

adopt now the preacher's closing words: "I maintain that Evangelicalism so called, if fully and truly taught, is really, as the name implies, the preaching of the Gospel, and I commend it to you not only as a working aspect of theology, but as a rule of practical life. The gift of Pentecost is ours, His Spirit is striving with men, and there is no end to the influence of spiritual religion; far greater exploits of faith are before us if we will. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord,'" and I close with the late Lord Selborne's exhortation, when he addressed the students of St. David's College, Lampeter, "Be spiritual, spiritual, spiritual."



Loyalty to the Prayer-Book.¹

BY THE REV. T. W. DRURY, B.D.

THE conduct of public worship is one of the highest duties of a Christian pastor. It is to lead the children of God into the presence of their heavenly Father; it is to lead the flock into the green pastures of Divine love.

For this the supreme qualification is the pastor's own communion with God. Nothing else can take the place of this. For how can we lead if we ourselves do not know the way?

And the true walk with God will save us from all that savours of taking liberties with sacred things; it will lead to scrupulous care in fulfilling our public ministry. It is self-esteem that leads to eccentricities in worship. If we remember that it is not only God's work, but that He is really close by us in it—"holding the stars in His right hand"—we shall never forget how *awful* as well as how happy is our ministry. βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε—"that ye walk *accurately*," remembering the importance of detail, judging nothing to be trivial even in matters of common life, least of all in your work as ambassadors

¹ A paper read at the Reunion, Ridley Hall, June, 1906.

of God. In all its parts let our ministry, like our life, be marked by "*accuracy*"—*πὼς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε*.

This will lead us to avoid not only what is plainly slipshod and irreverent, but also what offends and so hinders the worship of those to whom we minister. You are "the parson"—*i.e.*, the person of the parish, who is bound to care for all, provide for all. You are therefore bound to take a broad view of what, within proper limits, public services ought to be, to recognise varieties of feeling and opinion, and to make your services, to whatever type they are conformed, such as will excite the devotion, as far as possible, *of all*.

We must remember that our Prayer-Book is the Book of *Common Prayer*. Its forms, its rites and ceremonies, its discipline and order are such as appeal to all. It is the outcome of the experience of all the Christian centuries, it has incorporated the devout thoughts of holy men of different countries and of successive ages; above all the very backbone of its structure is Holy Scripture, "*the Book*," inspired for all, meeting the needs of all.

And so we have to minister its offices, remembering that they are helps to *common* worship, *common* prayer. How much painful defect, how much still more painful excess would this remembrance have prevented?

But some will say, "Is not the spirit of the Prayer-Book above the letter? and if we maintain the spiritual principles on which our Book of Common Prayer is founded, may we not be allowed some measure of liberty in construing the letter of certain rubrics?" Now obvious convenience and long-established custom have given—by a kind of "private legislation" on the part of Bishops and Clergy—a very considerable degree of liberty, to which (however irregular in point of law) no reasonable body objects. This, however, is very different to the individual clergyman "taking liberties" with the Prayer-Book, and in ignorance of the history and often the spiritual meaning of a service, presenting to his people what the educated

man recognises as a maimed, or what is still worse, an obscured rendering of what he has a right to expect in his parish church.

Of course the spirit is above the letter. But in nine cases out of ten the letter is that which best interprets the spirit. As a general rule people can trust the experience of ages far more readily than the very short experience of the rector or vicar, or even of the curate, though I do not forget the lack of flexibility in our system, which makes additional forms and new methods in their proper place almost a necessity. The highest aim of the true minister is to be ever leading the people into conscious communion with God ; and he is a bold man who, in the normal worship of Common Prayer, trusts his own judgment against the matured thought of many devout minds. *Sursum corda* is his constant appeal, and nothing must satisfy him—not the most crowded congregations, the most frequented Communions, the most orderly and dignified ceremonial, unless under and through it all there sounds this great diapason note, *Habemus ad Dominum*, “We lift them up unto the Lord.” And for this we do well to trust our Prayer-Book fully, at least in the regular public services of the Church.

