

Mediæval Survivals in Scottish Worship.

WHEN the Reformation of our Scottish Church took place in 1560, it was claimed by Knox and his colleagues that by their words and actions "the reverend face of the primitive and Apostolick Church" was brought back again. The claim was a great one, and in some ways was quite justified; but in other ways it certainly was not. "In much of the creed they professed," says Professor Hume Brown with regard to our Scottish Reformers, "in many of the reasonings with which they supported it, they were as essentially mediæval as the Church of Rome itself." Wheatley, whose work on the 'Book of Common Prayer' was long considered a standard work, refers to the Church of Scotland as having "too many marks of its parent" (the Roman Catholic Church), and we have still many traces of that parentage. We may notice some of these in everyday speech. The Scotsman of to-day speaks of the 'Sacrament' where an Englishman would say the 'Communion'—the former being an ecclesiastical and the latter a scriptural term. The Scots service ends with the 'Benediction,' the English with the 'Blessing,' the former being a purely Latin word and a relic of the time when the whole service was in that tongue.

Even in worship the Reformers retained far more than many imagine of the practices of the Roman Church. Dr Maxwell showed, in last year's 'Annual,' that the ordinary services for the Lord's Day, as given in the 'Book of Common Order,' are really founded on the Roman Mass; and there is reason to believe that the Readers' Services, which were such a marked feature of early Reformed worship in Scotland, were derived from the 'Hours' services—Matins, Prime, Compline, &c.—of the Mediæval Church. It is a commonplace of history that it was from these 'Hours' services that the Orders for Morning and Evening Prayer, in the Church of England Prayer-Book, are compiled. The

use of a Prayer-Book marks a departure from Apostolic usage, for there is no reason to believe that such a thing was in use in the earliest days of the Church. Dr Fortescue, the learned Roman Catholic writer, says in his book on the Mass that nothing but the Bible was read in the churches during the first two centuries. "Nothing else was written down, because nothing else was fixed. The celebrant and his deacons said their prayers extempore; the people answered short exclamations, such as Amen, Alleluia, Kyrie eleison, 'and with thy spirit,' more or less spontaneously." It is not until the time of the Donatist schism (fourth century) that we find references to liturgical books.

Now this was known to Knox and his colleagues; yet they had their 'Book of Common Order' printed, and, while strict adherence to it was not commanded, that does not alter the fact that the production of such a book at all was a relic of mediævalism. As 'Rabbi' Duncan is reported, in 'Colloquia Peripatetica,' to have said, "the best of our fathers were more anti-Erastian than anti-Episcopal, and more opposed to a bad liturgy than anti-liturgic."

Ninian Winzet, that able defender of the unreformed Kirk, was not slow to point out that, in many of their actions, the Reformers were following mediæval rather than scriptural practice; and though he tried to involve Knox in argument on some of the disputed points, that great Scotsman was too cautious to allow the matter to be put to the test. "Why do you Calvinian Preachers," asks Winzet, "sing with us Catholics, at the end of every Psalm, 'Glory be to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, &c.,' seeing that godly form of praise was first ordered to be sung by Pope Damasus as a rebuke to heretics?" Doxologies are to be found in the 'Gude and Godly Ballads,' and the practice of singing them at the end of the metrical psalms was long continued in the Scottish Church. It has been suggested that the introduction of the Doxology was due to the Episcopalian tendencies of King James VI., but for this view the writer has not been able to find the slightest evidence. Men like Calderwood and Baillie would not have defended the use of the Doxology so strenuously as they did, had they thought that it had been forced upon the Church by the monarch.

