

for destruction, and asked no questions, it would be delivered up as being less valuable than the Gospels; and that the spade of that benefactor of the little flock of scholars, the archæologist, may yet unearth a copy. But there may be another reason, and if the reason I am going to suggest is a possible one, it is one that the clergy—Bishops especially—might take note of.

The early Church, doctrinally, had a very high ideal; it wanted the best; it did not think that for teaching anything would do; double honour was to be given to those who ruled well, especially to those who laboured in the word and teaching. Now “in the word and teaching” must mean what is now held up to shame and reproach as “dogma.” This Q was not, even though it contained the great passage, “No one knoweth the Son, save the Father,” etc., and though, as Dr. Sanday points out, it presupposes the Divinity of our Lord, just as St. Mark’s Gospel does. Nevertheless, Q does not rise anywhere near the height of Paulinism, still less of the Johannine teaching. It was “milk for babes,” and St. Paul’s condemnation of teachers who were content to give, and of congregations who were content to receive nothing more, is emphatic. In other words, Q found honourable interment because the early Church had a very high standard, and did not think Q quite came up to the standard.

So simple an explanation as this would not satisfy a learned German Professor, but it quite satisfies me, the more for that it contains a useful lesson.



### Prayer-Book Revision.

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY EARDLEY-WILMOT, M.A.

IT might be thought unnecessary again to call attention to the subject of Prayer-Book Revision, since so much has already been written and said to show both the need and the demand for it. The position, however, taken up by a section of Churchmen seems to make it imperative to state again what

may be said in favour of it, especially as it appears to present itself to Evangelical Churchmen. And it is the more necessary since, in view of recent events, the subject of the revision of the Book of Common Prayer has become of the gravest importance to the whole Church and people of England and, indeed, to the whole Anglican Communion. For it is stirring not only the Church at home, but throughout Greater Britain. The Synod of the Church in Canada, for example, is debating the subject, and a strong party is demanding revision. Indeed, it would seem as if "revision" there would even anticipate "revision" here if the matter is long delayed by us.

It may be useful to remind ourselves of the steps which have brought the revision of the Prayer-Book into what we may call "the arena of practical politics." The subject, which had often been mooted in assemblies of Churchmen as well as privately, was brought to the front by the issue of the "Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline" in 1906. That Report, which was based upon a large amount of evidence, after recommending that certain specified practices which are "plainly significant of teaching repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and certainly illegal, should be promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the Bishops and, if necessary, by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts," went on to recommend that "Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations with instructions to consider, with a view to enactment by Parliament, (a) the preparation of a new rubric regulating the ornaments of the Ministers of the Church, and (b) to frame such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service, etc., as may secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand." A third recommendation was that the law should be so amended as to give wider scope for the exercise of a regulative authority in the matter of additional and special services, collects, and hymns. It will be seen, therefore, that by an influential commission—for such it was—composed of

Bishops, clergy and laity, representing all schools of thought, as well as ecclesiastical scholarship and legal acumen, revision of the Prayer-Book was not only thought possible, but was recommended; and the process was named by which revision might be carried through.

In November of the same year the Royal Letter of Business was issued, and was read by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the whole Convocation in full Synod assembled. In asking for the appointment of an Advisory Committee upon the procedure to be taken in reply to the Letter, the Archbishop said: "Rules clear in principle and yet elastic in detail we do absolutely require, if the Church in its manifold activities is to be abreast of modern needs and yet loyal to ancient order." The Lambeth Conference of last year appointed a Committee to consider and report upon the subject of "Prayer-Book Adaptation and Enrichment." The report presented was entirely in favour of general revision and adaptation, though it avoided the discussion of what are known as the more "burning questions." At the Church Congress at Manchester a whole session was devoted to the subject, and a strong lead in favour of revision was given by the Bishops of Gloucester and Sodor and Man. During the present year we have had the reports of the Committees appointed by the Houses of Convocation of both Provinces to consider the Royal Letter of Business. Definite proposals are, therefore, before us, and we are able to see in some measure what form revision—if carried through at the present time—might take. It is not our purpose now to consider those proposals in detail, but rather to consider generally what attitude we should adopt as loyal Churchmen, faithful to Evangelical principles and zealous to promote spiritual life in the Church, to the whole question of Prayer-Book revision, though, of course, with special reference to the proposals which are now before the Convocations.

