

**MANT ON THE RUBRICS: AN
EXPLANATION OF THE RUBRICS IN THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO UNIFORMITY
IN CONDUCTING THE SERVICE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649112890

Mant on the rubrics: an explanation of the rubrics in the Book of common prayer, with special reference to uniformity in conducting the service by Richard Mant & W. D. Wilson

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

RICHARD MANT & W. D. WILSON

**MANT ON THE RUBRICS: AN
EXPLANATION OF THE RUBRICS IN THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO UNIFORMITY
IN CONDUCTING THE SERVICE**

INTRODUCTORY LETTER.

TO THE REV. BENJAMIN HALE, *President of Geneva College, and Doctor in Divinity.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—As my part in bringing this Edition of Bishop MANT'S *Horæ Liturgicæ* before the public, was undertaken at your suggestion and by your request, I feel anxious that it should appear in connection with your name. Not that I would imply thereby, that all that I have here said by way of Notes and Additions has received your approval, (as you have seen but a small part of it,) or that I would hold you in any measure responsible for the opinions I have advanced. But it is due to the public and to yourself, that it should be known that the object and plan of editing this work are of your own suggesting, that they may know to whom they are indebted for the merits of that part of the work, (which are certainly very great,) while all of the imperfections in its execution, be they what they may, are justly chargeable on myself alone.

It remains only that I should give a brief account of what I have done.

And the first thing requiring notice in this place, is the liberty I have taken with the text of the Rt. Rev. Author. I have reduced his Two Letters into one. This is a liberty which I most certainly should not have taken, if I had not been assured that the form in which it was published by him was not one devised and matured by himself before he commenced writing. On the contrary, it appears that when he wrote the first Letter on Liturgical Discrepancy, he had no design of writing the second. In the first, he only pointed out the Discrepancies, and suggested some weighty considerations in favor of their removal. But the Clergy of his diocese wishing for further instructions on the subject, he wrote his second Letter, supplementary to the first, going over the same ground, and giving his opinions as to what is the right way in regard to each of the Discrepancies enumerated in the first Letter, answering the apologies for discrepancy, and refuting the objections that are urged against uniformity.

I can hardly doubt, that, if his lordship had contemplated the second Letter when he wrote the first, he would have incorporated them into one, in manner and form nearly as I have taken the liberty to do. In accomplishing this, I have not found it necessary

to omit or change any thing, except some references in the Letters to things contained in the Letters themselves, so as that the references as they now stand may be understood as pointing to the same things as they did in their previous form. I have also followed the usual form of placing the refutation of objections to uniformity before the reasons which should induce to its observance.

I hope that this liberty which I have taken with the Rt. Rev. Author's arrangement, while it will add greatly to the convenience of the use of his valuable Letters, will not be displeasing to his lordship, if it should ever come to his knowledge, as I hope it may.

My Notes I have thought best to incorporate in the body of the book itself, as they are of such a character as to require the same attention as the other matter contained in it, being designed to modify his lordship's statements, as the circumstances and peculiarities of our Church require.

In my Additions, I have gone over the most frequently used of the Occasional Offices. I have there explained sufficiently the motives and principles by which I was guided. My object has not been to point out all the discrepancies that exist, nor yet to set forth the most common usage; but to give that direction which seems most in conformity with the

general principles and the best authorities relating to subjects specially treated of.

There are two other points in regard to which I would say a word.

The use of the "*Amen*." In regard to this, I have followed the last standard edition of the Book of Common Prayer, set forth A. D. 1844. I have given in its place an extract from the Report of the Committee of Revision, showing the rule which they intended to establish, by their manner of printing the word. The application of this rule leads, as I confess, in a few instances to results which, in my private judgment, I should have had otherwise. I should have stated the rule thus—Whenever the Amen is printed in the Roman letter, it is to be pronounced by the same person or persons as the part of the service to which it is appended: thus, in the GENERAL CONFESSIO*N*, LORD'S PRAYER, CREED, &c., *by both Minister and People*; in the OFFICIAL FORMULA OF BAPTISM, &c., *by the Minister only*; and in the FORM OF EN*DOWMENT* in the Marriage Service, by "*the man*" only.

The Amen and its use is derived from the Bible, and we should undoubtedly be guided in our use of it by its usage there. It is there used by *the people*, in response to comminations, prayers, and thanksgivings, by the minister, in *Deut.* xxvii. 15, &c., *1 Cor.* xiv.

16, and other places. It is also used by the speaker himself to give emphasis to what he says. This is common in the language and discourses of our Saviour, where it is translated by "*verily*," and in the epistles of St. Paul, where it stands Anglicised, but not translated. But I know of no scripture precedent for the minister and people to join in a response to what either of them has said alone.

It may be said that the adoption of the typography recommended by the Committee and by the General Convention, does not imply an adoption of the principles and reasonings on account of which they recommended it. Still, however, I have not felt at liberty to take this view of the subject.

It will be observed that the resolution of the House of Bishops, A. D. 1835, does not go quite so far in the application of this rule as the Report above referred to. That resolution says—"It is also the opinion of the Bishops, that in those parts of the Liturgy in which the minister and people *unite in saying the whole*, as in the CONFESSIO*N*, the CREEDS, the LORD'S PRAYER, the GLORIA IN EXCELSIS, the TRISAGION, and the last PRAYER FOR ASH WEDNESDAY, the word '*Amen*' should be printed in the Roman letters, and the minister unite with the people in saying it." But this does not reach the cases specified by the Committee, where the congregation and people are directed to

respond together to what one of them has said alone, as in the Baptismal Formula, and in the Marriage Service. This resolution of the House of Bishops, in 1835, would accord precisely with my view of the use of the "Amen;" and I would also adopt and approve of the typography in regard to it which the joint committee recommended, and the General Convention adopted on their recommendation; only I would vary their rule, as I have just stated in a preceding paragraph.

It will be recollected, however, that the Report was drawn up and the principle stated, with these cases in view, by the REV. DR. CORR. Few persons that are acquainted with that gentleman's usual habits of thought and investigation, will feel disposed to suspect him of inadvertency, or to look for errors in his statements of facts. The report also received the special attention of the REV. DR. WAINWRIGHT. And if one had any fear that an error had escaped the research and accuracy of the first named reverend gentleman, that fear, I apprehend, would entirely subside when he considers the part which the reverend gentleman last named took in the matter.

With this view, I have yielded my private opinion, and consider the Church as having now sanctioned the rule laid down in the report above referred to.

The other point of remark in this place, is the

difference between the situation of the English Church and our own in respect to written laws. In England, authorities of this kind, to be appealed to as settling all controversy, are far more extensive than they are in our own country. I have regarded the declaration in the Preface to our Prayer Book—*this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship; OR further than local circumstances require*—as authorizing an appeal to the English law, or sanctioned usage, in all cases where there had been no express action of our Church to render such an appeal inadmissible, or where there were no “local circumstances” that positively “require” a different usage. I have found this principle an essential aid, and have kept it constantly in view.

Still there are cases in which something different is found necessary; as, for instance, in the use of metrical singing. These cases, however, are but very few and unimportant. There is much more difficulty in determining precisely where and how far our Church has intended to depart from the English: The safe way, under the circumstances, is undoubtedly not to suppose a departure where there are not clear indications that one was intended.

Under the guidance of these principles, and in this way, my Rev. Brother, have I accomplished the task