

thought and subtler faculties of sense which will complete the magnificent endowment of glorified spirits conformed in all their being to the likeness of their Maker. Perhaps, too, as Augustine,¹ Aquinas,² and far later writers³ have not unwisely taught, the Christian, in the special workings of his quickened spirit, as well as in the so-called trichotomy of his total nature, may bear some witness to that sublime mystery of the Trinity in Unity of which the earliest traces are to be found in the very record which announces first that man was created in the image of God.

ARTHUR C. GARBETT.

ART. V.—THE LECTIONARY OF 1871.

THE DEFECTS OF THE NEW LECTIONARY AND SOME PRINCIPLES FOR ITS AMENDMENT.

THE circumstances which attended the origin and preparation and enactment of the new Lectionary of 1871, which is in present use, are now almost forgotten. A casual admission of the late Archbishop Longley, in the House of Lords, led to the subject of an alteration in the Prayer-Book's Tables of Lessons being submitted to the Royal Commission, which was soon after appointed in order to inquire into the subject of ritual. And the draft of a new Lectionary was prepared and issued by the Royal Commissioners before they had completed their other and their legitimate work; and this, in defiance of the express terms of their own Commission, and under a protest from a distinguished legal member of their own body, the late Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland.⁴ The new Lectionary (so called), when issued, was silently submitted to, and enacted, almost without notice. Albeit, a few cautions and warnings were given in the pages of the *Guardian* by the late Archdeacon Harrison, and in the columns of the *Record* by the author of the present remarks, who was also enabled to promote and to send up a petition against its compulsory and

¹ "De Trinitate," in several places quoted by Lombard, "Sententiæ," Lib. i., Dist. 3.

² "Summa," P. i., Qu. 93, Art. 5, 7, 8.

³ Delitzsch, "Biblical Psychology," iv., § 4; Howe, "Oracles of God," Pt. ii., L. 20; Baxter, in many places of his "Catholic Theology"—a work of wonderful wisdom, learning and metaphysical depth.

⁴ For proofs of this the reader is referred to "The Lectionary as it might be," etc., by the Rev. C. H. Davis, ch. i., pp. 1, 2 (second edition, Elliot Stock).

permanent use.¹ In the year 1873, the general synod of the Church of Ireland considerably altered it, before adopting it for the use of that Church as a part of the Irish Prayer-Book of 1877. In 1874, the late learned Bishop C. Wordsworth, of Lincoln, in a published letter to the Prolocutor, urged its revision, and the adoption of some of the improvements contained in the Irish Lectionary. And in 1877, there appeared three papers, in one pamphlet, by Bishop Wordsworth and Deans Goulburn and Burgon, wherein the new Lectionary was severely criticized, and its revision was strongly urged.² In 1877, a revision of our present Lectionary was seriously undertaken by the Convocations of Canterbury and of York, and a "Report" of the Canterbury Convocation was published in 1878.³ And a memorial from the great combined meeting of "the Clerical and Lay Associations," held at Birmingham in June, 1878, was sent up, praying for a revision of the new Lectionary of 1871, and for an extension of the time allotted for the use of the old one.⁴

Now in any future revision of the present Lectionary, certain points should not be unheeded, as regards its many palpable defects. Among these defects, the following may be here mentioned.

I. The alternative Lessons for Evening Prayer are not constructed upon any systematic plan which would give an edifying and a consecutive series of Lessons for use, either at the Afternoon or at the Evening Service, if there be three services, or a complete series if there be only two services on the Sunday. But they are so mixed up, and so jumbled together, that if or when there may be only two services (as is generally the case, under sec. 80 of 1 and 2 Vic. ch. 106), one most important Lesson must often be omitted; as on Easter Day, and on the

¹ See "The Lectionary as it might be," p. 2.

² These two pamphlets were published by Rivingtons. See "The Lectionary as it might be," pp. 2, 3.

³ Rivingtons, at 6d.

⁴ The memorial is given at pp. 18-20 of the late Rev. W. F. Wilkinson's very able paper on "Revision of the New Lectionary," published at the unanimous request of the conference, by W. F. Bottrill, of Luttermouth, at 2d.—The memorial affirms of the present new tables, "that, in many instances, their distribution of the sacred text into lessons, is as prejudicial to the sense of Scripture, and therefore to edification, as some of the worst cases occurring in the capitular division."—Mr. Wilkinson argues at p. 3 that the almost universal adoption of the New Lectionary "may partly be accounted for by the extensive prevalence of the impression that the Act of 1871 was not merely of a temporarily permissive, but also of a tentative character, that the new tables were to be taken on trial, and would certainly be reconsidered before the use of them should become obligatory."

first and third and fourth Sundays after Easter, etc.; while the perplexity as to which Lesson of the two to select tends to the production of that double-mindedness which is a precursor to instability. (See James i. 8; iv. 8.)¹