Thus loyalty to the inner *spirit* of our Prayer-Book does not release us from the duty of loyal obedience to its external order. To some of us the externals of worship appeal less forcibly than to others, and attention to details may seem to hinder rather than to help. But I would warn you to be careful lest this indifference to careful obedience to order should really be due to a measure of moral slackness, and would ask you to ask yourselves whether more care in presenting the Prayer-Book ideal of public worship to your people would not tend to a deeper spiritual life in yourselves and in them.

Nothing is more certain than that our present difficulties partly arise from the fact that, owing to the rigid obedience to rubrics which the law requires, disobedience of one sort or another is universal. No clergyman observes all the rubrics. It is unrubrical to omit all the longer exhortations. It is unrubrical to give notices other than those prescribed in the

Prayer-Book, unless enjoined by the King or Ordinary. According to some, it is unrubrical to sit at the Epistle, though I do not find these purists standing during the sermon and lessons, which, if their construction of rubrics is right, they ought to do. Our Bishops are not spotless in the matter, for episcopal addresses, and even hymns, are unrubrical in the Confirmation Service. Indeed, I am told that even the famous "Ridsdale judgment" is not obeyed by some eminent Cathedral dignitaries who never wear a cope in their ministrations.

Now it is quite absurd to compare such breaches of order as those I have named with the grave irregularities which have brought about the present crisis in our Church. I need not take up time in labouring that point at present. But when we come to administrative duties, and consider the difficulties of a Bishop in enforcing the law against serious offenders, it is impossible not to recognise that this disregard of disobedience in small insignificant matters greatly hampers the Bishop when he endeavours to remedy neglect and disorder of a weighty and significant kind. There is a sense of unfairness, however unreasonable, when rules strained in one direction are acquiesced in, while the same acquiescence is refused when they are strained in another.

I myself believe it is a perfectly fair answer to say that most of the irregularities which I have named above, and there are many others like them, are introduced for general convenience, are inseparable from the strict enforcement of an ancient act of uniformity, and give little or no offence to anybody. But there are other irregularities, not based on general convenience, but due to carelessness, to a slender respect for plain and undisputed directions, or to a deficient conception of the standard of worship which the Prayer-Book enjoins. They do not arise from any deliberate intention to disregard authority, nor from any organised effort to alter or modify the type of Prayer-Book worship, but they are for the most part uncalled for, they give offence to many, and they hinder the administrative work of the Church by providing an excuse for more serious breaches of

order. It is by these breaches that a real obstacle to enforcing discipline has been created.

In a spirit of deep sympathy for the inconvenience which many find in altering long-established custom, but with an earnest appeal for a reasonable loving consideration of the genuine difficulties which even trivial and traditional irregularity causes, I venture to name some of this middle class of irregularities. I mean those irregularities which, on the one hand, cannot fairly be regarded as necessary or even convenient, and which, on the other hand, are absolutely free from the charge of being grave and significant disorder. Let us look at them together in the presence of our Master for whose sake we are willing to bear and to forbear, studying not only what is of the utmost spiritual moment and concern, but also all things which make for edification, unity, and peace.

The following are instances of divergence from rubrics which are plain and undisputed, and are in no way dependent on legal decisions :

1. In a great number of churches there is little or no observance of Saints' Days : in a few, not even of Ascension Day. I ask, Is this strictly loyal ? Is it desirable, except when there are exceptional conditions of difficulty ? firstly, because we lose bright lessons of holy example which can then be taught, and, secondly, because "Sundays and Holy-days" are always named together in our rubrics, while in one of the Homilies—the special duty of observing Sunday as the Lord's Own Day is emphatically urged.

2. The rubric after the Nicene Creed which directs the curate "to declare unto the people what Holy-days or Fasting-days are in the week following to be observed" is perfectly plain, and should be obeyed apart from the manner in which those days are kept.

The report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline says a good deal on the observance of days excluded from the calendar at the Reformation, or even of later Roman introduction. Such are *Corpus Christi* Day, All Soul's Day,

and such later observances as the "Feast of the Sacred Heart." But we cannot protest with the fulness of legitimate force against these serious and harmful excesses, while we ourselves are neglecting an express requirement to notify, as they occur, those feasts which (I quote from the Prayer-Book), "are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year."