There are, then, practically only two ways of meeting the proposal for revision. For a third way, that of swallowing all the proposals as they stand, without objection or alteration, is

clearly unthinkable. Indeed, since Convocation has not yet considered the proposals, there is no final form for acceptance.

1. There is the "non-possumus" attitude—meeting any suggestion for revision with a direct negative. That attitude is well represented by the motion which was moved by Lord Halifax and seconded by Mr. Athelstan Riley in the London Diocesan Conference about three months ago: "That this Conference is of opinion that any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer in the present circumstances of the Church of England, instead of promoting peace, would tend to increase dissension and disunion." A similar resolution stood on the agenda paper of the recent meeting of the Representative Church Council, also in the name of Lord Halifax, who may be regarded as the champion of the party in the Church opposed to all reform. Clearly, therefore, this may be taken as being the present policy of the section of the Church represented by the English Church Union. They are impressed, they tell us, with the growing spirit of unity in the Church. The alleged lax state of discipline in the Church has been tremendously exaggerated. They desire, above all things, peace, and would deprecate anything which would tend to schism. Their "policy is to keep the Evangelical party in the Church, and to prevent a split." It is hardly necessary to say that, as Evangelical Churchmen, we go heart and soul with them in these desires. We, too, would labour for peace, as we must also contend for truth. We have not the least intention of forsaking the Church. But there are one or two things which, I hope it is not uncharitable to say, suggest reflection. When, for example, we are asked whether, if the Prayer-Book is not obeyed now, it is reasonable to suppose that obedience would be given to a revised edition, it rather suggests the idea that the plea for peace is a plea to be let alone, because "we shall never do what we do not like." Or when Mr. Riley, in opposing any revision, says, "We have faith in our own principles, and we know that in the long-run they will prevail"; does it not sound rather like, "We do not want revision, because, if you only give us time to

educate the rising generation and accustom people—as they are being accustomed increasingly every year—to an advanced ritual, revision will not be called for, or will be carried out on lines of our own choosing”? But however this may be, it would seem to be pretty clear that, judging by the evidence given before the Royal Commission, revision on the lines proposed by at any rate the main part of the reports presented to Convocation would disturb what we may call the “equilibrium of laxity and lawlessness” as at present adjusted between the two great schools of thought, and throw the weight of lawlessness very much into the scale which is not occupied by Evangelical Churchmen. May it not be well asked, moreover, whether the “non-possimus” attitude is either politic or possible, at any rate without grave risk to the spiritual life and usefulness of the Church? The need for revision is acknowledged almost without contradiction. The labours of scholars, both Biblical and Liturgical, during the centuries since the Prayer-Book was last revised, have added enormously to the stores of material for the work. The history of the Church and the general progress of civilization and culture during that time have made prominent deficiencies and blemishes in the Prayer-Book which need to be corrected and brought into accordance with modern needs. To quote the words of the Report of the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury, “detailed rules and regulations put forward at a particular period must, in some points, gradually become obsolete. This has happened amongst ourselves to a considerable extent, partly owing to the increase of population, partly owing to changes in ideals of observance, partly owing to the alteration of some of the conditions of family or civic life.” Now here is a fact which must be recognized. And no appeal to the fears of Churchmen, on the ground of alteration in the Book of Common Prayer being certain to promote dissension if undertaken at the present time, should be allowed to prevent its recognition. The point was well put by the Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (Dr. Emery Barnes) in a letter to the *Times* on April 30. “If,” he said, “there be danger for the

Church in doing the work at the present time, what time has been without danger? The very first revision of the Latin service books, which gave us the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., was carried through at a time full of peril. The opposition of parties was at least as vehement then as it is to-day. The last revision, which gave us our present book, was made under similar circumstances of danger. In both cases it was for the general good of the Church that the thing should be done, and so the then rulers of the Church defied their fears and did their duty. If Churchmen shrink to-day because there is 'a lion in the path,' the spiritual life of the Church will suffer, and many will be lost to the Church, and perhaps to Christianity, who might have been saved had the Church risen to her mission and consulted more fully the wants of all her children."