II. Some glaring mistakes have been made in the arrangement of the present Proper Lessons, such as the following. (1) On the Fourth Sunday in Lent the removal of Gen. xliii., on Joseph entertaining his brethren, from the Morning, where it illustrated the Gospel of the day, about Christ feeding the multitudes,² to the Afternoon, where it may now be entirely omitted; and the removal of 1 Kings xiii. from the Morning of the Eighth Sunday after Trinity, where it illustrated the Gospel of the day about "false prophets," to the Evening of the Tenth, where it may now be entirely omitted, and where it *must* be omitted, *if* 1 Kings xvii. be read, without the reading of which the sequel of Elijah's history, contained in 1 Kings xviii., on the next Sunday's Morning is marred; and other like cases.³ (2) The removal of Jer. v. from the Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, where its verses 23-25 always fell most suitably somewhere near to the harvest, to the Seventeenth, where it now always seems to fall too late; and of the short chapter, Ezek. ii. from the Morning of the Sixteenth, after a Communion Sunday, where Wogan states that it was meant to illustrate the September Ember-week, to the Afternoon of the Eighteenth; and other like cases. (3) The omission of Isaiah lviii. from the Sundays after the Epiphany, (and its beautiful verses 13, 14, about the Sabbath, even when it is read on Ash-Wednesday, where Isaiah lviii. 13, 14, and Matt., ii. 23-28, if

¹ "One *apparent* gain will, I think, be found in practice a very real and considerable loss, and that is the alternative series for 'Evensong.' The idea, I suppose, is to provide for those churches in which there are three services; but I apprehend there are very few people who attend three times; and of those who attend twice, very few attend Afternoon and Evening. Nor is there any great gain for the clergy; for generally, where there are three services there are at least two clergymen; so that the gain is very small indeed. On the other hand, there is a very considerable loss; for the alternative lessons are not an independent series, but come in the same course with the others; and very frequently the omission of the alternative lesson makes a serious gap in the continuity of the Church's instruction. So that for the sake of the very few who attend Afternoon and Evening, the great number who attend Morning and Afternoon, or Morning and Evening, suffer."—Rev. B. Kennion, of Acle, in 1874.

² Which is the alleged origin of "Mothering Sunday."—See Wheatly.

³ The Convocation Committee's Report, of 1878, would extend this mischief. Thus, on the Second Sunday in Lent, by a divorce of Gen. xxvii. from the Morning, where it illustrates 1 Thess. iv. 6, in the Epistle; and on the first Sunday after Easter, by a divorce of Numbers xvi. from this Sunday, where it illustrates the Gospel, about the re-appointment of the Apostles by Christ, etc.

not here omitted, would have mutually illustrated each other),¹ and the omission of Deut. viii. on Rogation Sunday; and the omission of verses 24-31 of 1 Sam. v. on the Fifth Sunday after Trinity. (4) The use of Job and of Proverbs after the Epiphany, instead of the "Evangelical" prophet Isaiah, as formerly, and of Proverbs as the former practical conclusion of the series of Proper Lessons: see Wogan. (5) The use of such a chapter as 2 Sam. i. for a selected "Proper" Lesson, so as to yearly invite attention to a case of suicide, in not the most repulsive form. (6) The crowding out of the important Lessons from the minor prophets, such as Micah vi., in years when there are only twenty-three or twenty-four Sundays after Trinity (as in 1878 and 1879), by the pushing on of the Lessons in order to make room for such Lessons as 2 Sam. i., and 2 Chron. i., and 1 Kings iii. (one of which two chapters might well have been spared), and 1 Kings x. 4.² (7) Also in the Calendar, the omission of nearly the whole of Elihu's speech in the Book of Job; and other anomalies.

III. On the great Christian Festivals, a neglect to bring out under notice with sufficient prominence the great *facts* commemorated thereon.

IV. The reduction of many of the Lessons to too small dimensions, and to a state of "scrappiness," seeing that the true object of the Lessons is something more than to *merely* set forth a few verses bearing on the topic of the day.

V. The arrangement of the Second Lessons in such a complex form that it is difficult to avoid mistakes in the portions to be read. (This may arise partly from the disuse of the old form of printing the Lessons; as for St. Stephen's Day, Acts 6 v. 8, & ch. 7 to v. 30.) Also on such a plan that during several months of the year it is not now even allowable to read any Lesson from the Epistles of the New Testament!

VI. The direct and formal sanction for the first time of the use of Apocryphal Lessons on Sundays, when the Festivals of St. Luke and All Saints' Day and Innocents' Day may fall on Sundays; which is quite contrary to the mind of the reformed English Church, as explained by Wogan and Wheatly and Bishop Mant, etc.³

¹ After the Epiphany, we might have had at least Isa. 58 v. 13 & ch. 59.