With regard to the Sacrament of Baptism, Winzet

did not allow the Reformers to go unquestioned as to where they found Scripture authority for some of their practices. He asks, for example, why they had godfathers at their baptisms. The Baptismal Register of the English Church at Geneva, of which Knox was minister, shows that the practice of having godparents was in vogue there, the first godfather mentioned being no other than John Calvin. Knox filled the same office for two children, while for his own sons the godfathers were William Whittingham, afterwards a Dean, and Miles Coverdale, an exiled Bishop. Now there would be some difficulty in finding godfathers in the New Testament; and it was not until 1240 that the present rule of the Church of England that each male should have two male and one female godparents, and each female one male and two female godparents, was enacted. For some reason (maybe owing to the dropping of the Second Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.) godmothers who had been in evidence at the 'beginning of Reformation' were dispensed with, but they came into favour again in the seventeenth century. In later days godparents were termed witnesses. Students of Burns may remember that at his baptism the witnesses were John Tennant (Gude Auld Glen) and James Young. Then we learn from Winzet (there is no reference to this in the 'Book of Common Order') that it was the Scots custom for the parent (in later days sometimes the godparent) to hold the child in his arms while it was being baptised. One might have expected that the Anglican custom of the minister taking the child for baptism would have been followed, especially as it could be claimed that in doing so he was following the example of our Lord, who took the little ones up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them. This, too, was the method followed at Frankfort while Knox was minister there. Why did the Scots depart from it? The directions in the Sarum Manual which was in use in Scotland in pre-Reformation days were that the child should be "dipped" three times in the Font, but in practice both sprinkling and pouring were allowed. When Baptism was performed in either of the latter ways it may have been customary for one of the sponsors to hold the child, the other sponsors laying their hands on it. This is still the custom of the Roman Catholic Church, though Dr Percy Dearmer says that the directions in the mediæval Service Books in England

were the same as those in the Book of Common Prayer, which direct the minister to take the child in his arms.

A book for Roman Catechumens, published at Venice in 1555, has an illustration representing a contemporary baptism. The priest is pouring water from a vessel on the child, who is being held over the font by the sponsor. It is possible, however, that our Scots custom originated in a somewhat different way. In the Mediæval Church, it was usual for the sponsor to lift the child from the font (dipping being then in vogue) after baptism. In Scotland this was called 'heaving,' and in the Lord Treasurer's Accounts will be found evidence that James IV. acted as sponsor on more than one occasion, and 'hove' the child after baptism. It is possible that, in time, the practice of the sponsor's taking the baby was transferred from after, to before the administration of the Sacrament. Then the white veil, which was and still is drawn over the newly baptised child's face, is simply the 'cude' of pre-Reformation days. In this connection it may be noted that the use of the 'cude' was one of the things in the Roman ritual of Baptism which John Knox did not object to. Another Catholic custom followed by Knox was that of baptising the boys before the girls when children of both sexes were presented at one service. It is somewhat remarkable that with regard to adult Baptism, Scottish Reformed usage has departed from that of the Anglican and Roman Churches. In each of these communions the Catechumen stands while the rite is being administered. The Scottish custom is that he should be baptised kneeling. We learn from Gillespie on the one side and Forbes on the other, that such was the practice among both Presbyterians and Episcopalians in the seventeenth century. It is still the customary usage in the Church of Scotland.

When we turn to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we find again that our practice has been moulded to a very great extent by mediæval custom. In the Primitive Church the 'Breaking of Bread' was part of the service on every Lord's Day. Yet in early Reformed Scotland the Sacrament was never celebrated much oftener than once or twice a year. The 'Book of Common Order,' it is true, says that the ordinance should be observed usually once a month, but this was never done. Now this infrequency of Communion is by some traced to the usage of the Mediæval Church. There, it is true,

Mass was celebrated every Lord's Day, but the custom grew up there of confining actual Communion to one or two great festivals. The people thus 'assisted' at the observance of the Sacrament, but did not partake. The Reformers could not imagine a Communion without communicants. Hence the fact that, even to this day, in Presbyterian Churches, the Sacrament is seldom celebrated more than three or four times per annum. It is really the mediæval custom repeating itself in another form.

One of the points on which Winzet challenges the Reformers to produce scriptural warrant for their act, was that of placing a white cloth on the Communion Table when the Sacrament was being celebrated. We have to remember that this practice was more significant then, when probably domestic table-cloths were unknown, than now, when these are in use in almost every home. The custom was a pre-Reformation one, the altar being always covered in time of Mass with a linen cloth, and, as has been said, the Reformers continued the custom. As early as 1576 we find the Council of Canongate buying "vii. ells of linen cloth to eek out the Communion claes." (It is possible that these Communion 'linens' are the survivals of the mediæval 'housseling cloths.') It is still usual to cover the bread with a white cloth as it lies on the paten or plate, and in some places the wine-cups are also covered. These are the reformed representatives of the older corporal and chalice veil. I remember seeing the Communion cups covered in one of our oldest Secession Churches, where the practice had come down from the days of the Erskines. In many of the churches where the offering is taken at the door, one sees the plate covered with a fair linen cloth on Communion Sundays. It has been suggested that this cloth is a relic of the ancient sudery used in early days, when the offering took the form of the Elements to be used in the Sacrament. In the Non-Jurors' Liturgy, which was drawn up in the early years of the eighteenth century, and which throws light on many of the old customs, direction is given that the 'decent basin' into which the offerings were placed is to be covered with a white linen cloth. A similar direction was given by Bishop Rattray in the Liturgy which he drew up for the Scottish Episcopalians about the same time. The writer knows of one church where the plates, with which the offerings are collected by the

Elders, are covered with white linen on Communion Sundays.

