, practice. The festivals and saints' days of the traditional Church Year had long been eschewed by both Scots and English Puritans as wanting biblical warrant, as being part and parcel of popery, and, in the case of the saints' days, detracting from the sole glory of God.

The official Scottish position was stated in the First Book of Discipline. That book enjoined the suppression of

the superstitious observation of fasting days..., and keeping holy dayes of certaine Saints commanded by man, such as be all those that the Papists have invented, as feasts (as they term them) of the Apostles, Martyrs, Virgines, of Christmasse, Circumcision, Epiphanie, Purification, and other fond feastes of our Lady.

And lest it should be concluded that it was merely feasts related to "our Lady" that were abrogated, it must be noted that in ordaining quarterly Communion, the same book warns that in selecting the dates of celebration such "superstitious times" as "Pasche" (Easter) were to be avoided. (1) This was a marked departure from Calvinist practice on the Continent as the Scots were fully aware when in 1566 they took exception to the Helvetic Confession, submitted to the General Assembly for comment, at the point of that Confession's recognition of "festivals of our Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension and sending of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples"(2). Said the Assembly,

These festivals at the present time obtain no place among us; for we dare not religiously celebrate any other feast day than what the divine oracles have prescribed. (3).

Nevertheless, as William McMillan has amply demonstrated, (4) observance of the major feasts did in fact obtain in many places in Scotland for

1. Bks. Disc., pp.24-5, 58. It is noteworthy that the "Lords of the Congregation" in their bond of 1557, in commending the use of the BCP, thought it should be read "weekly on Sunday and other festival days". McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, pp.29-30.

2. Grub, Geo., An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland II, p. 151.

3. ibid.

4. op. cit., pp.299 ff.

several decades after the Reformation, and it was stimulated with the reconstruction of Episcopacy under the early Stuarts. And in curious contrast to the Church's official declarations, a remarkably full Kalendar continued to appear in the BCO in its various editions between 1564 and 1644. Doubtless it had its secular purposes in an age which knew no other calendar than the ecclesiastical.(1). But civil consideration aside, the very existence of the Kalendar in the BCO, suggests John A. Lamb,

must have tended to encourage the observance of some of the days as Holy Days. Those who used the Kalendar must have been reminded of some of the great events of salvation-history. While the Courts of the Church were fulminating against the festivals, the Kalendar must have continued to observe its silent witness....(2).

However, despite the localized observance of certain feast days, and despite legislation in its favour during Episcopal ascendancy (the Perth Articles for example), general Scottish Presbyterian thinking and practice refused to recognize the Christian Calendar.

1. Similarly the "black letter" days were restored to the English BCP after 1549 for their secular convenience; unlike the "red letter" days, they were not intended for liturgical observance. Courts of justice used them for reckoning, and they were used to mark the dates of parochial patronal festivals and fairs. Clarke, W.K.L., "The Calendar", in Clarke & Harris, Liturgy and Worship, p. 216.

2. "The Kalendar of the Book of Common Order: 1564-1644", RSCHS, vol. XII, i, 1954. Dr. Lamb, in this article, gives a full account of the Kalendar as it appeared in various editions of the BCO. The study suggests that the Kalendar was mainly Genevan in origin, with later probable influence from the BCP

English Puritans shared the aversion, and that from the beginning. In 1562 a party of the returned Marian exiles (the early Puritans) included the abolition of all feasts except Sunday among the six articles they submitted to Parliament in that year (1). And this remained a cardinal plank in their platform down to and beyond the time of the Westminster Assembly. In the nature of the case, since most Puritans remained within the Establishment, their actual practice varied (2).

The stern stricture in the Directory truly expresses the crystalized opinion of both national groups in the Assembly. Gillespie spoke for puritan opinion in both kingdoms when he protested that among Anglicans the festival days

are not observed as circumstances of worship, for order and policy; but... as the chiefe parts of God's worship are placed in the celebration and keeping of the same, so are they kept and celebrate most superstitiously, as having certaine sacred and misticall significations, and as holier in themselves then other dayes by the

-
1. Brightman, F.E. & MacKenzie, K.D., "The History of the Book of Common Prayer down to 1662" in Clarke & Harris, op. cit., p. 184.
 2. W.H. Frere cites as "not uncommon" the protests of the people of Elsfeld against their vicar (circa 1620), who, among other offences, declined to bid the Holy days and "defrauded the people of their Whitsunday communion". The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625), p. 381.

extraordinary works and great benefites
of God, which happened upon them....(1)

After some hesitation, the Assembly itself came
to practise what it preached. The first Christmas
of its session (1643) it adjourned for the festive
season in spite of Scottish pressure to remain
sitting. Thus Baillie complains:

We found sundrie willing to follow our
advoyce, but the most resolved to preach
that day, till the Parliament should
reforme it in an orderlie way....

Yet he had this consolation:

We prevailed with our friends in the Lower
House to carie it so in Parliament, that
both Houses did profane that holy day,
by sitting on it, to our joy, and some of
the Assemblie's shame. (2).

The following year, at the Assembly's recommendation
and Parliament's order, Christmas was converted from
feast to fast, by the simple expedient of enforcing
the monthly fast which happened that year to fall on
the 25th of December (3). The Assembly met for normal

1. A Disputation Against the English-Popish
Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland,
(1637) Pt. III, p. 14. (italics mine) Bishop Burnet
represents Reformed Anglican opinion when he replies:
"If by holy dayes you mean, portions of time so sacred,
that in these dayes; our services are more acceptable
to God than on other dayes; or that of their own
nature they are holy..., you have reason to say, none
can make a holy day. And this was never asserted...."
A Modest and Free Conference (1669), p. 81.
2. Letters and Journals II, p. 120.
3. Mitchell, Minutes, p. 21; Lords Journals VII,
pp. 105, 108.

business on the following Good Friday (April 4th, 1645) (1) and on the subsequent Christmas Day (2).

The article in the Directory abrogating the Calendar (3) appears to have passed through the Assembly and Parliament with little dissension and to have met with unanimity of approval in the Scottish General Assembly.

Richard Baxter's moderate Savoy Liturgy attempted to effect a compromise.

Though it be not unlawful or unmeet to keep anniversary commemorations, by festivals, of some great and notable mercies to the church or state...yet because the festivals of the Church's institution now observed are much abused, and many sober, godly persons (ministers and others) are unsatisfied of the lawfulness of the celebrating them as holidays, let the abuse be restrained; and let not the religious

1. And dealt with such a mundane matter as an order from Parliament "about £1000 for the Assembly". Mitchell, Minutes, p. 76.

2. In 1648 the Puritan suppression of Christmas drew riotous protests in various quarters of England, With Cromwell, in spite of his doctrine of liberty of conscience, "the destruction of any observance of Christmas was a cardinal point". Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 161 - 2.

3. In his critique of the Directory (in 1645), Henry Hammond states the Anglican case for retaining the Calendar. "A great part of the New Testament, being story of the lives of Christ and his Apostles ...it must needs be an excellent compendium of that Book, and a most excellent way of infusing it into the understanding, and preserving it in the memory of the People, to assign proper portions of Scripture in Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels to every day, every Sunday, every Festival in the year...." If these "with Sermons upon them, be turned out of the Church, together with Creeds also, 'twill not be in the power of weekly Sermons on some head of Religion to keep up the knowledge of Christ in men's hearts...." A View of the New Directory, in Works I, p. 374.

observation of those days, by public worship, be forced upon any that are thus unsatisfied, provided they forbear all offensive behaviour thereupon. (1)

As is well known, Scotland generally, and the Presbyterian churches in particular, persisted in the repudiation of the ecclesiastical year for at least two centuries after Westminster.(2). The first edition of Euchologion (1867) appends to its table of lessons some suggested Psalms and lessons for the five major feast days of the year, together with the following comment:

In regard to those special services which are commemorative, the propriety and benefit of such services appear to be generally recognized, apart from the

L. The English Presbyterians in the post-Westminster era were much more pliable than the Scots on this matter, as seen here in Baxter. Robert Kirk, a Scot in London during the winter of 1689-90 reports that London Presbyterians "are ready to consent to the practice of holy days, ceremonies and liturgy (though) not assenting to their being convenient in their own nature". And he adds, "But the Scottish regular clergy neither use liturgy, holy days, nor ceremonies and they would own the Assembly at Westminster Confession of Faith, and have their services in way of the Directory". MacLean, Donald, London at Worship, pp.15-6.

2. Evidently the Union of the kingdoms of 1707 had some effect on certain civil arrangements in Scotland as regards Christmas. For in 1737 we find the brethren of the First Secession making the following protest: "Countenance is given by Authority of Parliament to the observation of Holy-days in Scotland, by the vacation of our most considerable Courts of Justice in the latter End of December. This superstitious practice was condemned by the Acts of Constitution of this Church, and declared by the General Assembly that met in Glasgow Anno 1638, to be abjured by the National Covenant." Act, Declaration and Testimony, p. 47.

question of set times. It may, however, be observed that a continued refusal to concur with the great body of Christians throughout the world in such acts of commemoration seems somewhat unreasonable on the part of those who observe centenary and other solemnities in commemoration of events...not to be compared to the great events in the redemption of the world.

It will be noted that while this statement represents a distinct softening of Scottish view (though it is in advance of general Scots opinion), Gillespie's real point is not denied. The festival day have no "sacred or misticall signification" in themselves; they are merely arbitrarily set days of commemoration for "order and policy". The book also provides collects for the five days. In somewhat similar manner, the United Presbyterian PFS provides scripture lessons, opening sentences and special prayers for four of the major feasts(1) (as well as for New Year's Day and Harvest Thanksgiving). On the other hand, the Free Church's NDPW passes over the commemorative occasions in complete silence. The descendant of these two, DFPW of the United Free Church, contains opening sentences and lessons for all five holy days. Later service books of both the free and established churches, as well as the BCO of the reunited Church of Scotland provide lessons and

1. Good Friday included.

prayer materials for a much fuller observance of the Christian Year than even the five main days. In addition, the Church has published, as a companion to the BCO, Prayers for the Christian Year, which includes sentences, lessons and prayers (indeed, everything but homilies) for twenty-six days in the Church Calendar, including one Saint's day -- St. Andrew's -- and All Saints' day, as well as for Harvest Thanksgiving and New Year's. In its liturgical documents, and increasingly in its practice, the Kirk is recovering a tradition of the Church Catholic which was explicitly abrogated by the Scottish reforming fathers, eventually suppressed in the habit of the people, rejected by the Westminster Divines as "having no warrant in the word of God" and "not to be continued". There can be little doubt but that this recovery is gain.

3. Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving

(a) History

While the Directory repudiates the Holy days of the mediaeval tradition, it is quick to add;

Nevertheless, it is lawful and necessary, upon special emergent occasions, to separate a day or days for public fasting or thanksgiving, as the several eminent and extraordinary dispensations of God's providence shall administer cause and opportunity to His people. ("An Appendix", paragraph three)

And the opening paragraph of the section, "Concerning

Public Solemn Fasting" amplifies this (as it concerns fasting) with these words:

When some great and notable judgments are either inflicted upon a people, or apparently imminent, or by some extraordinary provocation notoriously deserved; as also when some special blessing is to be sought and obtained, Public Solemn Fasting...is a duty which God expecteth from a nation or people.

This follows in the Scottish tradition. The BCO (1) contains an order "Of Fasting" which "was drawn up in 1565 by Knox and Craig, in obedience to an order of the Assembly" (2), and was originally designed to meet a specific crisis in the troubled reign of Mary Queen of Scots. It was first published separately, in 1566, and again in 1574; and incorporated in to the BCO with the edition of 1587(3).

Days and seasons of fasting had, of course, been an integral part of the mediaeval cycle of the year (4). But the Reformed objection to the old rule appears to have been at two main points, both

-
1. Not the FP nor its English versions, WALD, and MIDD.
 2. Sprott, BCO, p. 205.
 3. ibid.; McMillan, op. cit., p. 330.
 4. Particularly Wednesdays, and Fridays, the vigils before the great feasts, and the seasons of Advent and Lent. In most instances these were of necessity only partial fasts, involving abstinence from certain foods. Proctor & Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 329 ff, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 495.

of which are touched on in the lengthy treatise which precedes the order "Of Fasting" in the BCO (1). The first concerns the purpose of the discipline:

Fasting by it selfe considered, is no suche thing as the Papistes heretofore have ymaged; to wit, that it is a worke meritorious, and a satisfaction for the sinnes before committed. No, all they that faste with that intent, renounceth the merites of Christ's death and passion, in so farre as they ascrive to Fasting (whiche is but an exercise used by man) that which is onely proper to Jesus Christ. (2).

The discipline, itself an external observance, must be accompanied by inner contrition and repentance. By biblical, particularly Old Testament, precept and example, it is required by God of his people under certain distressing circumstances. These include times in which the nation or Church are threatened with destruction, times of natural catastrophe, times of deep national sin when disaster is earned if not dealt, and times of Christian expansion, "for advancing of his glorie, and performing of his works according to his promes".(3).