Nor are we doing justice to our own principles, or to our desire to bring before our people the deep spiritual lessons of our Liturgy, if we pass by such days as Ember and Rogation days without due and even emphatic notice. Those days mark in a very special manner the duty of intercessory prayer. Of Ember days it is unnecessary to speak, though much more might be done to make their observance more practical. Unfortunately, no guidance is given for the observance of Rogation days. Yet what should hinder us from marking them as days for a special exercise of intercession, and for a thoughtful consideration of the duty and blessing of prayer. This year, in Ridley Hall, we had intercessory services on Rogation days at noon: on Monday for the work of the Church at home, on Tuesday for the work of the Church abroad, on Wednesday for the Student movement throughout the world. On Thursday these days find their climax in the happy celebration of our Lord's Ascension.

However observed, let us at least notice these days as the rubric plainly requires, and mention them in our sermons. Notice will lead to observance. Many omissions obviously serve the purpose of convenience, this omission serves no such purpose, nay, more, it hinders the full realization of the spiritual opportunities placed before us by our Church.

3. The practice of commencing evening Communion at the Offertory, or even at the short Invitation, cannot be defended. The Ten Commandments, the Epistle and the Gospel, the fuller Nicene Creed—these are things which are integral parts of our historic service, and as Evangelical Churchmen we yield to none in claiming that our service, with all the added beauty of its Reformation passages, finds its ancestry in the services of much

earlier days. Moreover, these are things rarely if ever heard by those who find in evening Communion the only opportunity for commemorating the great act of redemption, and partaking of the ordained pledges of salvation. To say that the first part of the service has been said earlier in the day cannot justify the omission. Self-examination, reading of God's Holy Word, the open confession of faith, and intercession for others are inseparable from a public act of Communion as ordered by the Reformed Church of England.

Moreover, is it not most unwise, when so much keen though, as we think, unreasonable opposition exists to evening Communion, to give a real handle for the charge that such celebrations are marked by carelessness and defect? Surely the whole service ought to be said. Loyalty forbids any other course.

4. Another rubric which is still neglected in some Churches, is as follows: "And when there is a Communion, the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient."

It is a very small matter provided they are placed there some time before the prayer for the Church Militant, so that those who regard the elements as included in the term "oblations" may join in that simple and very ancient offering of all our gifts for God's service. But this is as plain a direction as you can find anywhere in the Prayer-Book, no suspicion of any superstition or error can be fairly connected with it, and its neglect gives offence to many careful and devout rubricians. The Prayer-Book of the Church of Ireland allows the act at any time before the prayer for the Church, but our rubrics do not. Get a side table or bracket (you need not call it a credence table if you don't like the word), or have the elements carried reverently at that time from the vestry (as they did in the "Great Entrance" of the Eastern Church), but keep the rule.

I know that these two last changes have sometimes given offence to many devout and worthy people who have been brought up to the old custom. *Still, we must claim the right as clergymen to yield obedience.* The changes can be made

wisely, and with considerate explanations so as to disarm opposition, for novelty is the real objection to them. And we must tell our people that the difficulty of Bishops ought to be considered. Their power to administer discipline to grave offenders depends, to a larger extent than we have realized, upon the willing loyalty of those who in minor matters have followed custom rather than express rule.

Coupled with these defects in the conduct of the Communion service, let me name one small defect, and one small excess, to which some of us may plead guilty.

The defect is that of omitting the prayer for the Church Militant when there is no Communion. Such a valuable act of intercession when definitely ordered, cannot rightly be omitted, even when a short collect is said before the blessing. Both are directed by the rubrics.

The excess is that of inserting a collect and the grace after the prayer for the Church, and before the non-communicating congregation withdraws. A sufficient pause is more than justified. it is implied; but to insert a formal close at that point is to break in upon the ideal completeness of the service, and to lose a forcible though silent reminder to those who rarely, or perhaps never fulfil our Lord's command, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

5. There is a distinct order in our Prayer-Book for public catechizing. I remember once putting it to Archbishop Temple whether the introduction of Sunday-schools did not fairly modify this obligation. He allowed that it did. When this rubric was written the work which Mr. Raikes so nobly inaugurated was unknown. But modification is not abolition. Only a part of the children are supposed to be present, and I doubt whether the presence of children of all sorts and ages is helpful to successful catechizing. This subject will come up in the afternoon conference, so that I leave it for the present, merely adding that no part of the religious education of the young can wisely or fairly be now omitted, when we are combining so widely in the battle for the children which has been forced upon us.