² Solomon's glory, as described in 1 Kings x. 13-29, was in direct disobedience to Deut. xvii. 10-20, which does not come before the congregation as a warning, and a corrective of our admiration.

³ In "the Revised Table of Lessons" of the Church of Ireland, (published at 1d. by Hodges, Foster and Co., of Dublin,) the English Church's Lectionary of 1871 has been so revised as to exclude all the Apocryphal lessons. Until the enactment of the New Lectionary of 1871, which allows the Apocryphal lessons of three of the Saints' Days to be read

Accordingly, in any revision of the Lectionary, the following principles would appear to be desirable, as the basis of its reconstruction, (for to attempt a revision without any definite principles would be like going to sea without a compass,) namely :

I. To secure a clear and full set of Sunday Proper Lessons for Morning Prayer and for Evening Prayer, quite independently of the middle or supplementary set.

II. To arrange a middle-column or supplementary set of Sunday Lessons for Evening Prayer of the same general tone and character as the others. Yet so as, (1) not to impair the effect of the other two sets by its omission; but rather, (2) to supplement them, if used in addition to them; or even (3) to somewhat supply their place to those who might fail to hear one or both of the other two sets; and (4) to be not an entire failure, if or when used as a substitute for the other or principal evening set.

III. To restore the chapters, as nearly as possible, to the same Sundays, and, where practicable, to the same times of the same Sundays, upon which they fell in the old Tables of 1662, so as to avoid a loss of connection with the Epistles and Gospels, etc.; any exceptional cases being such as where the shifting of a chapter would *not* impair the connection with the Epistle or the Gospel or other topic of the Sunday's services (as by the use of Deut. iv., v., and vi., on the third Sunday after Easter); or would by its transfer to another Sunday Morning secure its non-omission; as by a transfer of Isa. liii. to the Morning of the third after the Epiphany, and of Daniel. vi. to the Morning of the twentieth after Trinity. Yet in such a manner as to utilize the new matter and the substance of the new Tables of 1871, but in a rearranged form, so as not to disorganize or disturb the general features of the old Tables of 1662 in their revised form.

IV. In the selection of "*Proper Lessons*," to have regard, other things being equal (*ceteris paribus*), to chapters which contain some direct appeal to the heart and conscience, or some evident practical instruction; such as Joshua xxiii., an old Lesson for the first Sunday after Trinity, rather than Joshua v. 13 and vi. to 21, which is one of the new ones.

V. On the greater Festivals and Holy-days, to set forth more clearly the facts commemorated upon them.

VI. To restore the old mode of printing the references to the Lessons in Arabic figures; as, for example, "Acts 6 v. 8 & ch. 7 to v. 30," etc.; instead of "Acts vi. 8 to vii. 30," etc.

when they fall on Sundays, no formal sanction had ever been before given to the Sunday use of Apocryphal lessons

A Lectionary prepared on some such principles as the above would, it is believed, be more conducive to edification than the present one, which seems to have been prepared upon no definite principles whatever.¹ In the meantime, for discussion at Ruri-Decanal Meetings and Conferences and at Clerical meetings and Clerical and Lay Conferences, the subject might be presented in some such form as this: "The comparative merits and demerits of the Old and the New Lectionaries, and the proper attitude of Churchmen towards them."

And it is to be hoped that Parliament will grant a restoration of the now expired liberty to the clergy to use the old Lessons of 1662; to the use of "all" of which it had, since 1662 up to 1865, itself compelled the beneficed clergy to publicly declare their "*unfeigned* assent and consent." It might easily be accomplished by a short enactment, to the effect that: "The Tables of Lessons in lawful use before the passing of 'The Prayer-Book (Tables of Lessons) Act, 1871,' may at any time hereafter be followed in lieu of the Tables substituted for the same by the said Act, unless or until it shall be otherwise enacted; and the said Tables may [?] shall] be printed at the end of the Book of Common Prayer, as a lawful Appendix to the same."

It would also be desirable to obtain of the S.P.C.K. the issue of an edition of the old and of the new Lessons of 1662 and of 1871 in parallel pages, in a clear and legible type and in a portable form, together with the Lessons of the Irish Prayer-Book of 1877, which were prepared for it in 1873.

For details wherein the present Lectionary may be improved, the author may be permitted to here refer to his two works on the subject of this paper, viz., "The Lectionary as it might be" (second edition), and "Model of a Revised Lectionary" (second edition).

C. H. DAVIS.

¹ An influential member of the Royal Commission which prepared the New Lectionary of 1871, once described to the author their mode of proceeding as follows: "We followed our own instincts; if a proposal were sent to us, we did not read it; and if a man quoted it, it was quite enough to not attend to him." Could any procedure be possibly more presumptuous or preposterous?