This definition of the occasional circumstances which call forth humiliation and fasting suggests the Reformers' second point of contention with the

1. This is omitted from Dr. Sprott's edition and quotations here are from the Glasgow University Press edition, 1886.
2. Glasgow, BCO, p. 198.
3. ibid., pp 172-3.

mediaeval system. By being arbitrarily bound to the Calendar, the fasting, as well as thanksgiving, days of the old Church were without reference to the events -- the dealings of God's judgment and providence -- which occasioned fasts and thanksgivings. The system was thus unbiblical on two counts: the Calendar itself was without scriptural authority and the arbitrary dating of fasts and feasts contrary to scriptural example.

The custom of occasional fasts took firm hold in Scotland as the re-printing and ultimate incorporation into the BCO of the Knoxian order suggests (1). Alexander Henderson in 1641 witnesses to the perpetuation of the use and of the principle on which feasts were called.

They (the Scots) neither make difference of days for humiliation, nor do they keep any set fasts or feasts: all is disposed and done according as the occasions, and causes do presse or require, as may serve most for the end intended.....(2)

Pre-Westminster editions of the Prayer Book make no provision for public fasts in the manner of the BCO or the Directory. However, inasmuch as they retain the main elements of the old Catholic Calendar, it may be assumed that Lent, at least, was regarded as a season of humiliation and abstinence(3).

-
1. See McMillan, op. cit., pp 330 ff.
 2. Government and Order, p. 25.
 3. Not until the 1662 revision were "Days of Fasting or Abstinence" defined as such. These include the forty days of Lent, the four Ember days, the three Rogation days, and every Friday.

But as already indicated, this is quite a different thing from the Reformed use.

Considerably less attention appears to have been given to the observance of days of thanksgiving than seasons of humiliation. The BCO provides nothing for a special service of thanksgiving in times of prosperity, victory or deliverance. McMillan observes that King James appointed two annual days of thanksgiving to commemorate his escape from the Ruthvens and the Gun Powder conspiracy respectively, both of which celebrations were imposed on both kingdoms. They were observed for some years in parts of Scotland but fell into disuse in the troubled years immediately preceding the Covenant (1). The Fifth of November (Gun Powder) commemoration survived in England and the special service drawn up for the day was ultimately annexed to the Prayer Book (2). Harvest thanksgivings were occasionally appointed in some parishes and synods of Scotland (3).

Whatever local English Puritan practice might have been with respect to the observance of days of humiliation or thanksgiving, the Puritans were in no position to declare national observances until the Parliamentary ascendancy. However, we find Charles I

-
1. McMillan, op. cit., pp 321-3.
 2. Proctor & Frere, op. cit., pp 645-6.
 3. McMillan, op. cit., pp 323-4.

in January 1641/2 commanding a monthly fast because of the Irish troubles. One day each month (the last Wednesday) special services were held and sports and trade suspended. The king's ordinance was confirmed by Parliament in August, 1642 and the practice continued through the period of the Assembly. It was this stipulated fast day which in 1644 coincided with Christmas Day and provided the Divines and Parliament with an opportunity to suppress the festive celebration of the Nativity.

During the sitting of the Assembly there were frequent special fasts in addition to the monthly observance (1). Indeed, so frequent were they that the exasperated Baillie reports:

Little more progress is made in Church-affaires. The Assemblée has been forced to adjourne on fyve diverse occasions of fastings and thanksgivings lately, every one whereof took from us almost two dayes. (2).

It will be observed that in the Assembly's and Parliament's fasts both the arbitrary and the "occasional" principle were applied. The monthly fast, though unrelated to the ecclesiastical Calendar

1. For an account of the seriousness with which both the Assembly and Parliament took the observance of fasting and thanksgiving days, and their relation to the fortunes of the civil war, see Carruthers, S.W., The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly, pp 73 ff
2. Letters and Journals II, p. 291.

and though originally inspired by a specific political-military crisis, was held on a fixed date of the civil calendar with no reference to immediate events. The other fasts (and the thanksgivings) were directly related to current happenings. It is the second principle -- that of ordering fasts and thanksgivings to suit the immediate dealings of God's providence (as most events were interpreted) -- which is uniquely Reformed and which underlies the orders for fasting in both the BCO and the Directory.

This principle for fixing days of humiliation and thanksgiving lent itself to abuse in a nation and church torn by faction and party rivalries such as the Scottish in the generations following Westminster. Thus Pardovan, at the conclusion of his condensation of this section of the Directory issues the following caution:

Our Fasting Days must be indicted for such causes as are both clear and just, and when it will be most for edification.... Therefore the Church is to take heed of appointing Fasts through insinuations or solicitations from statesmen, lest they be branded as tools to some who would fast for strife and debate, that others who differ from them about state-matters may be exposed to the odium of the people, as ill-countray-men. (1).

This suggests that general fasts were sometimes ordered for reasons of political expediency, with the

1. Collections and Observations, pp. 163-4.

discrediting of the opposition as the end in view(1). Pardovan gives a similar warning in his account of the observance of public thanksgiving (2).

Between the Restoration and the 1843 Disruption, fifteen general fasts were ordered by the General Assembly, nine of which fell in the period 1690-1710, a time of economic crisis at home and abroad (3) and extreme poverty in the land. In each instance, the Assembly set forth not only the manifestations of God's righteous judgments, but the sins, national and individual, which merited such dealings. That these days were not universally observed is admitted in the Act for a Solemn National Fast and Humiliation of 1701 where reference is made to the general "jollity and wantonness" that prevailed on the previous day of

1. Pardovan outlines what he considers to be valid occasions for fasting, drawing for the purpose on the Act of General Assembly of 1690-1 which called for a general fast for the sins of the Second Episcopacy. They include the sins of unfruitfulness ("having the form of Godliness and denying the power thereof"), abuse of God's goodness, supremacy, ("whereby the interest of...Christ was entirely sacrificed to the lawless lusts and wills of men"), persecution, unlawful oaths and bonds, profanation of Lord's day, shedding of innocent blood, apostacy of ministers, idolatry of the Mass, ignorance of the gospel, censoriousness. *op. cit.*, pp 164-6.

2. *ibid.*, p. 167.

3. One of the manifestations of God's wrath in 1700 was seen to be his "disappointing several undertakings to advance the trade and wealth" of the nation, "particularly in the cross providence that the African and Asian Company's Colony in America hath met with". Acts, p. 290.

humiliation, "few having fasted unto the Lord"(1). The Assembly of 1756 appointed a fast to supplicate the aid of God in the war newly declared against France (2). Acts of 1835 and 1842 calling for days of humiliation attribute the poverty of the people and the critical dissensions within the Church (foreshadowing the Disruption) to "Divine displeasure"(3). But by the mid-nineteenth century the new scientific world view was beginning to undermine the old notions of Divine providence, particularly with reference to natural catastrophe. Thus, for instance, when in 1853 the Presbytery of Edinburgh saw fit to appeal to the Home Secretary, Lord Palmerston, for the appointment of a national fast day because of a cholera-epidemic, the Minister answered the appeal with advice "to see to the cleaning out of the dirty haunts of poverty and disease, and the removal of the sources of contagion, which... 'infallibly breed pestilence, and be fruitful in death, in spite of all the prayers of a united but inactive nation'"(4)

Throughout this period there were innumerable presbytery and parish fasts designed to meet peculiar

-
1. Acts, p. 305.
 2. Acts, pp 725 ff.
 3. Acts, pp 1054 ff, 1145 ff.
 4. Story, R.H., The Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., I, p. 209.

local circumstances. In addition, there were the fast days associated with the Communion Occasions, "days of genuine humiliation and devotion" at their best, and days spent "in the pursuit of worldly pleasures..., public drunkenness", and later, "railway excursions" at their worst.(1).

Three days of general thanksgiving were authorized by the General Assembly between the time of Westminster and the Disruption. The first, in 1708, celebrated military victory over the forces of "Popery and tyranny", (2) the second, in 1746, was called to give thanks for the crushing of the Jacobite rising,(3) and the third, in 1788, was a centenary observance of the Revolution (4).

The great preponderance of fasts over feasts evident here suggests that the Kirk was more aware of the necessity of humiliation before the Lord than of occasions for celebrating and rejoicing in his bounty.

(b) Notes on the Texts.

(i) Of Fasting

After the opening rubric which sets forth in general the occasions calling for national fasts, the

-
1. Edgar, A., Old Church Life in Scotland I, p. 130.
 2. Acts, p. 424-5
 3. Acts, p. 689.
 4. Acts, p. 829.

Directory outlines the conditions of fasting. These include "total abstinence" from food, from "worldly labour, discourses and thoughts" and "bodily delights". These conditions are similar to those laid down in the BCO. The BCP, as noted above, contains no such regulations. Rules requiring private preparations are followed by materials and rubrical instructions for the public service. There is no stipulation as to the number of services (the BCO calls for two) but simply the general notice that

so large a portion of the day as conveniently may be, is to be spent in Public Reading and Preaching the Word, with the singing of Psalms.

The prayer material provided is examined in Chapter IV. A rubric advises the "serious and thorough premeditation" of prayers in order that the "people may be much affected, and even melted thereby". "Special choice is to be made of such scripture to be read, and of such texts for preaching as may best work the hearts of the hearers". The BCO, in what is probably the only order in Scottish Presbyterian service books to do so, prescribes the lessons to be read at both services of fasting, allowing no option. The Directory enjoins the minister further to lead the people, before concluding the service, in an act of rededication in which they engage "their hearts to the be Lord's" and resolve to reform. Finally,

he is to admonish the congregation "to improve the remainder of the day" with godly exercises that they may "find that God hath smelt a sweet savour in Christ from their performances and is pacified towards them". This clause violates the Protestant principle laid down in the BCO which affirms that fasting has no meritorious value in itself. Here (in the Directory) the merits of Christ are acknowledged, yet there is the definite suggestion that to these must be added the merits of men's "performances", the "sweet savour" of which God must "smell" if He is to be "pacified toward them". The clear implication is that God's punishments -- temporal if not eternal -- may be averted, that God may be placated, by the "performances" of contrition and fasting. This seems to be a curious subversion of Reformed doctrine. The order concludes with the notice that in addition to national fasts, congregations and families "may keep days of Fasting, as divine Providence shall administer unto them special occasion". The modern Presbyterian Service books contain no provision for special fasting occasions.

(ii) Of Thanksgiving

In contrast to the directory for fasting, that for the "Observation of Days of Public Thanksgiving" provides a clear and obligatory outline of service(1).

1. Lightfoot pleaded for more discretionary rubrics without effect. Journal of Proceedings, p. 304.

The order is as follows:

Exhortation (a call to worship and thanksgiving)
 Prayer "for God's assistance and blessing"
 Narrative of happening which "hath occasioned
 that assembling"
 Psalm or psalms (1)
 Scripture lesson, "some portion...suitable to
 the present business"
 Exhortation
 Prayer
 Sermon
 Prayers
 Intercessions for "Church, King and State"(2)
 Thanksgiving
 Petition "for continuance and renewing of
 God's wonted mercies"
 Prayer for grace
 Psalm
 Admonition
 Blessing
 (A collection to be taken in connection
 with this service)

It is worth noting that the Act for a Thanksgiving passed by the General Assembly of 1746 prescribes prayers containing precisely the contents outlined in the post-sermon prayer here, and in almost the same sequence (3). The admonition at the conclusion of the order warns the congregation against "excess and riot" in their celebrations "and to take care that their mirth and rejoicing be not carnal, but spiritual"(4). A second service is enjoined, "the

-
1. Alternatively, the praise may follow the lesson.
 2. "If before the sermon they were omitted".
 3. Acts, p. 689.
 4. Pardovan appends the stern warning: "The people are to rejoice with trembling, and to beware of excess....And demonstrations of civil mirth, such as ringing of bells, firing of guns, bonfires, and illuminating the windows should not be intermixed with the religious duties of the day". Collections and Observations, p. 167

like course" to be followed. The collection "is to be made for the poor". The section ends with further exhortative material regarding the duties of the day. The question was raised by Rutherford in the Assembly of Divines as to whether the Church had, on biblical authority, the right to impose a full day's observance on any day other than the Sabbath (1). And while the Directory requires a day-long observance, it was conceivably this doubt which caused the removal of the clause in an earlier draft which required explicitly that "the day be kept wholly from manual labour" (2).

While some of the modern Presbyterian service books contain materials for services of Harvest Thanksgiving and other festive days, all pass over in silence the old custom of special thanksgiving days and services for occasional blessings and deliverances received at the hands of Providence.

4. Places of Worship

And as no place is capable of any holiness, under pretence of whatsoever dedication or consecration; so neither is it subject to such pollution by any superstition formerly used, and now laid aside, as may render it unlawful or inconvenient for Christians to meet together therein for the Public Worship of God. And therefore we hold it requisite, that the places of public

1. MS Minutes II, p. 284; Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 302.
 2. *ibid.*, p. 304.

assembling for worship among us should be continued and employed in that use.

