

**FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE. THE
SUBSTANCE OF THE ARGUMENT
DELIVERED BEFORE THE JUDICIAL
COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY
COUNCIL**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649585540

Folkestone Ritual Case. The Substance of the Argument Delivered before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by Archibald John Stephens

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

ARCHIBALD JOHN STEPHENS

**FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE. THE
SUBSTANCE OF THE ARGUMENT
DELIVERED BEFORE THE JUDICIAL
COMMITTEE OF
THE PRIVY COUNCIL**

FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE.

THE SUBSTANCE OF

THE ARGUMENT

BELIVERED BEFORE

THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

BY

ARCHIBALD JOHN STEPHENS, LL.D.,

ONE OF HER MAJESTY'S COUNSEL,

ON BEHALF OF

THE RESPONDENTS,

IN

RIDSDALE *v.* CLIFTON AND OTHERS,

ON THE

27TH, 29TH, AND 30TH JANUARY, 1877.



HENRY S. KING & Co., LONDON.

1877.



*MEMORANDUM.—The following pages are
reprinted from a Publication intituled
"FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE,"
published by Henry S. King & Co.,
London, 1877.*

SYNOPSIS OF ARGUMENT.

	PAGE
THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, a complete Guide in Ritual ...	1
THE CHARACTER OF THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1549	2
It prescribed eight ornaments of the Minister, two of which are not in question	3
The Ornaments Sacrificial and non-Sacrificial	4
Chasuble, Alb, and Tunicle, Sacrificial	4
Surplice, Cope, and Hood, non-Sacrificial	5
Sacrificial and non-Sacrificial Vestments cannot be worn together	7
Surplice and Cope worn at the Altar by authority of Parliament	8
Reason for the permissive use in 1549 of the Sacrificial Vestments	9
The Prayer Book of 1549 an unsatisfactory Compromise ...	9
Sacrificial Vestments destroyed under Elizabeth	9
Non-Sacrificial Vestments introduced by authority of Parliament, retained	10
ELIZABETH'S ACT OF UNIFORMITY made special provision for Ornaments of the Minister	11
It retained the non-Sacrificial Vestments introduced by authority of Parliament... ..	11
Walgrave's Case	12
THE INJUNCTIONS OF 1559 enjoined the use of the Prayer Book ...	13
They constituted "the other order" referred to in the Statute	14
They were always received as law	15
<i>Faulkner</i> and <i>Litchfield</i> as to the Injunctions	15
Pursuant to the Injunctions, the Royal Commissioners abolished Chasubles and Albs	16
Peacock's returns show that Chasubles and Albs were destroyed	17
The Royal Commission, and its constitution	17
Sir J. Stephen never attempted to prove, that either the Chasuble or Alb was legally used in any Parish since 1559	19
Copes, superstitious and plain, the former were destroyed, not the latter	19
The Candlesticks, and other ornaments which were destroyed, were adjuncts of the Altar	20
Laud and other Prelates enquired for concealed Chasubles and Albs	21
Two classes of Copes, superstitious and plain, Bishop Parkhurst's articles of enquiry, Dolby's Church Furniture, Rushworth's Collections, Cosin's Works, the 24th Canon, Smart's Treatise on Altars, <i>Collectanea Curiosa</i> , Dr. Rock's Church of our Fathers	24
The 30th Injunction enjoins the use of such garments as were worn in the latter year of Edward VI, but its language is indefinite	27