The Elements used in the Sacrament are bread and wine, and in many of the parishes up to comparatively recently the custom of using unleavened bread was continued. In one or two parishes it is still found in use. The unleavened bread used in Scotland took the form of shortbread, which was baked in thin flat cakes. At the beginning of the nineteenth century practically every parish in Galloway and Dumfries used this form of bread at Communion, and it is noteworthy that the same form of Element was used by many of the Presbyterians of Northern Ireland, who had many customs in common with their brethren in Scotland. It is also to be found in Churches in Canada and the United States, where Scottish emigrants had continued its use. References to the use of shortbread are to be found in almost every quarter in Scotland. In the Burgh of Newburgh, for example, shortbread is called 'pentie,' which is simply a corruption of the words 'pain bénit' or 'panis benedictus,' which in the Roman Church was common bread which had received special benediction and which was distributed to the worshippers at High Mass when Communion was rarely given; the usual reception being at the early Masses.

The cakes of shortbread used in the South were usually round, and those at St Michael's, Dumfries, up to 1865, were marked with a cross on the top. In the eastern counties unleavened bread was used up to the eighteenth century, if not later, but whether it took the form of shortbread is not so certain. Among the matters disputed in the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy in 1630 was the question whether unleavened bread might be used in the Sacrament; and, though it is not definitely recorded, the feeling of the members appears to have been unfavourable. Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh (1585-1634), in his '*Considerationes Modestæ*,' refers to the matter, but considered it a thing indifferent. His contemporary, Archbishop Spottiswood, however, seems to have been definitely opposed to its use. It would appear, therefore, that this practice of using unleavened bread was more a Presbyterian than an Episcopalian usage. Laud's Liturgy, it may be noted, while ordering that the "best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten" should be used, yet allows that it "be lawful to have Wafer Bread."

It is well known that in the Roman Church the wine for Mass is mixed with water, and this usage also passed into the Reformed Church. Writing about the beginning of the eighteenth century, Bishop Rattray, who was born in 1684, stated that it was the custom in many places "to mix a little pure and clean water with the sacramental wine, not indeed at the altar, but in preparing the elements before." "This custom," he continues, was "almost universal throughout the North, perhaps from the very time of the Reformation." The use of wine mixed with water in the Communion was also practised by some of the old Presbyterian Churches in the North of Ireland. There, probably, it may be traced to the influx of Aberdonians in the seventeenth century. About ten thousand persons left the Northern district of Scotland to settle in Ireland in 1634, and doubtless carried their ecclesiastical customs with them. The practice still exists in some parts of our country among Presbyterians, and had it been more generally observed, perhaps there would not have been the same desire for 'unfermented wine' that we find in some quarters to-day.

It must not, however, be thought that the practice was universal. Winzet complains that the Reformers did not mix "the Lord's Cup with water and wine before the sanctification," though here the reference may be made to the ceremonial 'making of the chalice,' which was a part of the Mass services. At Kirkcaldy, in 1630, the question "De . . . Vino Aqua Temperato" was debated by the Presbytery, and apparently the feeling was adverse, so that it would appear that wine mixed with water was not used there. An interesting relic of the same objection was to be observed up to comparatively recent times in churches so far apart as Dunrossness in Shetland and Kirkmaiden in Galloway. In each of these places, as well as in others, it was customary to bring the wine to the Communion Table in bottles, and to draw the corks and decant the wine during the service. The reason for this is stated to have been a fear on the part of the congregation that the wine had been watered. In some places a determined effort was made to stop this practice of using the mixed chalice, and in the Synod of Aberdeen, in 1650, the question was put to every congregation, "Is your wine prepared for the celebration of the Communion mixed with water or not?"