This proposition required a morning's debate in the Assembly before it reached its final form. In the end, the puritanical logic of Rutherford prevailed over the sensibilities of Palmer. The latter argued that in the Old Testament there were "houses of God", so called "because they were separate from mundane affairs, devoted only to God" and he desired "to know what difference in this point there was now with our own churches"(1). The Scots commissioner replied that in the Old Testament "houses of God" were set apart only "for order's sake to the worship of God" and that "in the New Testament there is no more holiness of place than of time, except the Lord's day" (2). In Marshall's view the issue was not an important one and the only justification for mentioning it in the Directory was the existence in the land of two groups of superstitious extremists: those "who think places not fitly prepared without a consecration" and those who "think that places having been consecrated are so polluted that the servants of God should not make use of them" (3).

-
1. *ibid.*, p. 341, Mitchell, Minutes, p. 17.
 2. *ibid.*, pp. 17-8.
 3. *ibid.*, p. 18.

Rutherford's attitude was characteristically Scottish. While many of the "monuments and places" of "idolatry" were destroyed at the Reformation in Scotland, many more remained, or were converted into, parish churches with little apparent regard for past associations (1). Gillespie, like his colleague, was impatient with the notion of holiness residing in a place.

Unto us Christians no land is strange,
no ground unholy; and every coast is
Jewry, every towne Jerusalem, every
house Sion; and every faithfull company,
yea, every faithfull body a Temple to

1. The First Book of Discipline contains the following statement: "We cannot cease to require Idolatry, with all monuments and places of the same, as Abbeys, Monkeries...other then presently are Parish Churches or Schooles, to be utterly suppressed in all bounds and places of this Realme." Bks. Disc. p. 26. "In the great majority of cases", writes McMillan, "the Churches used before 1560 continued in use afterwards. In most of the Cathedral cities the Cathedrals were turned into Parish Churches." So also were many abbey churches. (McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, p. 362.) The architectural historian, George Hay, has pointed out that the destitute condition of many ecclesiastical edifices, particularly parish churches, during the Reformation era was not due exclusively or even mainly to Protestant iconoclasm. Before 1560 "the appropriation of parochial endowments and teinds by monastic, cathedral, and collegiate establishments was a universal feature of mediaeval Europe, which in Scotland attained vast proportions". And with the passage of most church lands in to lay hands at the Reformation, repair was often an economic impossibility. Of Reformed "cleansing", he notes that "while monastic and friary buildings received considerable damage, extant parish churches duly 'cleansed' were in the main adopted for Reformed use". The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches, 1560-1843, pp. 9, 13.

serve God in....The presence of Christ among two or three gathered together in his Name maketh any place a Church, even as the presence of a King with his attendants maketh any place a court (1)

1. Gillespie, Geo., A Disputation Against the English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland, Pt. III, p. 9. Gillespie is unlikely to have understood Richard Hooker who earlier expressed the Anglican view thus: "The very Majesty and holiness of the place where God is worshipped, hath in regard of us great virtue, force and efficacy, for that it serveth as a sensible help to stir up devotion; and in that respect, no doubt, bettereth even our holiest and best actions in this kind." Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity V, xvi, 2, quoted in Davies, H., The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 169. From the outset of the Reformation the Scottish attitude to church buildings appears to have been strictly utilitarian. The new liturgical requirements (aside from the dictates of economy) determined how the mediaeval buildings were used. Writes George Hay, "Architectural essentials were... facilities for the administration of the Reformed sacraments...and for the preaching of the Word, with conditions in which the people might hear, see, and participate intelligently". op. cit., pp 21-2. The obverse side of this utilitarian attitude was (and is) Presbyterian indifference to the use to which abandoned churches were put. For instance, the sensibilities of one Anglican (1712) were shocked, and little wonder, by the use to which Sir James Hall put a church building when he converted the nave into a stable, the chancel into a coach house, and the turret into a pigeon house. Writes the critic, "that which loads the whole (Presbyterian) Party with this Abominable Profanation, is this, that Sir James is still well esteem'd by them, as ever he was, and in full Communion with their Kirk....Nor do I know, or cou'd learn, of any Reproof he ever had from his Spiritual Guides...." Strange News from Scotland, p. 8. It might be noted in passing that English Dissenters took the same view as that expressed in the Directory and embraced by the Scots. In the spate of Puritan church building construction after the 1689 Act of Toleration, "the certification and registration" required by law for each edifice "never implied that the building was used solely or chiefly for worship". Briggs, M.S., Puritan Architecture, p. 23. There was nothing sacrosanct about the building.

Clearly neither side of the proposition concerning "places" was directed toward the Scots. Anglicans and extreme Puritans were the intended recipients of the advice. The Church of England had not to this date authorized a form of consecration or dedication of church buildings (1), but W.K.L. Clarke cites a few instances of new churches receiving episcopal dedication (2). Doubtless there was a large body of Anglicans, clerical and lay, to whom the church building had a peculiar sanctity, by reason either of its association or its consecration or both, and to these the word of the Directory was addressed. At the other extreme were the Brownists, whose opinion Baillie interprets as follows:

All Monuments of Idolatry must be abolished precisely, according to the lawes of the Old Testament; they will have all Churches that were builded in the time of Popery, made leuell with the ground, their Bels to be broken, yea, all Bels do be unlawfull, being Humane and Popish inventions (3).

To such people, too, the statement in the Directory was addressed.

The modern Scottish Presbyterian service books

1. "The question was not pressing in the reformed Church of England, since the number of churches was ample and only rarely was a new church required for a long time to come." W.K.L. Clarke, "The Consecration of Churches and Other Occasional Services", in Clarke and Harris, Liturgy and Worship, p. 709.

2. ibid., pp 709-10.

3. Dissuasive, p. 27.

in this, as in the case of the Christian Calendar, reveal an acceptance and appreciation of sentiments which in the days of struggle were repudiated in the name of purity. Most of them contain orders for the Dedication of a Church, and quotations from two of these will suffice to indicate the reverence in which the house of worship is held.

Euchologion, 1905:

Vouchsafe, O Lord, to be present with us, who are here gathered...to consecrate this place to the honour of Thy great name; separating it from henceforth from all unhallowed, ordinary, and common uses, and dedicating it to Thy service....

DFFW, 1909:

We consecrate it to Thee, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be henceforth the House of God, and a gate of heaven; we set it apart from all common and worldly uses, for a temple and a sanctuary....

5. Congregational "Behaviour"

Unlike either of its liturgical predecessors, the Directory lays down rubrical directions for the deportment of the congregation. They concern the necessity of attendance at public worship, the manner of entering the church, and behaviour during the service.

The clause which rules that parishioners are not to absent themselves "upon pretence of private meetings" appears to have resulted from Mr. Wilkinson's "motion to expresse something to prevent meeting in private houses for publique worship"(1). This was

1. MS Minutes, II, p. 174.

a particularly pressing problem in England at a time when Church and parish discipline were disintegrating in the interim between the overthrow of the old order and the establishment of a new, and when independent sects were emerging at an alarming rate. But it is noteworthy that the Directory does not literally proscribe private gatherings for worship; it merely prohibits their taking place during the hours of the Church's worship. In the debate on the Lord's Day a somewhat similar resolution to Wilkinson's was put forth by Burgess. He desired that something be said in the Directory concerning people "keeping themselves to their own congregation". In this instance, the concern was the growing tendency among the people to ignore parish boundaries and to follow after the popular preacher. Palmer, in supporting the resolution, saw in the new habit a threat not only to the parish but to family solidarity (1). Nothing however, was done to implement the Burgess suggestion. But what is of interest in both of these resolutions is that they reflect a new phenomenon in the English scene: the flowering of the individualism which was incipient in the Puritan-Parliamentary revolt against

1. "Nothing is more destructive to the right performance of family duties," said Palmer, "than that one should go to one place and another to another." Mitchell, Minutes, p. 6.

crown and hierarchy, and which now rebelled against any form whatever of civil or ecclesiastical jurisdiction over personal opinion and choice in matters concerning religion. In this the people were ahead of the Assembly. The Puritan individualism of the Divines was tempered by their adherence to the concept of an all-embracing national Church in which individual liberty was subordinated to the doctrines and discipline of the body as a whole. The resolution cited, and the Directory rubric discouraging if not prohibiting, private meetings are an expression of this understanding of the Church.

The stricture against worshippers' "bowing themselves toward one place or other" is obviously intended as a repudiation of a gesture of obeisance toward the altar which had of late been advocated by the Laudian party (1) and which was regarded by the Puritans as a reversion to Roman Catholic superstition. This "bowing themselves" was a sensitive point with the Scots commissioners and with Baillie in particular who in his own parish had defended the ministerial practice of "bowing in the pulpit" against the radical innovating party which eschewed it. Baillie would

1. The gesture was commended though not absolutely enjoined by the 1640 Canons. Lathbury, Thos, A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, pp 252-3.

have liked to have kept separate the two issues: the innocent custom of "bowing in the pulpit" for prayer before commencing the service, from "the late consequent abuse of it by the Prelaticall party to bow to the east and the altar". And he insists that of the former, "there is nothing in the Directorie". He nevertheless admits that the two are related and reports the Scottish promise to yield up their custom. (1). The promise was made good by the General Assembly in its Act supplementary to that authorizing the Directory. It ruled that

the minister bowing in the pulpit, though a lawful custome of this Kirk, be hereafter laid aside, for satisfaction of the reverend Divines of the Synod of England, and for uniformity with that Kirk, so much endeared to us (2).

Doubtless it proved to be of satisfaction to many reverend divines in the northern Kirk as well (3).

Finally, there is the second last paragraph in this section of the Directory. It perhaps ought still to be included in the Church's service books.

It reads:

The Public Worship being begun, the people are wholly to attend upon it, forbearing to

1. Letters & Journals, II, pp 258-9.

2. Acts, p. 121.

3. Baillie admits that "our willingness to have that matter of debate removed from our Church" was one factor in making the Scots commissioners "more condescending in their (the English) desyre of our coming to them here". Letters & Journals II, p.259.

read any thing, except that the Minister is then reading or citing; and abstaining much more from all private whisperings, conferences, salutations, or doing reverence to any person present, or coming in; as also from all gazing, sleeping, and other indecent behaviour, which may disturb the Minister or people, or hinder themselves or others in the service of God.

What these things needed being said, at least in the Scottish Church, is suggested by the evidence compiled by Wm. McMillan regarding congregational department during the period preceding 1645. Chattering, "greetin' bairns", barking dogs, sleeping, squabbles and near riots were apparently not unusual(1). Over against this one must take cognizance of Alexander Henderson's description. He writes,

The publike worship beginneth with prayer, and reading of the Old and New Testament, which the people hear with attention and reverence....(2)

But Henderson's purpose was to present the Scottish ideal; his account describes the norm and not necessarily always the actual fact. Evidently there was need to reassert these admonitions in 1709, for in that year the General Assembly passed an Act in

1. McMillan, op. cit., pp 156 ff. W.D. Maxwell observes that it was the custom for beades to carry "a 'staff' or 'wand' not merely as a token of authority but for the very practical business of 'crubbing the bairns' and keeping order generally". A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. p.81.n.3.

2. Government and Order, p. 15.

similar terms to this paragraph in the Directory (1). Edgar remarks, "It may be held as a sign of the times that the Presbytery of Ayr caused this Act to be read from every pulpit within their bounds"(2). W.D. Maxwell asserts that "behaviour in church was far from decorous...till well into the eighteenth century." (3).

-
1. Acts, p. 432.
 2. Old Church Life in Scotland I, p. 111.
Later in the century, "Blacksmith" derides Presbyterian congregations for their irreverence in worship, Letter from a Blacksmith, p. 63.
 3. op. cit., p. 100, n.1; see also pp.161-2.

CHAPTER IXSummary and Evaluation.1. The Dependence of the Directory on the Reformed and Anglican Rites.(a) On the Genevan-Scottish Order.

It is obvious at a glance that the Directory falls in the Reformed tradition rather than the Anglican. That this should be so was inevitable: Both English Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians were the inheritors of Continental Reformed theology and uses. Consequently there is a similarity in emphasis and in spirit between the Calvinist-Knoxian service book and the Westminster Directory. Both are Word-centred and both excessively wordy. Both are more penitential than joyful, more didactic than devotional, more prosaic than poetic.

In more detail, the Directory follows the older Reformed order in the following major features: it contains no lectionary, though it gives a prominent place to scripture; preaching is central and indispensable; sin and judgment are the subjects of lengthy portions of the long prayers; extempore prayer is permitted; metrical rather than prose psalmody is enjoined; the Baptismal rite calls for public administration, requires parental consent, emphasizes the parental obligations, and permits no

extraneous ceremony; the same rite draws one of its prayers from the older order; the Communion order is vague as to the frequency of celebration, it requires that the Word of Institution be read to the congregation and that the bread be ceremonially broken; the Marriage service contains no ring ceremony; a burial service is prohibited.