	PAGE
THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE INJUNCTIONS were drawn up in 1559	
by Parker and others, for the better direction of the Clergy	28
Internal evidence proves that the date 1561, assigned by Sir J. Stephen to the Interpretations, is incorrect	29
The Interpretations prescribe the non-Sacrificial Vestments, Cope and Surplice	30
Cope and Surplice were used at Parker's Consecration ...	32
The word " Vestment " is ambiguous, and was not used in the technical sense in the Synod of 1562	33
The Injunctions of 1559, explained by the Interpretations, required the use of the Surplice, whereas the book of 1549 required the Alb	34
The Official Returns in 1564 refer to great varieties in public worship, but make no mention of the use of Chasuble or Alb	35
These Official Returns resulted from an order from the Queen to Archbishop Parker, to make enquiries as to Uniformity...	36
THE ADVERTISEMENTS were issued in consequence of the negligence of the Clergy	38
They differ from the Injunctions by confining the use of the Cope to Cathedrals	39
On the 21st of May, Bishop Grindal wrote an official letter to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, who had a special jurisdiction over certain Parishes, requiring them to enjoin the use of such habit, as is appointed by the Queen's Majesty's authority in the Advertisements	40
If the Advertisements had not received the Royal sanction, every Clergyman who wore a Surplice, according to the Advertisements, instead of the Alb, was liable to fine and imprisonment	40
The presumption of <i>omnia rite acta</i> illustrated from <i>Sichel</i> and <i>Lambert</i>	41
An important State Paper refers to the Advertisements, as set out by Her Majesty's authority	41
Sir James Stephen's argument from the Canons of 1575 answered	42
Archbishop Parker and other Prelates ascribed the Advertisements to public authority, that is an authority to which all must yield obedience	42
The Canons of 1603 refer to the Advertisements	44
THE AUTHORITY OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE, is analogous to that of the Advertisements	44
THE CANONS OF 1603 restrict the use of the Cope further than the Advertisements	45
The use of the Surplice was the only grievance of which the Puritans complained	46
The Prelates, including Laud, dealt with Chasubles and Albs as Ornaments of Superstition	46
THE THEORY OF MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM is irreconcilable with the principle of Uniformity	47
COSIN'S NOTES ARE NOT A SAFE GUIDE...	48
Cosin had made Innovations	49
But Cosin, who at one time seemed to think the Vestments legal, changed his opinion	51
" SHALL BE RETAINED AND BE IN USE," are the most important words in this controversy	51

	PAGE
THE WORD "RETAINED," is used in the sense of keeping or continuing, and can only refer to Vestments then in use ...	51
THIS SENSE OF "RETAINED," is illustrated by 3 & 4 Edward VI., c. 10, by the Preface to the Prayer Book, and by the use of the word in the Prayer Book, revised by Royal Commission in 1689	52
ONLY ORNAMENTS that are legal, are those which are consistent with the Service, and thus the Chrisom, and the Chrismatory, are now illegal, though used under the Book of 1549	54
The Pix was lawful in 1649, but is not lawful now	55
Laud's Prayer Book of 1638 was passed over by the Commons, who, being jealous of Laud, selected the Book of 1604	56
Is it possible, that the Commons could have intended to bring back Chasuble and Alb?	56
The Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth had never been repealed during the Commonwealth	57
The words "Shall be retained and be in use," can only have reference to what was in use in 1662, but Chasuble and Alb were not in use in 1662	58
Sir James Stephen has refrained from attempting to show any user of Chasuble or Alb from 1559 to the present century ...	59
Contemporaneous usage is of the greatest force to determine the meaning of obscure documents	60
The Chasuble and Alb were not in use when the rubric was enacted in 1662, and therefore do not fulfil the legal condition of being "in use"	61
THE EASTWARD POSITION, this question involves the enquiry, What is the legal position of the Table?	61
It is necessary, therefore, to consider both the place and the direction of the Table	62
The place of the Table at Communion time, is governed by two rubrics	63
The Table must stand in the body of the Church, or, if in the Chancel, in that part of it, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said	63
The Table must be moveable, as set forth in <i>Westerton and Liddell</i>	64
One of the essential principles of the Reformation, was to destroy all resemblance to the Romish Altar... ..	65
Therefore the Communion Table, was not to stand as the Altar did	66
Until the legal place and direction of the Table be determined, it is impossible to determine, which is the North side ...	67
The Injunctions of 1559 required the Table to be moved in Communion time	68
The limitation by the Injunctions of the Table to the Chancel, was modified by the interpretations which required the Table, at Communion time, to be moved into the body of the Church before the Chancel door... ..	69
This is illustrated by the case of the Churchwardens of Sedgefield	69
The 82nd Canon of 1603, is in accordance with the Injunctions and Interpretations, viewed together, as to the placing of the Table, but does not refer to the East end	70