In the Mediæval Church the officiating Priest was

required to consume any part of the Elements, whether bread or wine, which had been consecrated and not used. This practice, also, was carried over into the Reformed Church, though in a somewhat different form. Up to comparatively recently it was customary in many parts of Scotland for the Elders to consume what had not been used of the Sacramental Elements. In one case known to the writer this was discontinued just about fifteen years ago. In Laud's Liturgy the direction was that the Presbyter and such of the Communicants as "he shall take unto him" should reverently eat and drink what remained. According to the Canons of 1636 it was the "poorer sort" of Communicants who were to be invited, and traces of this practice are still to be found among us.

Another most interesting survival was the use of the 'Lavabo bowl.' At a certain part of the service of the Mass (after the Oblations) the priest washed his hands at the altar, repeating the words of the 25th Psalm (Vulgate), "Lavabo inter innocentes manus meas" ("I will wash my hands among the innocent"). The practice had no scriptural authority, unless the washings of the priests under the Old Testament dispensation were considered as providing a precedent. Yet it continued among the Presbyterians in some parts down almost to our own days. The Very Rev. Dr Hutchison, minister of Banchory-Ternan, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1887, used to tell how, when he became minister of that parish in 1846, he found at his first Communion that a basin of water with a towel had been placed on the Communion Table in order that he might wash his hands before 'taking' and distributing the Sacramental Elements. He was told, on inquiry, that "it had always been done there," and on visiting other parishes in the neighbourhood he found the same practice observed.

If there is one thing more certain than another about the Lord's Supper it is that it was first celebrated in the evening. It was "when the even was come" that our Lord "sat down with the twelve," and one might have expected that the Reformers would, in restoring the ordinance to its primitive simplicity, have followed the Divine example, or at least have given those who wished to communicate in the evening liberty to do so. Yet here again it was the Roman custom which moulded the post-Reformation practice, and the Sacrament was

never celebrated except in the morning—sometimes in the very early morning. In Glasgow we find the service starting at 4 A.M.; and at Stirling it appears to have been half an hour earlier. In the East of Scotland the hour was a little later, five o'clock being the hour of commencement in Edinburgh, St Andrews and Perth, there being a second service beginning about eight or nine o'clock. Even these early hours were sometimes improved on, for at Elgin, in 1613, the first bell on Communion Sunday was rung at "half-hour to three" (2.30 A.M.). This early service was meant apparently for servants. In Edinburgh, at least, in 1574, the earliest celebration was stated to be "for servants and sic others that pleases to come." In time these very early services came to be dropped, and it is interesting to note that the change took place during the first Episcopacy, 1610-1638. At Dalgety, where Covenanting fervour remained strong, the early morning service was not given up until much later. Combined with these early diets of worship was the idea derived from the Roman Church that the Sacrament should, upon no consideration, be celebrated after twelve noon. At Anstruther, in 1592, as we learn incidentally, only as many as could communicate "befoir twell hours" were to be served, "ye rest to communicate ye next day that sall be found meetest." In view of the early hour at which Communion was celebrated, it is not surprising to learn that the pre-Reformation custom of communicating fasting still continued. Indeed, the Reformed were more strict than the Romans. At St Andrews, for example, in 1598, the fast commenced at 8 P.M. on Saturday and lasted to 4 P.M. on Sunday. Robert Blair, the Covenanting Divine, mentions in his autobiography that, in 1613, he attended Communion service at Irvine, apparently in the early morning. He greatly desired to communicate, but he says, "Having gotten my breakfast I durst not, for it was then generally received opinion that the Sacrament behove to be received fasting." It has been generally held that the Fast Day services, which were once a special feature of the preparation for the Communion in Scotland, were introduced in Covenanting days. Dr Burns, for example, states that sacramental fasts were unknown before 1638; while Dr Leishman, speaking of the 'Westminster Directory' (1645), says, "The sacramental fast had not yet been introduced." There seems ample evidence that both

writers are wrong, and that preparatory services and fast days were in vogue in Scotland long before Covenanting times. In 1567, in the Canongate, the Session decided that the 'exhortation' was to be given on the Saturday before the Communion, and these Saturday services in time became general, while other days (Wednesday and Friday in Elgin, in 1593) were kept as days "of fast and abstinence" for the preparation for the Communion. Now there is some reason to believe that the 'exhortation,' which was the forerunner of the present-day preparatory service, was another relic of the Scottish pre-Reformation Church. In 1558, Archbishop Hamilton published a brief address, entitled 'A Godly Exhortation,' which was meant "for use by vicars, curates, and other priests that are employed in the ministration of the Sacrament of the altar." It was to be read to the people before they received the Communion, and although Knox somewhat sarcastically refers to it as the "Twa penny faith," there does seem to be some connection between the 'exhortation' of the Roman and that of the Reformed Church.