In addition, the Directory incorporates certain usages which were a part of the unwritten Scottish tradition. Among these were the system of "course reading" of Scripture and the repudiation of the Apocrypha; the three-fold sermon structure; Baptism by ordained clergy only and the requirement of parental promises; the pre-Communion preparatory service, the inclusion of an Epiclesis and the Words of Delivery in the Lord's Supper, the sitting position at communicating, and a post-Communion address. Some of these were common to Scots and English Puritan usage, notably those relating to the use of scripture and to Baptism. Two Puritan usages, the "lecture" in conjunction with the scripture lesson and the "lining out" of the Psalm, also found acknowledgment, however guarded, in the Directory.

(b) On the Anglican Order.

While there is a radical difference in character between the Directory and the Book of

Common Prayer, the Westminster order nevertheless shows a certain liturgical dependence on the Anglican book. This is particularly obvious in the composition of the prayer materials where structural similarities appear. Structural likenesses are apparent, too, in the order for the Visitation of the Sick. The incorporation of the Words of Institution into the act of consecrating the Communion elements is a reminder of the Anglican prayer of Consecration. Verbal echoes of the Prayer Book are heard in the Baptismal rite. The Marriage service shares with that in the Prayer Book (and not with that in the Genevan order) the requirement of witnesses only, the joining of hands, the recitation of the vows and the declaration of marriage. (The charge to the persons being married is a close paraphrase of the charge in both parent orders). It would appear that while the Westminster Divines consciously set out to provide the national churches with a Reformed service book not unlike that which was compiled in Geneva and used in Scotland, they looked to the Anglican book, however reluctantly, for liturgical guidance in many details.

2. The Extent of the Directory's Influence

(a) The Fate of the Directory in England

Mention has been made of the fact that while the

Directory became the official standard of worship in Scotland, it was without honour in its own country. Consequently, our chief attention in measuring its influence has been given to the Scottish Church. But the failure of the service book to find acceptance in the English Church must be taken into brief account.

"The Parliamentary Directory", writes Horton Davies, "remained in use (in England) for sixteen years until the Restoration" (1), but this is a misleading generalization. The Directory was the legally established liturgy of the Church of England during the sixteen years between its appearance and the restoration of the monarchy. The relative stringency of the law establishing it is noted in Chapter I of this work. A subsequent ordinance, in August 1645, called for the imposition of fines and imprisonments for failure to adhere to the new book (2). And down to and including 1660 there were enactments endeavouring to enforce its use. (3).

But the Church, not to mention the nation as a whole, was in a state of chaos. Neither Anglicans

-
1. The Worship of the English Puritans, p. 142.
 2. Commons Journals IV, pp 218, 232, 251; Acts & Ordinances of the Interregnum I, pp. 755-7.
 3. Lords Journals VIII, p. 493; Acts and Ordinances I, pp. 925-7; II, pp 1459-62.

nor Independents were inclined to implement the new book. Of the months immediately after its establishment, the Puritan historian, Neal, writes,

In some parts of the country the church wardens could not procure a directory, and in others they despised it, and continued the old common-prayer-book; some would read no form, and others use one of their own. (1)

The Anglican historian, Lathbury, confirms Neal's account and offers an explanation:

In London the churches assumed the appearance of uniformity according to the directory; but in the country disorder was predominant. Had the new discipline been set up when episcopacy was abolished, its continuance would probably have been secured; but since that time so many sects had sprung up, and so many pulpits had become occupied by sectarian individuals, that presbyterians found it impossible to erect their platform (2).

Without a Presbyterian "platform", or system of judicial courts, the enforcement of Presbyterian worship was difficult in the extreme (3). The Prayer Book probably remained in use in many

1. History of the Puritans III, p. 145; cf. Hall, Reliquiae Liturgicae I, p. xxxviii.

2. A History of English Episcopacy from the Period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity, p. 173.

3. cf. above, page 267 where it is asserted that the Presbyterian clergy, while they possibly used the Directory in their normal Sunday service, would not, owing to the lack of disciplinary machinery, administer the Lord's Supper; hence, the Directory Communion order was probably rarely used.

quarters (1). Maxwell says of the Commonwealth period,

It is certain...that the Directory was not widely followed; and among those opposed to the Prayer Book, services appear to have conformed instead to a simplified Genevan pattern. (2).

At the Restoration (but before the Act of Uniformity) the picture was still a confused one. Robert Halley states that

the restored clergy brought with them their old prayer books....The Presbyterians generally observed the order of the Westminster Directory, although some of them made considerable use of the Book of Common Prayer (3).

One fact is abundantly clear: the Directory had not found general acceptance. "The Savoy Liturgy", remarks Leishman, "drawn up at the Restoration in the

1. In a letter to the English Parliament in February 1645/6 "the Committee of the Scots Parliament" complained that "their Kirk and Kingdom is...scandalized...that the Service-Book is still retained in some places in England under Parliament's power, and the Directory slighted". (Rushworth, Historical Collections V, p. 592). An interesting instance of use of the Prayer Book during the Commonwealth period is provided by the Anglican Divine, Robert Sanderson. He tells of how he used the BCP more or less openly until the "Presbyterian gang" protested and his living was threatened. He then temporized by a mere shifting of words and paragraphs which apparently was acceptable. Nowhere in his account does he as much as acknowledge the existence of the Directory. Nine Cases of Conscience Occasionally Determined, pp. 165-7.

2. The Book of Common Prayer and Non-Anglican Worship, pp. 12-13.

3. Lancashire: Its Puritanism and Non-Conformity, II, p. 136.

Presbyterian interest, is so free from traces of it that we can conclude that fifteen years' trial had failed to naturalize it."(1). Thereafter, the Act of Uniformity and the ultimate decline of English Presbyterianism, even after toleration was granted, rendered all Westminster documents obsolete (2). In the early nineteenth century the Directory "became the standard of worship...for the Presbyterian Church of England when a synod was formally organized...and was viewed with respect even by later Congregationalists"(3). But this was late in the day and such influence as it might have had was soon overshadowed by the modern liturgical revival.

(b) The Use of the Directory in Scotland

In Scottish worship "the tendency ever since Laud's Liturgy has been towards freedom from all directorial control"(4). The apparently negligible influence of the Directory on the Kirk's worship over the ensuing two centuries or more verifies the truth

1. In Story, (ed.) The Church of Scotland, Past and Present V, p. 388.

2. "Fifty years after these documents were drawn up, they were nothing more than mere landmarks of a great controversy, relics indicating where a great battle had been fought." Colligan, J.H., The Westminster Assembly and After, p. 13. Robert Kirk, speaking from his London experiences in 1689-90, says, "Not any two Presbyterians keep any one way" in their worship services. MacLean, D., London at Worship, p.18.

3. Maxwell, W.D., op. cit., p. 11.

4. Burton, J.H., The History of Scotland VI, p. 398.

of Burton's dictum. In the foregoing study, such tendencies and practices contrary to the Directory have been noted as the following: a neglect of systematic scripture reading and of the high homiletical standard set by the Directory; the loss of the Lord's Prayer; the deterioration in the Church's praise; the administration of private Baptism; the infrequent celebration of Communion; and the prevalence of house marriages. In addition there were the widespread use of the "lecture" or running commentary on the scripture lesson and the "lining out" of the Psalm, both of which practices are barely tolerated by the Directory. Among the many Scottish usages consistent with the Directory, most were customary in any case; few are attributable to the influence of the Directory. The disuse of the Creed and of godfathers in Baptism might be regarded as examples of the book's influence, but there is nothing to suggest that these changes would not have come about had the Directory never appeared.

On the whole it would seem that the service book's effect on the Kirk's worship was negligible. "The Directory was strictly enforced upon the Church," writes G.D. Henderson, "At the Synod of Moray in 1646 the various Presbyteries made report

that practically everyone was using it." (1) But rigid enforcement was not characteristic of the succeeding years of conflict, disruption and reimposed episcopacy. "Even your leaders quickly wearied of it," chides Bishop Burnet in 1669. (2) During the period of the Second Episcopacy neither conforming nor non-conforming ministers adhered to any particular service book: the hierarchy imposed no liturgy on the established Church, and the Covenanting conventicle congregations, in the nature of the case, observed only the simplest of usages. Henderson asserts that services generally followed "the lines laid down by John Knox and by the Westminster Directory" (3). Unlike the Confession of Faith, the Directory was not re-established by Parliament at the Revolutionary settlement of 1690 (4) "and the Church was left without a legal order of worship" (5). Nor did the first General Assembly after the Revolution as much as make mention of the Directory (6). In 1693 Parliament rather vaguely

1. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 7.

2. A Modest and Free Conference, p. 71.

3. op. cit., pp. 151-4; cf. McCrie., The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, pp. 228-31.

4. See McCrie, op. cit., pp. 244-5.

5. Sprott, G.W., The Worship & Offices of the Church of Scotland, p. 6.

6. "Legislative action was not necessary to restore what had never been lost," writes McCrie (op. cit., p. 248); but he refers rather to the traditional Scots mode of worship than to the Directory in particular.

ordered that

Uniformity of Worship and of the administration of all publick ordinances within this Church be observed...as the same are at present performed and allowed therein, or shall hereafter be declared by authority of the same (1)

And the General Assembly of the following year ordained that the "late conforming ministers" shall, on being received into the re-established Presbyterian Church, promise to "observe uniformity of worship, and of the administration of all public ordinances... as the same are at present performed and allowed"(2). In neither instance is any standard of uniformity named. The Directory did, however, receive recognition as an authority at subsequent Assemblies(3), though it was never re-established by either Church or State. Steuart of Pardovan obviously regarded the Directory as the standard of the Kirk's worship in his Collections and Observations (1709), but even he felt free to modify and abridge the book and to interpolate other materials (4). The service book is reprinted in a volume published in 1725 containing the documents "of Publick Authority in the Church of

-
1. McCrie, op. cit. p. 255.
 2. Acts, p. 239.
 3. As in 1694, 1704 and 1705. Acts, pp 238, 327, 387.
 4. His most radical alteration being in the Baptismal order.

Scotland" (1). It is noteworthy that in this reprint the Directory was not brought up to date -- the names of royalty in the state prayers remain as in the original edition -- suggesting that it was regarded as a very general standard only and not as a manual to be closely followed.

Little more is heard of the Directory until the mid-nineteenth century when the stirrings of the liturgical innovators appear to have driven the Church to look to its historic standard of worship. The General Assembly of the national Church in 1856 commended the Directory to its ministers. Robert Lee, in his radical liturgical innovations in the Kirk of the Greyfriars, Edinburgh, 1857, and following, appealed (whenever it was expedient) to the authority of the Directory and to the recent enactment of the Assembly, in defence of his innovations (2). The Basis of Union of the United Presbyterian Church acknowledged the Directory "as a compilation of excellent rules" according to the editors of

1. The Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directories, Form of Church Government, Discipline, &c. of Publick Authority in the Church of Scotland.

2. See Story, R.H., Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., I, pp. 333 ff. Not many of Dr. Lee's innovations could be defended on this basis. In reality, he had little patience with the Directory. "It was a failure at first," he writes in 1866, "and any effort to revive it would be equally a failure". The Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship, Doctrine and Government, p. 151.

Presbyterian Forms of Service (first edition, 1891) but they add, "undoubtedly this venerable document has long ago ceased to be used as a guide." And Robert Milne, three years earlier, confessed, on behalf of the Church of Scotland ministers, to the same indifference (1). Similarly, the compilers of the Free Church's unofficial New Directory for Public Worship contend that the 1645 Directory "deserves...much more careful study...than it often receives," though "it is indeed of full authority in the Church".

In their concern to bring about a renaissance in the public worship of the Scottish Churches the authors of these and other service books paid more heed to the Directory than was given in general practice. The Directory and the Knoxian Book of Common Order constituted the two major documents upon which they must draw in any attempt to revive the Scottish liturgical tradition, though they by no means confined themselves to these in their endeavours to enrich that tradition. Consequently, traces of

1. "Some ministers seem hardly to know of its existence, and others who know it seem persistently to ignore it" Directory & Guide to the Ministerial Office of the Church of Scotland, p viii. D.D. Bannerman lists the four major points at which Scottish practice controverted the Directory at the time of his writing, 1884; Private marriages, funeral services, the non-use of the Lord's Prayer, the absence of an opening prayer from the normal diet. The Worship of the Presbyterian Church, pp.41-3.

the Directory are discernible in their work, as has been noticed time and again in the foregoing study. If little was drawn from the prayer materials for the normal Sunday service, conscientious efforts were made to exploit the Directory where that book is at its best, in the orders for the sacraments. For the rule of public administration, the use of the words of institution and the parental promises, the modern editors looked to the Directory Baptismal order for their authority. Some made use of the prayer materials in this rite, as well. In the orders for the Lord's Supper many of the modern books follow the Directory in incorporating the Word of Institution into the act of consecration; and many, with the Directory as their explicitly named warrant, include an Epiclesis. The significant Communion Words belatedly found their way into modern use in the 1940 Book of Common Order. Further, the nineteenth and twentieth century service books find their Presbyterian authority in the Marriage order of the Directory for the ceremony of the joining of hands, and the declaration of marriage, and some paraphrase the Directory pre-marriage prayer. These constitute the salient contributions of the Westminster Directory to modern Scottish Presbyterian liturgies.