6. There is the difficult question of daily service. It is really a matter of conscience as to what is an "urgent cause," and what it is to be "otherwise reasonably hindered." That is the question each parish clergyman has to face and to answer, and I feel sure that such "reasonable hindrance" does in this altered state of society and of parish work not unfrequently exist. But, speaking with deference to the judgment of those who are actively engaged in the ministry of widely differing parishes, I strongly suspect that the "reasonable hindrance" of the preface has had a very generous latitude allowed to it. Do we remember the avowed purpose, the simple noble aim of daily service? It is "that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him" (*i.e.*, with the minister). Now it is hard to believe that *where there are those who desire to do so, or could be encouraged to do so*, and where the position of the Church and vicarage and the other duties of the clergyman allow it, there can be a "reasonable hindrance," or that it would not be a great blessing and help to the souls of both clergyman and people to embrace this ideal of daily public prayer, which may be made in some parishes one of the most spiritual characteristics of our system of public worship.

7. There is the Athanasian Creed. Personally I hold that where the history of the creed and its setting is understood, and the wording of some of the difficult clauses is properly weighed, the difficulty of publicly reciting it is far less than is commonly supposed. But I am also conscious that many, far better able to weigh historical evidence than I am, have come to an opposite conclusion. And it is certain that we cannot instruct the man in the pew as to what the creed really means to the extent that is necessary, so that it is the *primâ facie* meaning of the words that really holds the field. For that reason I wish with all my heart that some change might be made, which, while preserving the valuable public protest of the *Quicumque vult* against loose views on cardinal truths, would relieve the consciences of many loyal and obedient Churchman. For such a change we have the right to pray and labour. But until some modification

becomes a fact, we shall do well to fulfil our plain obligation to recite this creed, while we strive by occasional sermons and addresses to point out where the value of the inner symbol lies, and how each clause marks some battle fought, some victory won by the famous men, the men of renown, the men who stood for truth *contra mundum*,—though the world was against them.

These are some of the matters which seem to be of most importance in the defects which have been brought before the Commission.

There are three notes of loyalty which should be, I think, beyond debate.

1. Obedience to the Bishop, and especially when he speaks as the mouthpiece of the whole Episcopate. The Prayer-Book recognises the Bishop as the proper counsellor in all cases of doubt and diversity. Our ordination vows bind us to such obedience. The evidence given before the Royal Commission bears witness to a very general readiness to submit to Episcopal directions, and not least, I am thankful to remember, in the matters of defect which I have named. The case of daily services is peculiar, but there too there is an increasing readiness to conform so far as circumstances allow. We must avoid the very dubious loyalty of those who say, "I don't agree with my Bishop—he is an excellent man, but no more infallible than the Pope—and when his admonitions conflict with my own ideas, they cannot be 'godly admonitions.'"

2. There should be a loyal frank recognition of our Church's system in its fulness. The close of Exhortation I. on the private ministry of reconciliation, where the public exercise of that ministry has failed, must be fairly accepted, and when the exceptional case arises, no one can rightly refuse to act upon it. In lecturing upon that part of the Prayer-Book, I always point out what seems to me to be the best means of affording "by the ministry of God's word" that "benefit of Absolution" which it is the privilege of the individual to ask for in private, if he cannot quiet his conscience by means of our more formal public ministrations.

Again, the Church Kalendar, with its ordered round of feasts and fasts, its Holy-days, its Rogation days and Ember seasons, should be frankly recognised, and as far as possible followed out. Self-discipline demands external rule as the means of securing full spiritual blessing. What do we put in its place when we neglect the guidance of our Church? For my own part, both as a matter of personal need, and of the spiritual training of others, I feel that we have lost by our neglect of these appointed means of enforcing the "discipline of Christ."

