

**AN ORDER FOR MATINS AND EVENSONG  
AND THE CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY  
COMMUNION COMMONLY CALLED THE  
MASS CHIEFLY AFTER THE FIRST PRAYER  
BOOK OF KING EDWARD THE SIXTH**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649447121

An Order for Matins and Evensong and the Celebration of the Holy Communion Commonly Called the Mass Chiefly After the First Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth by Charles Walker

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**CHARLES WALKER**

**AN ORDER FOR MATINS AND EVENSONG  
AND THE CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY  
COMMUNION COMMONLY CALLED THE  
MASS CHIEFLY AFTER THE FIRST PRAYER  
BOOK OF KING EDWARD THE SIXTH**



AN ORDER FOR  
MATINS AND EVENSONG

AND THE  
CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION  
COMMONLY CALLED THE MASS

CHIEFLY AFTER THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK  
OF KING EDWARD THE SIXTH.

TOGETHER WITH A BRIEF CEREMONIAL

COMPILED AND ARRANGED

BY

CHARLES WALKER

*Author of the "Ritual Reason Why," "Liturgy of  
the Church of Sarum," etc., etc.*

LONDON  
BASIL MONTAGU PICKERING  
196 PICCADILLY  
1877.

138. i. 421.

TO THE  
BISHOPS  
IN VISIBLE COMMUNION WITH  
THE SEE OF CANTERBURY  
WHO DO NOT SIT UNDER  
THE UPAS TREE OF  
THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY;  
AND TO  
THE CLERGY OF THE LOWER HOUSE  
OF CONVOCATION  
THIS  
TENTATIVE ESSAY  
TOWARDS  
*A Modus Vivendi*

FOR THOSE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND  
WHO, DISCARDING THE TRADITIONS OF THE LAST THREE  
CENTURIES, ACCEPT *ex animo* HER APPEAL  
TO PRIMITIVE CATHOLICITY,  
IS MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.



## PREFACE.

THE following compilation is the result of a conviction, long cherished and profound, that the only adequate settlement of the controversy which is now raging on the question of Ceremonial in the Church of England, will be found in the Legalization of the Liturgy of 1549 (or some modification of it) with the limits of allowable Ritual clearly laid down. So, and so only (as it seems to me), will congregations have Christian liberty of worshipping God with more or less of Ceremonial circumstance according to their spiritual needs, and the evils which cannot but ensue from continued litigation, and the promulgation of "judgments" at once one-sided, contradictory, and inadequate, be averted.

I put forth this view some years ago;\* and the subsequent course of events has convinced me more and more of its soundness. Indeed, nothing but the intensity of the conviction could justify me in coming forth before the world as in any sense—however humbly—the compiler of a Liturgy. I am thankful to say that nothing in the following pages is my own, but the adaptation and arrangement of well-known and authoritative materials.

A few words will be desirable (1) as to the *intention* of the present compilation; (2) as to its *advantages* (*me judice*); and (3) as to the *principles* upon which it has been arranged.

\* In a pamphlet entitled "Pax Super Israel," published by Mr. Palmer, and now out of print.



First, then, as to its *intention*. I need not state that I give it merely as a sample or model of such an Alternative Use. If the Church of England saw fit to put forth a detailed *maximum* of allowable ceremonial as well as a recognised *minimum*, those who would avail themselves of it ought certainly to be consulted as to matters of detail whether by their acknowledged leaders or by a committee of "experts." There are many individual points (indifferent in themselves) upon which opinions and tastes vary; but upon which by mutual consultation a "Consensus" might be obtained. Again, much that is here given might be retrenched, modified, or possibly added to, by a Ritual Committee of Convocation. I repeat, then, that if I seem to dogmatise, it is only for convenience' sake, and the better to obtain a hearing. I simply wish to be understood as saying, 'Here is the kind of thing "Ritualists" would be perfectly satisfied with as a *permissive* use. Take it and modify it as much as you will in detail; but give it us in principle.'