3. Biblical Authority and the Directory.

In their compilation of the Directory, the Westminster Divines claimed to have but one criterion: the absolute and exclusive authority of Holy Scripture.

The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture. (1).

D.H. Hislop has said of "the spirit of Puritanism" that it "seeks to escape from obedience to all liturgical order which seems to it a bondage, feels free only by repudiating as outworn what has been practised, finds its sincerity by discarding any position but its own"(2). This may indeed be true of a degenerate or irresponsible "Puritanism", but it does not describe the Westminster Divines. Their object was not "escape from all liturgical order" except in so far as they regarded the traditional liturgical order as being without biblical warrant. Their liturgical authority was the Bible; and so far were they from seeking to escape from this that they would tolerate little that had not its explicit

-
1. The Confession of Faith, XXI, i.
 2. Our Heritage in Public Worship, p. 196.

sanction. Worship, indeed all faith and order, must be submitted to this authority. At the heart of the Puritan controversy with Anglicanism was the question of authority however much other factors might have stimulated the conflict and blurred the issue. The Divines saw their task as that of completing in England a Reformation as yet incomplete. As their fathers had repudiated Rome because it had usurped the infallible and exclusive authority of the Bible, so now must they eradicate such unbiblical vestiges of Rome as had survived an imperfect Reformation. Their rule was not iconoclasm for its own sake, but absolute obedience to the Word of God. Their protest was against a continued usurpation of biblical authority which they believed they saw in Anglicanism. William Ames spoke the Puritan mind in 1642 when he asserted that the Church "is ordained by God and Christ onely" and

men have neither powers of themselves to institute, or frame a Church unto Christ, neither have they by the revealed will of God any such power committed to them: their greatest honour is that they are servants in the house of God.

It is not therefore in the power of man either to take away any of those things which Christ hath granted to his Church, or to ad other of them of the like kind. (1)

The precept of obedience clearly applied to

1. The Marrow of Sacred Divinity, p. 142.

worship as much as to any other facet of the Church's life and thought. And at this point the Puritans were at one with Calvin who saw "contrived" modes of worship, no matter how nobly motivated, as doing dishonour to God.

If we desire...that he should approve of the honour which we confer upon him we ought always to consider what he requiresObedience is the foundation of true worship....God is never worshipped aright but when we receive him as he presents himself to us.(1)

And God presents himself to us in the Bible and nowhere else. Obedience, therefore, means obedience to scripture and to nothing else. The Church's authority is contingent upon the authority of the Word; she has no authority in or of herself; she can authorize nothing that is not authorized by the Word; her office is that of obedient servant. The fruits of her disobedience are blasphemy, error and superstition.

To the Divines the Prayer Book was vitiated by the fruits of disobedience. Too much of its content was either contrary or extraneous to the revealed will of God. It was an irrelevant argument that

1. Commentary on the Gospel According to John I, p. 234. The context is Calvin's exposition of John 6:15 wherein is told how the crowd sought to make Christ king by force. "They who venture to offer God honours invented by themselves are chargeable with using some sort of force or violence toward him."

contended that the book's intention was the provision of the richest possible medium for the Church's devotion. Such, too, was the intent of the Missal! "That which hath been a seed of a greate deale of superstition," remarked Philip Nye in the Assembly, "hath been devotion and a desire to helpe devotion"(1). Hence, "we have...resolved to lay aside the former Liturgy, with the many rites and ceremonies formerly used in the worship of God...."(2). The obverse side of the coin of obedience to the Word was iconoclasm: the destruction of the contrivances of men.

If the principle of obedience to the "perfect rule of faith and manners" was the chief guide in the composition of the Directory, it was not without its problems. Not all things necessary were found to be in Holy Scripture. The Church "may and ought by all lawful means...provide that these things which Christ hath ordained may be furthered and confirmed", wrote Ames, qualifying his above quoted statement (3). The Divines did not always agree as to precisely what was sanctioned by the Word, and were far less unanimous as to what additional things were necessary

-
1. MS Minutes II, p. 212.
 2. The Preface to the Directory
 3. op. cit., p. 142.

that the Word might be obeyed. The rubrical ambiguities in the Communion order reflect the disagreements. A notable example of almost complete departure from scriptural authority is the Marriage order. In this instance, the Bible simply did not provide "rubrical instructions", or, for that matter, any explicit authority to the Church to solemnize marriage. The dependence of the Directory upon the "traditions of men" at this point was observed and illustrated in Chapter VII.

To the modern mind, many of the scruples, not to mention wrangles, of the Divines as to what had or had not scriptural sanction appear almost irrelevant. The view of the Bible taken by the seventeenth century Puritans must now be considered unenlightened, if not superstitious. There can now no longer be drawn so sharp a distinction between infallible, inspired biblical propositions and the fallible and presumably uninspired notions of men. In the light of modern understanding, the sixteenth and seventeenth century traditionalists -- the Lutherans and Anglicans for example -- appear to have taken the more enlightened approach to the problem of authority for worship usages in that they were less legalistic. A case in point is the Puritan and Scottish repudiation of the Christian Calendar

and the Anglican retention of a reasonably expurgated version of it. The former rejected it on the literalistic, legalistic grounds that it is not prescribed in the scriptures. Yet the Calendar, in a derivative sense, is thoroughly scriptural in its essential features: its primary purpose is to mark and commemorate the great events in redemption-history, the history of which the Bible is both witness and record. It might be offered in defence of the Reformed-Puritan divines that they were driven to their absolute literalism by the absolutism of their adversaries, that the absolute claims of the Roman Pope and the influence of Roman traditions could be countered only by a rigid adherence to the "paper pope", even though, as it now sometimes appears, this involved the pitting of one superstition against another. Yet it is difficult to avoid the judgment even allowing for the pre-critical view of scripture held by all parties in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that the Puritans of both kingdoms were unnecessarily legalistic in their approach to their authority and needlessly negative in their regard for traditional usages. D.H. Hislop observes that there is superstition in the fear of superstition and gives as an example the Directory prohibition against prayer at funerals lest prayer be thought

to be offered for the dead (1). While the spiritual progeny of the Westminster Divines do well to hold fast to the principle of Biblical authority, they may be grateful that they are not bound by the Divines' application of it, in the Directory or elsewhere.

If obedience to the Word was the primary rule in the composition of the Directory, the possibility of the unconscious operation of a second factor must be considered. This factor was the dynamic spirit of individualism which was abroad in the land and shaping the Puritan movement. With the Puritan assertion of the sole authority of scripture over doctrine and order, the authority of the Church even to interpret the biblical truth and to administer discipline in the name of biblical authority was undermined and men grew accustomed to the idea of individual interpretation and individual responsibility to the Word. Montague sees the distinction between Puritanism and Anglicanism in these terms. He writes,

Most of the differences between the two modes of religious thought sprang from the ultimate contrast between those who laid emphasis on the relation of the individual soul to God and those who laid emphasis

1. op. cit., p. 189.

on the conception of a Church through which God communicates His influence to the individual soul. (1).

This is to misunderstand the genius of Puritanism. Yet it is fairly evident that the end result of the English Puritan movement was religious individualism. Anglicanism was not without its individualistic tendencies -- it wanted a full sense of the corporate nature of the Church, as suggested in the discussion of the Communion in Chapter VI -- but where it was effective the Anglican Church at least bound individuals to itself as an institution and to its liturgy. With the overthrow of the institution and the Prayer Book, atomization followed: sectarianism bred further sectarianism and every man was free to choose his sect or start one himself.

But as suggested in Chapters II and VIII the Westminster Divines, committed to the reformation of the national Church of England, were not as far advanced as their fellow countrymen along the road to religious anarchy. Indeed their object was the erection of a new ecclesiastical system out of the anarchy which existed. The failure in England of their Presbyterian liturgy, polity and discipline is attributable to the fact that the Divines assumed a

1. The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Restoration, p. 129.

corporate Church in which individual liberty of opinion and behaviour are subordinated to the body as a whole and in which a man, to be responsible to God, must be responsible to the Church at large. Membership in Christ meant disciplined membership in the Body of Christ.

The leaven of individualism is perhaps discernible in certain features of the Directory: the latitude, even greater than that permitted by the Presbyterian Book of Common Order, given to the individual minister in the conduct of worship; the ambiguities of the Communion order which leave in question the method of distribution and thus jeopardize the corporateness of the Church at the heart of its sacramental life; and the removal of the Marriage service from the ordinary gathering of the congregation. But over against these signs is the very idea of a directory to establish uniformity. Puritanism, in its individualistic manifestations, could not seriously entertain the concept.

4. The Deficiencies of the Directory

Various deficiencies in this service book have been observed in the preceding chapters. It is, in most of its sections, exceedingly prolix and didactic. Hislop remarks of Calvinistic worship that "it is the service which most exclusively exhibits...the

descending movement in worship. God speaks and man responds."(1). And the God of Calvinism, it might be added, speaks through words -- reading, lecturing, exhorting, preaching. Virtually all other symbols, apart from the sacraments, by which the truth and grace of God might be communicated to the minds and souls of men are deprecated. Further, in the Calvinistic service, man's response is mainly through words, in the long prayers uttered on the people's behalf by the minister (though the place of metrical psalmody must not be overlooked). The Directory inherits this family characteristic. The net effect is a service in which the congregation is talked to and little else that is discernible to the senses happens. Even in the Communion, where the Word might speak through symbols more eloquent than words, and where the people are enabled to join outwardly in significant action, the service is marred by an excessive amount of instruction and exhortation. The role of the congregation in the worship prescribed by the Directory is largely passive. The people are the recipients of God's Word through many words; they are given opportunity to express their adoration, confession, thanksgivings and supplications only in the Psalms which are sparingly prescribed.

1. op. cit., p. 183.

The over-emphasis on the "descending movement" is revealed at certain other points. There are no responses in which the people might join; even the parental confession of faith is removed from the Baptismal rite; the money offering, which might have an almost sacramental value, "is to be ordered that no part of the public worship is thereby hindered"; a prayer of self-oblation is omitted from the Communion service.

The effectiveness of the services of the Directory is, in the main, too dependent upon the minister. This is a besetting deficiency of all Presbyterian and Puritan worship, a part of the price paid for freedom. A heavy burden is laid on the clergyman; and the reality of the people's worship is rendered precarious. By the Directory the clergyman is left only with "some help and furniture" and is admonished "to furnish his heart and tongue with further or other materials of Prayer and Exhortation". For their diet of worship the congregation is largely dependent upon the capacities, judgment, sensitivity and, indeed, the integrity of the officiating minister. Whether or not this defect is more than offset by the positive values in individual ministerial freedom is one of the persistent problems confronting the "non-liturgical

churches.

The excessively penitential character of the Directory has been observed. There is a lack of balance between the acknowledgement of human depravity and the righteousness of God's judgments on the one hand, and expressions of joy and thanksgiving in the grace of God in Christ and the sure remission of sins on the other. There is an apparent belief that forgiveness is conditional -- that it is contingent upon election or upon the sincerity of the worshipper's confession, or both. Therefore, the Divines could include in their service no outright declaration of absolution. They substituted for the Absolution in the Prayer Book services a prayer for the assurance of remission of sins (1). The Directory, like the Knoxian Book of Common Order, while pleading the merits of Christ in beseeching pardon, seems never to accept the fact of pardon, and the penitential note persists to the end.

Three lesser deficiencies might be noted.

1. In this they were following the FP/BCO tradition. Maxwell points out that while Calvin had used an Absolution in his Strasburg liturgy, 1545, he yielded to the demands of the Genevan Church when he returned to that city and gave it up. Thus the FP, the English version of his French Genevan liturgy, is without an Absolution. John Knox's Genevan Service Book, p. 97, n.4.

Communion for the sick, whether by private celebration or, preferably, by the "reservation" of the elements consecrated by the congregation's celebration, is wanting in the Directory. So also are rites for the burial of the dead. And the prohibition of the ring in marriage has been deemed a defect by modern Presbyterians.

5. Positive Values in the Directory

The Directory constitutes a repository of Reformed-Puritan principles of worship, many of which, though they need qualifying in the light of modern understanding and needs, are still of value and still in some manner applicable.