There is also the custom of confining the celebration of the Sacrament to the Chancel of the Church, as was the custom at Perth and other places. At Dunfermline, where the Chancel was the Monastic Church, which became ruinous, a space at the east end of the Nave of the Church, where the parish Altar had formerly stood, was railed off for a 'Communion Yle,' thus indicating the desire to conform to ancient precedent. The tokens which were so long distributed among intending communicants were, according to Dr King Hewison and Dr Hay Fleming, survivals of Roman practice, and it is the case that tokens were used by the Roman Catholic congregations in Scotland up to the middle of last century. They were certainly used by the Reformed in St Andrews before the Reformation had been officially confirmed.

In the 'Book of Common Order' drawn up by Knox, the Apostles' Creed is introduced at the end of the Intercessory Prayer after the sermon, and so before the actual Communion. Now there is no apostolic or even sub-apostolic authority for the use of the Creed in the service. Indeed, it was not until the fifth or sixth century that it was introduced, and it was much later before its use became general. But while that is so, the Nicene Creed appears in almost the same place in the Roman service,

and there seems little doubt that it was from that service that the practice was taken over.

It would be interesting to know how the beautiful old Scottish custom of 'Bringing in the Elements' originated, a custom which unfortunately is falling into disuse. That it was the practice in early post-Reformation times in Scotland to bring in the Elements seems quite clear, and up to a comparatively recent period the custom was almost universal in our land. Dr King Hewison connects it with the pre-Reformation 'Corpus Christi' procession, but the writer is unable to agree that it originated there, for in one case the Elements about to be consecrated are carried, while in the other it is the consecrated Host which is so borne. I am inclined to think that this is one of the borrowings from the Greek Church, and that it came to us through a usage of the Celtic Church, but it is possible that we may find the origin of the custom in the Rubrics in the Sarum Liturgy, which was in general use in Scotland in pre-Reformation days. "After the offertory let the Deacon carry to the Priest the Chalice with the Paten and Sacrifice. . . . And he receiving the Chalice shall reverently place it in its accustomed place in the midst of the Altar . . . and put the Bread reverently upon corporals in front of the Chalice." It will be noticed that the cup is placed on the Altar before the Bread, and, while it may be mere coincidence, the writer has noticed that this practice is followed by more than one set of elders at our Scottish Communion service. In the days before 1560 the Credence Table (or side Altar, for we are not sure that Credence Tables were known then in Scotland) would suffice to hold all the Elements required, but when the whole of the congregation communicated more space would be needed, and this may have led to the keeping of the Elements in the Vestry until they were required. Some time ago the writer assisted at a Communion service in the heart of Covenanting Ayrshire, and during the singing of the 35th Paraphrase the elders filled the empty Communion Cups (which had been set on the Holy Table before the service began) with wine. This seems to be customary in quite a number of places. It would be difficult to find any scriptural authority for the action, but quite easy to find Roman authority, for at Low Mass the empty Chalice is placed on the Altar before the service is begun, and the wine (mixed with water) is not poured

into it until the time of the offertory. It is only fair to Knox and his fellow-Reformers to say that, while there is no scriptural precedent for 'Bringing in the Elements,' the first of the sub-apostolic writers who has given us a description of the Eucharist says that, "Bread and a cup of wine mingled with water are brought to the President," so that the Scots practice could claim the support of antiquity.

In the early days of the Church's history it was customary for the people to present the bread and wine which were to be used for the Sacrament. This custom was in vogue in Rome in the eighth century, and still, I understand, continues at Milan. St Augustine (354-430) mentions that in his day a Psalm was sung as the people made their offerings of the Elements. In the present Roman use only a single verse (varying with the day) is sung. Among Presbyterians the usual item of praise at the 'offertory' is the 35th Paraphrase, but before the Paraphrases were introduced, or where they were disliked, the Psalm used was the 24th (especially verses 7-10). The well-known tune "St George's, Edinburgh," written by Dr Andrew Thomson, was specially composed for this use at Communion seasons. Hislop, however, mentions in his 'Poems' that in Nithsdale (circa 1820) the Psalm sung when the elders were bringing in the Elements was the 116th, "I'll of salvation take the cup." Can it be that from this custom of repeating snippets of Psalms in the service of the Mass has come our Scottish custom of singing the Psalms in bits only?