3. Let us keep to the rubrics, as our appointed rules in conducting Divine worship. And let us be especially careful not to take liberties where any rubric or formulary has proved to be a battle ground of controversy. Let us yield scrupulous obedience when that is the case. We have sworn to obey, and let us remember the divine approval of the man who "swaereth to his neighbour and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance."

We have an anxious and perilous time ahead. But *Dominus regnavit*. Let us meet it with patience, obedience, prayer. Do not be in a hurry to speak (or write) on the issues raised by the Royal Commission Report. It will take long and patient study in all its parts before its purpose and plan can be fully understood. It must be read as a whole, not one section apart from another. And—avoid rash vows.

In the meantime, while action is being taken, let perfect trust in God and loyal obedience rule our hearts. Let us strengthen the hand of our rulers, and do all we can to avoid an embittered controversy within the city, when "The Gaul is at the gate."

Above all, let us pray, often and earnestly, in public and in private, with friends and when alone, that God may cleanse and defend the Church, and in His mercy bring about the time when "all who profess and call themselves Christians" shall "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

Let me add a word on the dislike which many of our

younger brethren feel to being thought narrow and to be labelled as belonging to a certain school.

The dislike is not wholly without cause. There is a narrowness which excludes generous recognition of the loyalty of those who differ from us as to the best methods of expressing our devotion, although such methods fall fairly within the limits of our Church's rule. And there is a generation that lives in an atmosphere of controversy, that sees the whole truth and has nothing more to learn. What drives many a man out of the ranks of that school to which we belong is our intolerance of what appeals to minds which differ from our own. Party talk, the ceaseless waving of our evangelical flag, the constant beating of the big drum,—many of us feel that these things are not necessary to the maintenance of spiritual religion, that indeed they hinder it. Controversy, stern and keen, is necessary, it may be very necessary in the near future; but let us keep very severely on our guard lest in it we lose touch of the Master and become severed from His Spirit of love.

Party spirit again alienates many,—*ἐπιθεία*. A custom is continued not because it serves to edify but because loyalty to a party seems to demand it. Let us do the right thing because it is right, not because a certain school demands it. I fear that evening Communion, which has brought such untold blessing where it has met a real want, has sometimes been regarded as a necessary note of a truly Evangelical Church, even where other hours are more fitting and helpful.

But with this caution, I say to each of you, do not be afraid of being known to be an Evangelical Churchman. You need not go about always wearing a label to announce the fact. We want the *thing*, not the *name*.

Remember there are the great schools of thought, there always will be, and it will be a sad day for our Church when any one of them is excluded. And if you yield to a nervous fear of being called names, and say you are a Churchman, a true Churchman, and nothing but a Churchman, you run into the danger of drifting into a shallow, colourless religion, and of

belonging to the narrowest party that I know of within our national Church.

Strong currents run in narrow channels, and it is quite possible to hold firmly the great doctrines for which Nicholas Ridley died, which Charles Simeon taught, and the founders of this Hall desired to perpetuate, and yet live in friendly relations with all loyal Churchmen who are willing to endeavour, though each working on separate lines, to save our Church from error in doctrine, formality and superstition in worship, and coldness in life. Nor let us forget that even Evangelicals cannot all see eye to eye in minor matters. We must avoid suspicions, hope all things, hold all together, *pro patria, pro ecclesia, in Christo.*



Mr. Burns and the Unemployed.

BY THE REV. W. EDWARD CHADWICK, B.D., B.Sc.

DURING the last few months interest in the proceedings of Parliament has been so concentrated upon the Education Bill that other matters, in themselves of great importance, have not generally received the attention they deserved. One of the most useful debates which has taken place for some time in the House of Commons was that which arose on the proposition of Mr. Burns to devote £200,000 to carry out the provisions of the "Unemployed Workman's Act" during the next few months. The speeches with which Mr. Burns opened and closed this debate deserve careful study. He spoke with a very full sense of his responsibility, and at the same time with the feeling that he must tell the House, and through the House the country, some very unpalatable truths. In making the proposition Mr. Burns stated that this Act, which was somewhat hurriedly passed by the late Government almost at the end of their term of office, had satisfied no one. The Central Poor Law Conference, the Municipal Corporations Association, the Charity Organization Society, Trades Union officials, Labour