Nor is what I here plead for in any sense a new Prayer-Book. It is in no way an attempt to bring in Liturgical Revision by a side-wind, or to obtain a legal footing for things at present illegal. "Bind us down" (I would be understood as saying) "as tightly as you please to use the present Book of Common Prayer with a statutable *minimum* of Ceremonial when there are a reasonable number of *bona fide* parishioners so desiring: but give us liberty to use the *maximum* for additional services, and in churches built for our own people and with our own money." On this head half an ounce of statesmanship would save the Church and possibly the Establishment also. But the half-ounce has as yet been conspicuous only for its absence.\*

\* The real way to get rid of "Aggrieved Parishioners," of whom there are Catholics as well as Protestants—"High" no less than "Low" Church—is to secure freedom of worship (which does not mean anarchy) within as well as outside the Established Church. Free-trade is a sound principle in religion as well as

Again : what is sought is not the legalizing of now illegal rites, but (for peace' sake) a fuller declaration of what is at present enjoined, and its relegation from the category of *præcepta* to that of *permissa*. It is a waiving of rights to secure liberty, but the liberty asked for is freely conceded to others. The Rubric says "SHALL be used" : and by the aid of State Courts any three men of straw backed by an irresponsible association can say "shall NOT" : we would say "MAY be used" : and put it beyond the power of any to say "may NOT." True it is that individual points of ceremonial are here introduced which are not compatible with the letter of our present Rubrics : but these are, for the sake of bringing out in greater fulness, recognised principles. For example, there is nothing involved in the omission of the Gloria Patri on the three days before Easter that is not involved in *germ* in calling one Lord's Day a Sunday in Lent and another a Sunday after Easter. The principle in each is the recognition of ecclesiastical seasons. So, too, the Reservation of the Eucharist for Communion of the Sick and others out of Mass, is a logical outcome of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and has so been regarded by the Church from the first ages. Permitted by the Liturgy of 1549, it has since fallen into disuse (save in the Scotch

in commerce. So long as there are parties in the Church, and by consequence in the parish, it is absurd to make all men worship after one type, and that the (often arbitrary) type of the individual who happens to be the Parish Priest. The parochial system must be modified or it will stifle all life out of the Church. All that is here pleaded for is license for Catholics to minister to their own people. But Catholics in "Low Church" parishes (and Evangelicals in "High Church" ones) ought to be able to build or maintain private or subsidiary chapels irrespective of the parochial system ; and for purposes of litigation Parishioners ought to be Churchmen, and to have a legitimate grievance. Dissenting Churchwardens, and aggrieved parishioners who never went near their parish church till egged on to do so, *ab extra*, for the purpose of litigation are a disgrace to a civilized country professing to administer *justice* !

Church), and this doubtless by the wise permission of Almighty God. Now that clergy are few and the population large, while the spirit of devotion has revived amongst us, there is a twofold reason for its restoration. Utilitarianism and piety alike demand it.

II. And secondly, as to the *advantages* of an Alternative Use such as this. I have already adverted to one of these—the stopping of wearisome and fruitless litigation and the securing of liberty to congregations to agree (within recognised limits) to differ in their external acts of Divine Worship. But there are others. It may sound paradoxical to number among these the securing of uniformity. But would not such be the result? The Church of England at the Reformation expressed her wish to change the varying Uses (she enumerates five) for “but one use” throughout “all the whole Realm.” In effect she changed them for five hundred. She may, therefore, be well content to fall back upon *two*. The State has recently recognised this principle by so far relaxing the Acts of Uniformity as to permit the use of two distinct Lectionaries side by side; the use upon week-days of the full or of a shortened service at discretion: and the employment of special Psalms when enjoined or permitted by the Ordinary. As regards the *text* of the present book, surely there is no greater divergence between it and our present Liturgy than exists between, say, a full Evensong with the Psalms of the day and the Lessons according to the Old Lectionary,\* and an abbreviated form of the same with special Psalms

\* Beyond a few suggestions elsewhere, I have not ventured to meddle with so wide a subject as the Lectionary in these pages: nor shall I enter upon the battle of the old and new Lectionaries in this foot-note. Neither is perfect: perhaps the worst fault of the new is its State origin and authority and its treatment of the Apocrypha, which the Article tells us “the Church reads,” but which the Lectionary does not let the Church read, with the exception of two books and one chapter of a third. Were the Liturgy of 1549 restored, could not a new arrangement of Lessons be devised according to seasons, *i.e.*, each week’s Lesson to be indicated after the Sunday, and the day of the month arrangement altogether abandoned?