With regard to Marriage, Winzet wished Knox to tell him where was the scriptural authority for the calling of the 'Banns' on three several Sundays before the Marriage took place. This was a purely mediæval enactment, yet it remains with us to this day. Again, there is no scriptural authority for 'joining hands' at the actual ceremony, though that has always been part of the traditional ritual of the Scottish Church. The wedding ring, though not put on the wife's finger as part of the ceremony, in either Presbyterian or Episcopalian times previous to the eighteenth century, was nevertheless in use as the symbol of wedlock, as it still is, though there is no New Testament authority for its use by Christians at all.

In Ordination and Induction we have also quite a number of mediæval customs which were carried over

into the Reformed Church. Thus it was customary for a Bible to be delivered to the newly ordained minister, and that, too, as part of the ceremony. It is possible that this was simply borrowed from England, where it is found in the Anglican Ordinal. But even if so, the Scottish Divines must have known that it was of Roman origin. The mediæval world, both civil and ecclesiastical, abounded in forms of investiture to office, and what was believed to be an especially appropriate symbol was given to set forth the conveyance of the rights of office. Thus the ostiarius or door-keeper was given a key, the acolyte a taper, the clerk a holy-water dish and sprinkler, and so on. To the priest was given the paten and chalice. In 1527 a priest at Kilmarnock was put in possession of the church by delivery to him of the door-key, chalice, vestments, missal, and the key of the font. These things were laid aside, but the Bible was given to the minister at his ordination, and, though the symbol differed, the thought underlying the action was the same as in earlier days. Again it would be difficult to say that the action was scriptural. We find in 1577 that the former Bishop of Aberdeen (Roman Catholic) gave collation of the vicarage of that city to Walter Cullen, the Protestant reader, by the delivery of a ring. Ten years later a chaplain received a book of the Gospels on being inducted to office in St Giles', Edinburgh. In 1640 the Presbytery of Strathbogie gave induction to a minister by "delivering unto him the Bible, as the use is in such cases." About the same time Robert Lawrie was admitted reader at Perth by being placed at the Latrone (Lectern) and by delivery to him of the Bible. The ceremony was still in use in the eighteenth century, and has been recently revived. There is nothing to be said against it, but it certainly is much more mediæval than primitive.

But perhaps the most striking example of how Roman tradition has been followed in Scotland is seen not only in special services like Baptism, Communion, Ordination, but in all services. In the 'Primitive and Apostolick Church,' to quote Knox, the service was much more informal and many-voiced than it is in modern days. "When ye come together," says St Paul, "every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation." But in the Reformed Church the people, except in praise, are silent.

The minister, like the priest, is all in all. In the Eastern Church, says Mr E. Bishop in his '*Liturgica Historica*,' the people, so far as voiced prayer is concerned, are something; in the Roman, as nearly as possible nothing. E. G. C. Atchley notices, in his '*Ordo Romanus Primus*,' how the later history of the Roman ritual, so far from increasing the people's part in the service, has been steadily in the direction of curtailing it. In the Church of England the people have a say in the service. There are prayers, such as the General Confession, which are as much the people's as the minister's. In the '*Revised Prayer-Book*' the General Thanksgiving, too, may be said by the minister and people. In the Litany they have almost as much to say as the officiating priest, but Knox would have none of these things. He objected strongly to the people's responses. It was enough for them to listen to what he had to say either for them or to them. Yet in the early Reformed Church in Scotland the people said "Amen" or "So be it" at the end of the prayers. They joined their voices with the minister's in the Lord's Prayer and in the Apostles' Creed. In time, however, even these usages were dropped almost everywhere, and the people, as Spalding declared regarding those of Aberdeen after the coming of the Covenanting ministers among them, "had all to be silent and dumb." The service in the average parish church became what has been termed somewhat irreverently a 'one man show.' Principal Story in his '*Baird Lectures*' declares that in the eighteenth and earlier part of the nineteenth centuries the ritual of the Church was "bald and unimpressive in the extreme, disfigured by many of the roughest features of the irreverent Puritanism of the Protectorate." We are returning, however, to the earlier conception of worship as a service in which everyone has something to contribute—a conception which is in every way in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Christian Faith.

WILLIAM M'MILLAN.