The first and most obvious is the principle of freedom from the shackles (as they may become) of a compulsory ritual. But this is not freedom for its own sake, which too easily leads to carelessness and irresponsibility. The Divines were concerned to be free from the "traditions of men" in order the better to be enslaved to the Word and the Holy Spirit. While the modern Reformed Church cannot take the Divines' "levitical" view of the Bible -- regarding the scriptures as an infallible source of absolute liturgical rules -- it must, nevertheless, if it is to be the Reformed Church, submit its customs and traditions to the living Word as it speaks ever anew through the Bible.

This means that a certain liturgical flexibility must be retained. The Church must neither allow itself to be fettered by a fixed liturgy nor to be so bound to its unwritten traditions of worship that it cannot submit them to the judgment of the Word or be led by the Word and Spirit into a modification of its patterns to meet modern needs. Blind enslavement to traditions, written or unwritten, is repugnant to the spirit of the Westminster Divines. The relative independence of the Directory from both the Anglican and the Genevan-Scottish liturgical traditions testifies to the desire of the Assembly to submit all afresh to the dictates of the Word as the Holy Spirit might lead them to understand it. Probably they were too independent of their traditions and thereby lost much that the Spirit would teach them through the long experience of the Church. Yet a pursuit of and rigid adherence to traditions for their own sake would have been, and is, a denial of the Word and Spirit; freedom from them enabled the Divines to take the Bible as their point of departure. Or better, their insistence on the supreme authority of the Bible was the key to their relative freedom from tradition and custom.

Not only does the Directory exhibit freedom from inherited usages in its composition, it permits

the maximum liberty to the individual minister to exercise the "gift of prayer". It was contended that this was as much a ministerial gift as that of preaching. If the inherent dangers in this policy are obvious, it is not to be repudiated. The Divines themselves were cognizant of the perils attendant upon purely extemporaneous utterances and advised the "serious and thorough premeditation" of prayers (1). But they were concerned that the gift of prayer be neither stinted nor stunted by liturgical form. Pastoral prayers by one who knows the condition of his flock, is sensitive to the temper of the times and is disciplined by the Word, are an invaluable aspect of the public worship of the Church and an essential feature of the Presbyterian inheritance.

Set over against the principle of freedom is that of uniformity. The object of the Westminster Assembly was to achieve a balance between freedom and uniformity of order within the Church. That it is a delicate balance is evident by the Assembly's failure to achieve it in practice. It is nevertheless a balance to be aspired to. If the imposition of a compulsory liturgy is unthinkable to the modern Presbyterian mind, unbridled freedom which would permit the individual minister to ignore "the mind

1. In the order for "Public Solemn Fasting".

of the Church with regard to its offices of worship"(1) is, or ought to be, equally unthinkable. The Directory was composed by the Divines and subsequently established by the General Assembly as a norm; so in our own day the Church has set forth a norm in its Book of Common Order. It is in the nature of things that neither service book could hope to meet with universal approval. But as the ministry ignored the Directory at great cost to the Church, so the ministry may ignore the present standard to the detriment of the public worship of the Church.

Another positive value reposed in the Directory is the central place it gives to the sermon and the high standard of preaching it demands. The Divines appear to have assumed that no act of worship is possible without the declaration of the Word in exhortation and preaching. The extremes to which they carried this have been observed, but excesses of application do not invalidate the principle. The principle recognizes the fact that Christianity emerged, the Church is nourished, the unchurched evangelized, and the truth of the gospel sustained, through the faithful preaching of the Word, and that where preaching has waned the Church has fallen into the ways of heresy, superstition and moral

1. The Prefaces to the BCO's of 1928 and 1940.

irresponsibility. The Directory therefore maintains that preaching ought always to accompany the sacraments and ordinances of the Church and that such preaching ought to be alike doctrinal and ethical, and above all, biblical. Such a principle is surely worthy of preservation.

The high place given to the systematic use of scripture in public worship is noteworthy. Whether it be by a system of "course reading", as commended in the Directory, or by the use of a lectionary, the principle is the same: the presentation of Holy Scripture in its fulness to the worshipping congregation. This has a counterbalancing effect to the inevitable limitations imposed on preaching by the individual minister's peculiar interests and insights.

The Directory rule regarding the public administration of Baptism reminds the Church that the sacrament is not a private or individual act, but the concern and the act of the whole congregation.

Finally, the Communion order commends itself for its theological and structural integrity and simplicity. It embodies a high doctrine of the sacrament and the doctrine is given clear liturgical expression, whatever the limitations of the order. For what it includes, it is worthy of study and

appropriation. Also commendable is the incorporation of the Communion into the very structure of the normal Sunday service, which not only binds it firmly to "the preaching service", but by implication reaffirms the two-fold norm of the Church's full diet of worship, that of the Word and the Sacrament.

Taking into account the limitations imposed on it by the political and ecclesiastical exigencies and excesses of the times and the peculiar biases and prejudices of its composers, the Directory for the Public Worship of God remains, to a remarkable degree, a guide book to the major historic principles of Reformed worship.

APPENDIX A

The Legal Establishment of the Directory
in England and Scotland

The Directory, or a major portion of it, first came before the houses of the English Parliament on 22nd November, 1644, and was given a first reading in the Commons. The minutes of the lower house for that date read in part:

The Consideration of the Preface was laid aside until the latter end. The particular paragraphs or chapters concerning the Assembling of the Congregation, and their behaviour in the publick worship of God; concerning publick Reading of Holy Scriptures; concerning publick Prayer before the Sermon; concerning the Administrazion of the Sacraments, and first, of Baptism; were all particularly read, clause by clause, and each particular title to each particular paragraph; and all particularly voted; and upon the Question passed. (Commons Journals III, p.702)

A reading of the Communion order was begun but difficulties were encountered almost immediately and the matter was postponed until 26th November when the houses appointed a committee to consult with the Assembly about the clause "concerning such as are to be admitted to the Communion". The house, further, deleted the clause "as in the Church of Scotland" from the rubric on the position of communicants "about" or "at" the table, and read the Preface "clause by clause", each of which "passed upon the Question". "Then the whole Directory, and Preface, were together passed upon the Question; and ordered to be sent unto the Lords for their concurrence." (ibid., p. 705) It was not, however, the "whole Directory".

The following day the upper house went into committee "to take into consideration the Directory". (Lords Journals VII, p. 116)

On 30th November in the Commons "An Ordinance for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for the establishing and putting in execution of the Directory for the Publick Worship of God" was given first and second readings and put into the hands of a committee for final wording. Said

committee was ordered further to "consider the particulars touching Marriage and Burial". The same day the committee to consult with the Divines regarding "such as are to be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" reported its opinion that the conditions laid down in that paragraph be deleted and the rubric stand simply as "the ignorant and the scandalous are not fit to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper". This was approved by the house. (Commons Journals III, pp. 709-10)

On 4th December the Assembly sent up its "Advice" anent the Marriage order and requested of the house some legislation prohibiting marriages against the will of either party. (*ibid.*, p. 713) On the 6th the Marriage order was accepted and referred to the Lords, and a committee was appointed to prepare something for the Directory enjoining the keeping of parish registers for marriages and burials and to draft the requested marriage legislation. (*ibid.*, pp. 715-6) Six days later the house "Resolved &c. that the Directory for Publick Worship be translated into Welsh tongue". (This came before the Assembly on 12th and 30th December; and finally on 4th March, 1644/5, a committee was set up "to think of fit men to be employed in the translating of the Directory into Welsh"; but the translation seems never to have been made. Mitchell, Minutes, pp. 19, 24, 67.) And the Commons requested the Assembly to send up something on burial, which was done the next day. (*ibid.*, p. 722) On 16th December the Assembly presented its order for the Visitation of the Sick which, with minor un-named amendments by the house, was accepted on 26th. (*ibid.*, III, p. 724, IV, p. 2) On the 27th the orders for Fasting, Thanksgivings and the section on the singing of Psalms were brought in and the next day, after some minor changes in the first, all three were passed and then the whole Directory (less Appendix) was passed, "ordered to be ingrossed in Parchment; and to be sent unto the Lords for their concurrence". (*ibid.* IV, p. 3). The Appendix followed the same course on 1st January, 1644/5.

The Lords' minutes, silent on the subject since the entry of 27th November, indicate only that the remainder of the Directory "concerning Fasting, and Holidays and Thanksgivings &c....was received by this House and read" on 1st January. The same day the house received from the Commons the establishing Ordinance. (Lords Journals VII, p. 119) The Ordinance, given two readings on the 2nd, was amended on the 3rd and sent back to the Commons for concurrence and

acceptance on the 4th. (ibid., pp. 120-8)

The Lords also on the 4th ordered the printing of the Directory. On the 6th the Commons referred the printing of both the Ordinance and the book to the Assembly (and at the same sitting ordered the execution of Archbishop Laud). (Commons Journals IV, p. 10). But all was not yet settled and on the 7th the Commons requested the suspension of printing pending consultation with the Scots commissioners. (Lords Journals VII, p. 128; there is no reference to this in the Commons Journals).

The document was sent to Scotland where on 3rd February, the General Assembly accepted it with certain stipulated reservations anent the Communion order (Acts, pp.115-6) and had the ratification of the Scots Parliament on the 6th (Tyler 1645 edition of Directory). The General Assembly communicated its approval (with the stated reservations) to the Assembly of Divines in a letter dated 13th February. (Acts, pp.131-2) On the 27th the Lords were informed of the Scottish approval of the Directory "without any alterations", ordered the Divines "to make a title to it" and "that it might be printed by the Assembly". (Lords Journals VII, p. 253)

But on 5th March "Mr. Tate reported" to the Commons "from the Assembly some few alterations desired by the Assembly of Scotland, to be made in the Directory for Publick Worship: The which were read; and carried to the Lords for their concurrence, by Mr. Tate". (Commons Journals IV, p. 70) On the same date the upper house received a message "to let their Lordships know that the House of Commons have received a Paper from the Assembly of Divines, wherein they offer some Alterations in the Directory to which the House of Commons have agreed, and their Lordships' concurrence is desired therein". The alterations as given in the minutes of the upper house (but not the Commons' minutes) prove to be the deletion of the Baptismal interrogatories and a minor change in the Marriage rite. The house agreed. (Lords Journals VII, p. 264).

The order for the printing of the Directory was passed in both houses on 13th March. (ibid., pp.272-3) Its printing is entered in the Stationers' Register under the date, 17th March, 1644/5 "by an order of both houses of Parliament...wherein Master Hen: Robrough and Master Andonira Bifeild the scribes of the Assembly of Divines, are authorized to cause to be printed The Directory and ordinance concerninge it, and by authoritie of the said Scribes under their

hands...." (A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708, I, p.159). Tyler (of Edinburgh) and John Field (see Appendix B) are two of the four names of printers and booksellers entered in the margin. The order for the Scottish printing was given on 27th May, 1645 by the Commission of the General Assembly and the clerk of the Commission accordingly appointed "Evan Tyler, his Majesties Printer to Print the Directory, with the Acts of Parliament and Assembly concerning the same". (Tyler 1645 edition of Directory).

The further ordinance passed by the English Parliament to enforce the use of the new service book received its first and second readings in the Commons on 27th June, 1645, and after some amendments by both houses became law on the 25th August. (Commons Journals IV, pp.187,218,232,251).

APPENDIX BA Supply of Prayer, Dating
and Authority

The publication of A Supply of Prayer is of particular interest because it gives in direct prayer form the prayer materials for the normal Sunday service in the Directory. Inasmuch as it claims to be "Published by Authority", it represents a remarkable reversal, within a few months' time, of "Authority's" stated beliefs and policy as laid down in the Directory. So radical a departure is it that A.F. Mitchell questions the book's authenticity as a government publication, suggesting that it "may have been a device of the enemy to burlesque" the work of the Assembly. The evidence for its authoritative publication is not entirely conclusive.

Its title page is as follows: "A Supply of Prayer for the Ships of this Kingdom That want Ministers to Pray with them: Agreeable To The Directory Established by Parliament. Published by Authority. London. Printed for John Field, and are to be sold at his house upon Addle-hill." After a brief preface (quoted in full in Chapter IV of this work) there follow twelve pages of prayers with rubrics preceding each. Apart from the three final prayers (a form of blessing and two prayers for use at sea) they constitute an almost verbatim reprinting of the prayer materials in the sections "Of Public Prayer before the Sermon" and "Of Prayer after the Sermon" in the Directory. In addition to the verbal changes necessary to turn the material into liturgical form there are a few minor alterations, additions and omissions. The only change worth noting is the omission of the prayers related to the sermon, since there is no preaching in the service prescribed, there being no minister. Modernized orthographically, A Supply of Prayer is reprinted in Leishman, T., The Westminster Directory, Appendix D, pp.172 ff.

Dating: The title page gives no date of publication. The date, May 16, 1645, is inscribed on the title page of one of the two copies in the British Museum. Its publication is entered in the Stationers' Register under the date 11th May, 1645. (A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708 AD., I, p. 169). Henry Hammond, the contemporary Anglican critic of the Directory, first makes mention of A Supply of

Prayer in an appendix to one of the 1646 editions of A View of the New Directory. He refers to it as "a book just now come to my hands". (p.79). It may then be safely dated 1645 or 1646. (H.G.Bohn puts it as late as 1650 in Lowndes, W.T., and Bohn, H.G., The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature VI, p. 1954).

Authority: There is less certainty as to the authorization of the book. Unlike the Directory it is not as much as mentioned in the journals of Parliament or the minutes of the Assembly of Divines. Nor is there any indication of its authorization in such other state records as Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1662 and the Calendar of State Papers for the period 1644-1647. Another factor which casts some doubt upon its authenticity is the failure of the Stationers' Register to indicate explicitly by what authority the book was being published. As noted in Appendix A, the parallel entry for the Directory names the Parliament as the authorizing agent.

On the other hand, Parliament exercised a strict censorship on printed works. By an Ordinance of June, 1643, no book or pamphlet could be printed without its prior entry in the Stationers' Register under the hand of a government-appointed licenser. (Acts & Ordinances I, p. 184-6). Among those appointed as licensers was one James Cranford (*ibid.*) under whose hand A Supply of Prayer is entered in the Register. The Directory of National Biography (Vol.V, p. 16) says he was "a zealous presbyterian" and Haller suggests that he was among the stricter of the government licensers. (Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, p. 140) It is doubtful if this man would license a service book designed to "burlesque" the work of the Westminster Assembly.

John Field, the bookseller, whose name appears on the title page of the book and in the margin of the entry in the Register later became printer to Oliver Cromwell. This suggests that he is not likely to have indulged in an anti-parliamentary ruse on behalf of "the enemy". It must be observed, however, that Field's integrity is questionable. One of many allegations against him was his altering of the text of the Bible for a price (after he had procured a copyright on the Scriptures by dubious means) in the interests of the Independents. (See Palmer, H.R., A Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers...from 1641 to 1667, p. 74; Timperley, C.H., A Dictionary of Printers and Printing, pp.520-1;

Herleian MS No.7580, British Museum). In all probability, Field was an opportunist, and his agency in the publication and distribution of the book in question can throw little light on the problem of its authority or lack of it.

It is worth reflecting that this was an age given to much less subtle forms of satire in print than A Supply of Prayer, if satire was in fact the intention of this book.

The evidence suggests that though this little service book probably lacked official sponsorship, it had Presbyterian origins and was designed to meet the particular need its title page names -- "for ships...that want ministers to pray with them". (The want of chaplains for the Navy had for some time been felt. The Lords urged the matter on the Assembly in April 1644 and the Lord Admiral approached the Divines on that occasion and again eleven month later. Lords Journals VI, p. 498; Mitchell, Minutes, pp.68,71. A Supply of Prayer appears to have been designed as a temporary substitute. Hammond suggests that not all the ships were at sea, except, perhaps in the figurative sense. "All such...Mariners in the ship of the Church are supplied also." A View of the New Directory, Works, I, p. 393).

It is noteworthy that Harford and Stevenson refer to this service book as the precedent for the "Forms of Prayer to be used as Sea" appended to the Prayer Book in the 1662 revision. (The Prayer Book Dictionary, p. 749).

BIBLIOGRAPHY1. Service Books(a) Title Pages of Early Editions of the Directory

First English Edition:

A Directory for the Publique Worship of God, Throughout The Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Together with an Ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer and For establishing and observing this present Directory throughout the Kingdoms of England, and Dominion of Wales. Die Jovis, 13 Martii 1644. Ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, That this Ordinance and Directory bee forthwith Printed and Published: Joh: Brown, Cleric. Parliamentorum. H. Elsinge, Cler. Parl. D. Com. London: Printed for Evan Tyler, Alexander Fifield, Ralph Smith, and John Field: And are to be sold at the Sign of the Bible in Cornhill, near the Royall-Exchange. 1644.

First Scottish Edition:

A Directory for the Publike Worship of God, Throughout the Three Kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland With an Act of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland for establishing and observing this present Directory. Together with an Act of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland approving and establishing the same: An Act of the Committee of Estates concerning the Printing thereof: And an Act of the Commission of the General Assembly for the Printing, and for the present practice of it throughout the said Kingdom of Scotland. Edinburgh: Printed by Evan Tyler, Printer to the King's most Excellent Majestie. 1645.

Two further English Editions:

A Directory for the Publique Worship of God Throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Together with....London, Printed by G.M. and I.F. for the Company of Stationers, 1645.

A Directory for the Publique Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland. Together with....London: Printed by G.M. and J.F. for the Company of Stationers. 1646.

French Edition:

Directoire pour le Service Public De Dieu par tous le trois Royaumes. D'Angleture Escosse et Irelande: Avec le Ordonnances du Parlement pour la Police Ecclesiesstique. Se vendent à Charenton, Par Louys Vendosme, demeurant à Paris rue neufve du Palais, an Sacrifice d'Abraham. M.DC.XLVI.

(b) Reprints of Early Reformed and Anglican Liturgies Referred to in this Work.

The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, &c. vsed in the Englishe Congregation at Geneva: and approued, by the famous and godly man, Iohn Caluyn. They haue forsken me, the well of the water of lyfe, and dygged theymselues pyttes, yea vyle and broken pyttes, that can hold no water. Iere 2. Imprinted at Geneva by Iohn Crespin, M.D.LVI.
Reprinted in Maxwell, W.D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556, pp.81 ff. (FP)

The Psalmes of David in Meeter with the Prose. Wherevnto is added Prayers commonly vsed in the Kirke, and private houses: with a perpetuall Kalendar and all the Changes of the Moone that shall happen for the space of xix. yeeres to comes. Duellie calculated to the Meridian of Edinbvrgh. Edinbvrgh, Printed by Andro Hart.1611. Cum Privilegio Regiae Majestatis.
Reprinted in Sprott, G.W., The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, pp. 1 ff. (BCO)

The Liturgy of John Knox. Received by the Church of Scotland in 1564. Glasgow University Press. Hamilton, Adams & Co., London, and Thomas D. Morison, Glasgow, 1886. (BCO)

A Booke of the Forme of common prayers, administration of the Sacraments: &c. agreeable to Gods Worde, and the use of the reformed Chvrches. The contents of this Booke, are contened in the page following. I Corinth. I. 11. No man can lay any other foundation, then that which is layed, euen Christ Iesus. At London; Printed by Robert Walde-grave. Reprinted in Hall, P, Fragmenta Liturgica, Vol. I., pp. 1 ff. (WALD)

A Booke of the Forme of common prayers, administration of the Sacraments, &c. agreeable to Gods worde, and the use of the reformed Churches. To this fourth edition is added the manner of ordination and admission of a Pastor to his charge, according to

the maner of the reformed Churches. The contents of this booke, are conteyned in the page following. Middlebvrgh, Imprinted by Richard Schidlers, Printer to the States of Zeeland. 1602. Cum Priuilegio.
Reprinted in Hall, P., Reliquiae Liturgicae, Vol. I, pp. 3 ff. (MIDD)

A Form of Service to be used in all the Parish Churches of Scotland upon the Sabbath Day by the Readers where there are any established, and where there are no Readers by the Ministers themselves before they go to Sermon.

Printed from MS in Sprott, G.W., Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, pp. 1 ff. ("Howatt's")

The Booke of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments with Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland as it was sett downe at first before the change thereof made by Ye Archb. of Canterburie and sent back to Scotland.

Printed from MS in Sprott, G.W., Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, pp. 25 ff. ("Cowper's")

The Book of Common Prayer, editions of 1549, 1552, 1559, 1604, 1637, (Scottish) and 1662, Reprinted in parallel in Keeling, Wm., Liturgiae Britannicae or Several Editions of The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, from its compilation to the last revision; together with the Liturgy set forth for the use of the Church of Scotland: arranged to shew their respective variations. Second Edition. William Pickering, J. Deighton, London and Cambridge, 1851. (BCP)

The Reformation of the Liturgy As it was Presented to the Right Reverend Bishops, by the Divines Appointed by His Majesties Commission to treat with them about the alteration of it. London, Printed, Anno Dom. MDCLXI.
Reprinted in Hall, P., Reliquiae Liturgicae, Vol IV, pp. 1 ff. (Baxter's "Savoy" Liturgy).

(c) Modern Scottish Presbyterian Service Books Referred to in this Work.

Prayers for Social and Family Worship, Prepared by A Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and Specially designed for the use of soldiers, sailors, colonists, sojourners in India, and other persons, at home or abroad, who are deprived of the ordinary service of the Christian ministry, also Prayers and Thanksgivings on

Particular Occasions. Published by authority of the Committee. Wm. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1860. (PS&F, 1860)

Prayers for Social and Family Worship, Prepared....
1890. (PS&F, 1890)

Services of Prayer for Social and Family Worship....
Printed by Order of the General Assembly, 1897
and Revised 1909. Wm. Blackwood and Sons,
Edinburgh and London, 1910. (PS&F, 1910)

Prayers for Public Worship with Extracts from the
Psalter, by Robert Lee, D.D., John Greenhill,
Edinburgh, 1857. (Lee'57)

Prayers for Social and Public Worship by Robert Lee,
D.D., Second Edition, Hamilton Adams & Co.,
London, John Menzies, Edinburgh, 1861. (A reprint
of the 1858 or Second edition) (Lee'58)

A Presbyterian Prayer-Book and Psalm Book or Aids to
Devotion in Public and Social Worship, by Robert
Lee, D.D., John Greenhill, Edinburgh, 1863. (Lee'63)

The Order of Public Worship and Administration of the
Sacraments as used in the Church of Greyfriars,
Edinburgh, by Robert Lee, D.D., Thomas and
Archibald Constable, 1873. (A reprint of 1864 or
Fourth edition) (Lee'64)

Euchologion or Book of Prayers; being Forms of
Worship issued by The Church Service Society,
William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London,
1867. (Euchologion, 1867)

Euchologion, A Book of Common Order being Forms of
Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and
other Ordinances of the Church, The Church Service
Society, Edited by G.W.Sprott, William Blackwood
and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1905. (Euchologion
1905).

Euchologion, A Book of Common Order....Ninth Edition,
Carefully Revised....1913. (Euchologion, 1913)

Euchologion, A Book of Common Order....Eleventh
Edition....1924. (Euchologion, 1924)

Presbyterian Forms of Service, issued by The
Devotional Service Association in connection with
the United Presbyterian Church, MacNiven and
Wallace, Edinburgh, 1894. (First edition, 1891)
(PFS)

A New Directory for the Public Worship of God,
 Founded on the Book of Common Order (1560-64) and
 the Westminster Directory (1643-45), and prepared
 by the "Public Worship Association in connection
 with the Free Church of Scotland", MacNiven and
 Wallace, Edinburgh, 1898. (NDPW)

Directory and Forms for Public Worship, Issued by
 The Church Worship Association of the United Free
 Church of Scotland, MacNiven and Wallace, 1909.
 (DPPW)

Prayers for Divine Service in Church and Home, By
 Authority of the General Assembly of the Church
 of Scotland, Issued by the Committee on Aids to
 Devotion, William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh
 and London, 1923. (PDS)

Book of Common Order, 1928, for use in Services and
 Offices of the Church, Oxford University Press,
 Humphrey Milford, London. (BCO, 1928)

Book of Common Order, of the Church of Scotland, by
 Authority of the General Assembly, New impression
 with new Lectionary, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford
 University Press, London, 1952. (First edition,
 1940) (BCO, 1940)

Prayers for the Christian Year, Second Edition,
 revised and enlarged, Prepared by the Committee
 on Public Worship and Aids to Devotion of the
 General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,
 Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press,
 London, 1952. (First edition, 1935)

An Order for the Visitation of the Sick for the use
of Ministers in Scotland and others, by James C.
 Lees, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London,
 1875.

2. Accounts of Proceedings of the Westminster
Assembly.

MS Minutes "Transcript made from the original in Dr.
 William's Library in Queen Square Feb.-July 1868
 by E.M. Thompson, Assistant, Dept. of MSS, British
 Museum". Vols, I, II, & III. In the General
 Assembly Library and Record Room of the Church of
 Scotland.

Baillie, Robert, The Letters and Journals of Robert
Baillie, edited by David Laing, Vols. I, II, & III.
 Robert Ogle, Edinburgh, 1841.

Gillespie, George, Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster. February 1644 to January 1645. Edited by David Meek. Orbert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1846.

Lightfoot, John, The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines from January 1, 1643, to December 31, 1644. and Letters to and From Dr. Lightfoot. Being Vol. XIII of The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D., edited by the Rev. John Rogers Pitman. London, 1824.

Mitchell, Alex. F., and Struthers, John, Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1644-49, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1874. Being a printed version of Vol. III of MS Minutes.

3. Official Records and Documents: Civil and Ecclesiastical.

Calderwood, David (ed), The First and Second Books of Discipline, Together with some Acts of the Generall Assemblies clearing and confirming the same: And an Act of Parliament. 1621.

The Confession of Faith, Catechism, Directories, Form of Church-Government, Discipline &c. of Publick Authority in the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1725.

Act, Declaration and Testimony for Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland... by some Ministers associated together for the Exercise of Church Government and Discipline in Presbyterial Capacity. (First Session Church) Edinburgh, 1737.

Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842, Reprinted from the original edition under the superintendence of the Church Law Society. Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Company, Edinburgh, 1843.

Peterkin, Alex., (ed) The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland wherein the Headis and Conclusionis devysit be the Ministers & Commissionaris of the Perticular Kirk thereof, are specially expressed and contained. Edinburgh Printing & Publishing Co., Edinburgh, 1839.

Peterkin, Alex., (ed) Records of the Kirk of Scotland containing Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies from the year 1638 downwards...with notes and historical illustrations. Peter Brown, Edinburgh, 1843.

Journals of the House of Lords, Vol. VII in the Scottish National Library.

Journals of the House of Commons, Vols III & IV (in the Scottish National Library)

Firth, C.H. and Rait, R.S., (eds), Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660, H.M.S.O., London, 1911.

Hamilton, Wm., D. (ed), Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1644 to 1645 and 1645 to 1647, H.M.S.O., London, 1890 and 1891.

A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708 A.D., London, 1913, Vol. I.

4. Other Primary Documents

(Anon.) A Dirge for the Directory, written by one of King James ancient Protestants, Oxford, Printed by Lenard Lichfield, Printer to the University of Oxford.

(Anon.) A Letter from a Blacksmith to the Ministers and Elders of the Church of Scotland, (second edition), J. Coote, London, 1761. (First edition, 1758) Attributed to John Witherspoon, D.D.

(Anon.) Strange News from Scotland, or, Scotch Presbyterian Piety Evidently Prov'd by the Regard they shew to Consecrated Churches, the Bodies of the Dead &c. London, 1712.

Ames, Wm., A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies in God's Worship or A Triplication unto D. Burgesse his rejoinder for D. Morton, 1633.

Ames, Wm., The Marrow of Sacred Divinity, Published by order from the Honorable House of Commons, London, 1642.

Baillie, Robert, A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time, Wherein the Tenets of the principall Sects, especially of the Independents are drawn together.... Published by Authority, London, 1646.

Ball, John, A Friendly Triall of the Grounds Tending to Separation, Printed by Roger Daniel, printer to the University of Cambridge, 1640.

Burnet, Gilbert, A Modest and Free Conference betwixt A Conformist and a Non-conformist about the present distempers in Scotland, 1669.

Calvin, John, A Treatise on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, John Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1838.

Calvin, John, Commentary on the Gospel According to John, Vol. I, (Tr., Wm. Pringle), the Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, 1847.

Cartwright, Thos., A Directory of Church Government, reprinted in Neal, D., History of the Puritans, Vol. V, Appendix iv.

Geree, John, Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae or Ten cases resolved which discover that though there bee need of Reformation in, yet not Separation from the Churches of Christ in England. Printed by Richard Cotes for Ralph Smith, London, 1644.

Gillespie, George, A Dispute Against the English-Popish Ceremonies Obtruded upon the Church of Scotland, 1637.

Hammond, Henry, A View of the New Directory and A Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy of England: in Answer to the Reasons pretended in the Ordinance and Preface, for the abolishing of the one, and establishing the other. Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, Oxford, 1645. Also edition of 1646 and reprint in Works, Vol. I., London, 1784.

Henderson, Alex., The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland, Printed for Jas. Byron, 1641.

Kilburne, Wm., MS Treatise concerning John Field, Harleian MSS, No. 7580, British Museum.

King, William, A Discourse Concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God, Printed for William Keblewhite, London, 1697.

Sanderson, Robert, Nine Cases of Conscience Occasionally Determined, Printed for H. Browne, J. Wright and C. Wilkinson, London, 1678. (Written originally during the Interregnum).

Steuart, Walter (of Pardovan), Collections and Observations Methodized Concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland, Heirs and Successors of Andrew Anderson, Edinburgh, 1707.

The Second Tome of Homilies of such matters as were promised and entitled in the former part of Homilies. Set out by the authority of the Late Queenes Majesty: and to bee read in every Parish Church agreeably. Printed by John Norton, and Richard Whitaker. 1633.

5. Studies in Liturgies and the History of Worship

Baird, Chas. W., Eutaxia or the Presbyterian Liturgies, M.W.Dodd, New York, 1855.

Bannerman, D.D., The Worship of the Presbyterian Church with special reference to the Questions of Liturgies, Andrew Elliot, Edinburgh, 1884.

Begg, James, Purity of Worship in the Presbyterian Church as set forth in the Westminster Standards, Lyon and Gemmell, Edinburgh, 1876.

Bonar, Andrew R., Presbyterian Liturgies with specimens of forms of Prayer for Worship as used in the Continental Reformed, and American Churches. Myles MacPhail, Edinburgh, 1858.

Clarke, W.K.L. and Harris Chas., (eds.) Liturgy and Worship, A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion, S.P.C.K., London, 1954.

Crichton, A. Maitland Makgill, Spots on the Sun or Thoughts for Presbyterians on some Important Points of Presbyterian Church Polity, Thos., C. Jack, Edinburgh, 1857.

Davies, Horton, The Worship of the English Puritans, Dacre Press, London, 1948.

Donaldson, Gordon, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, University Press, Edinburgh, 1954.

Dunkerley, R., (ed.) The Ministry and the Sacraments, Report of the Theological Commission Appointed by the Continuation Committee of the Faith and Order Movement, S.C.M. Press, London, 1937.

Duchesne, L., Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution, A Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the Time of Charlemagne, S.P.C.K., London, 1904.

- Frere, W.H., The Principles of Religious Ceremonial,
A.R.Mowbray & Co., London, 1928.
- Hall, Peter, Reliquae Liturgicae, Documents
Connected with the Liturgy of the Church of
England, Vol. I (General Introduction), Binns
and Goodwin, Bath, 1847.
- Hall, Peter, Fragmenta Liturgica, Documents
Illustrative of the Liturgy of the Church of
England, Vol. I. (General Introduction), Binns
and Goodwin, Bath, 1848.
- Harford, G., and Stevenson, M., The Prayer Book
Dictionary, Isaac Pitman and Sons, Bath, 1925.
- Hislop, D.H., Our Heritage in Public Worship, The
Kerr Lectures, T. & T., Clark, Edinburgh, 1935.
- Lee, Robert, The Reform of the Church of Scotland
Doctrine and Government, Part I, Worship,
Edmonston & Douglas, Edinburgh, 1866.
- Leishman, Thos., The Westminster Directory, edited
with an Introduction and Notes, Church Service
Society, William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and
London, 1901.
- Leishman, Thos., "The Ritual of the Church" in Story,
R.H., (ed.) The Church of Scotland, Past and
Present, Wm. MacKenzie, London, Vol. V.
- Lorimer, James, A National Church Demands a National
Liturgy, James Thin, Edinburgh, 1879.
- Maxwell, William D., A History of Worship in the
Church of Scotland, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford
University Press, London, 1955.
- Maxwell, Wm. D., An Outline of Christian Worship,
Its Developments and Forms, Geoffrey Cumberlege,
Oxford University Press, London, 1955.
- Maxwell, Wm. D., John Knox's Genevan Service Book,
1556, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London,
1931.
- Maxwell, Wm. D., The Book of Common Prayer and the
Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches, Geoffrey
Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London, 1950.
- Manning, Bernard L., The Hymns of Wesley and Watts,
Epworth Press, London, 1942.

- Maclean, Donald, London at Worship, The Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Manchester.
- McCrie, Chas. G., The Public Worship of Prebyterian Scotland, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1892. s/
- McMillan, Wm., The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, James Clark & Co., London, 1931.
- Milne, Robert, Directory and Guide to the Ministerial Office of the Church of Scotland, James Gemmell, Edinburgh, 1888.
- Patrick, Miller, Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London, 1949.
- Proctor, F., and Frere, W.H., A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices, MacMillan & Co., London, 1955.
- Shields, Chas., W., Liturgica Expurgata or the Prayer Book as amended by the Westminster Divines, A.D.F. Randolph, New York, 1864. k/
- Sprott, Geo. W., Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, Church Service Society, William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1901.
- Sprott, Geo. W., The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, Commonly known as John Knox's Liturgy, with Historical Introduction and Illustrative Notes, Church Service Society, William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1901.
- Sprott, Geo. W., The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1882.
- Sprott, Geo. W., The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1863.
6. Ecclesiastical and General History and Biography
- Briggs, Martin S., Puritan Architecture and Its Future, Lutterworth Press, London, 1946.
- Burton, J.H., The History of Scotland (A New Edition, Revised) Vol. VI, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

- Brown, P.Hume, History of Scotland to the Present Time, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Carruthers, S.W., The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly, The Presbyterian Historical Society (of America) and the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Colligan, J.H., The Westminster Assembly-and After. The Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Manchester.
- Cunningham, John, The Church History of Scotland, Vol. II, Aden and Chas, Black, Edinburgh, 1859.
- Davies, Godfrey, The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660 (The Oxford History of England Series), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1937.
- Dickinson, W.C., and Donaldson, G., A Source Book of Scottish History, Vol. III, Thomas Nelson & Sons, London, Edinburgh &c., 1954.
- Edgar, Andrew, Old Church Life in Scotland: Lectures on Kirk-Session and Presbytery Records, Alexander Gardner, Paisley and London, 1885.
- Edgar, Andrew, Old Church Life in Scotland: Lectures on Kirk-Session and Presbytery Records (Second Series), Alexander Gardner, Paisley and London, 1886.
- Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625), MacMillan & Co., London, 1904.
- Grub, Geo., An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Vols. II & III, Edmonston & Douglas, Edinburgh, 1861.
- Haller, Wm., Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, Columbia University Press, New York, 1955.
- Halley, Robert, Lancashire: Its Puritanism and Non-conformity, Vol. III, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1869.
- Hay, George, The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches, 1560-1843, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1957.

- Henderson, G.D., Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Henderson, G.D., The Church of Scotland, A Short History, Church of Scotland Youth Committee, Edinburgh, 1939.
- Henson, H.H., Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century, John Murray, London, 1903.
- Hetherington, W.M., History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (5th edition, ed., Williamson, R.), James Gemmell, Edinburgh 1890.
- Hole, Chas., A Manual of English Church History, Longmans, Green, London, 1910.
- Hutton, Wm. H., The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714), MacMillan Co., London, 1903.
- Lang, Andrew, A History of Scotland, Vols. II & III, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1907.
- Lathbury, Thos., A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the earliest period to the year 1742. J. Leslie, London, 1853.
- Lathbury, Thos., A History of the English Episcopacy from the Period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity, John W. Parker, London, 1836.
- Mackintosh, John, The History of Civilization in Scotland, Vols. II & III, Alexander Gardner, Paisley and London, 1893.
- Mitchell, Alex. F., The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards, (Baird Lectures, 1882), John Nisbet, London, 1883.
- Montague, F.C., This History of England from the Accession of James I to the Restoration (1603-1660), Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1907.
- Neal, Daniel, The History of the Puritans or Protestant Non-Conformists (ed. Foulmin, J.), Vols. III, IV, V, London, 1797.
- Orr, R.L., Alexander Henderson, Churchman and Statesman, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1919.

The ?

Scholes, P.A., The Puritans and Music in England and New England, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London, 1934.

Shaw, Wm.A., A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth 1640-1660, Vols. I & II, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1900.

Story, R.H., Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., Vols. I & II, Hurst and Blackett, London, 1870.

7. Articles

Cooper, James (ed.) "Disquisition by the Rev. John Anderson" in Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, Vol. I (1903-6)

Lamb, John, A., "The Kalendar of the Book of Common Order: 1564-1644", in Records of the Scottish Church History Society, Vol. XII, Part I, 1954.

Lamb, John A., "Examinations of Innovations" in Records of the Scottish Church History Society, Vol. XI, Part I, 1951. 21

8. General Reference

Cross, F.L., (ed.) The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Oxford University Press, London, 1957.

Greg, W.W., Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1956.

Hazlett, W.C., Bibliographical Collection⁵ and Notes on Early English Literature 1474-1700, Bernhard Quartich, London, 1887. 5/

Lowndes, W.T. and Bohn, H.G., The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature, Vol. VI, Bohn, London, 1864.

Plomer, H.R., A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667, Bibliographical Society, Blades, East and Blades, London, 1907.

Rushworth, Historical Collections, Vol. V, (Jan. 1642-Apr. 1646), London, 1708.

Stephen, L. and Lee, S., Dictionary of National Biography, Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1905.

Timperley, C.H., A Dictionary of Printers and Printing, H. Johnson, London, 1839.