2. This suggests the other and, I venture to think, the better way of dealing with the proposals that are now made for revision. It is to accept generally the principle that revision is desirable and practicable, and would tend to spiritual life in the Church, but at the same time to stand firm against any alteration in the standard of doctrine as laid down in the authorized formularies of our Church; to recognize, in short, the difference between matters of faith and matters of discipline, between credenda and agenda, between changes which involve doctrine and those concerned only with practice. Now, without entering into detail, a study of the various proposals which are before the Church at the present time, and which have yet to be discussed in the Convocations, will show that there are a large number which are expressly designed to "meet the changed conditions of modern life and some of the present needs of the Church; to secure greater elasticity, and thereby to be a help to worship and to spiritual life in the Church." Broadly speaking, the proposals made may be divided into three classes: (a) Changes which simply give sanction to quite unimportant matters which are already in general use; (b) changes involving no point of doctrine or matter of grave controversy which would

afford the elasticity desired by so many, and would tend to edification ; and (*c*) changes which do involve doctrine, and the effect of which would be to alter the doctrinal position of the Church of England as expressed in her authorized formularies from that agreement with primitive doctrine and practice which was restored to her at the Reformation—which would, in fact, throw her back into those mediæval times from the corruptions and errors of which she was, by the grace of God, set free. And may I be allowed to say here that it is, I think, a matter of regret that while there was evidently a desire on the part of the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury to hold the balance evenly, in most cases, between the leading schools of thought in the Church, and to act up to their expressed wish “to preserve everything closely linked with the history of the Church ; to preserve, also, as much as possible of old ideals of duty, and yet to provide for the changed and changing conditions of Church life,” they should yet, in dealing with burning questions of controversy, have gone so far over to one side as to make recommendations which would legalize “the Eucharistic vestments ;” which would sanction reservation beyond the primitive form in which it was practised in the early Church, and in a way which would leave an opening for the reintroduction of the exaggerations and abuses which had grown round the primitive practice in mediæval times ; and which, by requiring from Deacons at their Ordination only the same affirmation as to Holy Scripture which is required from Priests, would not secure from them any definite expression of belief in the authority of God’s Word, and would, in effect, tend to weaken the authority of Holy Scripture in the Church. Alterations such as these we would heartily join with Lord Halifax in resisting, though possibly upon different grounds.

For while we think that the proposals in question, and others which are not now named, carry us too far in one direction, he and his party may think that they do not carry us far enough ; and if revision is to come at all, would desire that it should be of a far more serious character than even the alterations just

mentioned. We shall, at any rate, be at one in believing that those alterations would not be acceptable to the Church at large, would not promote peace, but would tend to increase dissension and disunion. For how, after all, could it promote peace and unity, and be a satisfactory settlement of a difficult question, to have two standards of doctrine and practice authoritatively permitted, even though it is sought to safeguard them by declaration and regulation? We have abundant evidence that declaration carries no weight, and that regulation would be disregarded. Indeed, there is no indication that any of the recommendations which have been made upon the subject of the Ornaments Rubric would be acceptable to, or accepted by, those represented by the President and officials of the English Church Union. Would it not be wise, therefore, to leave those matters alone, at any rate, until some further authoritative pronouncement is made, or until the desired reform in Convocation is effected, and to concentrate effort, for the present, upon the large number of proposals upon which there is substantial agreement, and which might be acted upon without dissension? The Prayer-Book as it stands is in matters of doctrine, and of practice where it involves doctrine, the expression of the faith of a Church—Primitive, Apostolic, Catholic, and Reformed. On those grounds it meets the needs and satisfies the desires of the great majority of the English people. To alter it in the way proposed would, apparently, please no one, and would most certainly cause grievous pain and offence, and be a “serious and even dismaying shock to multitudes of loyal Churchmen, true sons of the Anglican Reformation, Scriptural and Catholic.”<sup>1</sup>

There is just one other aspect of the question which should be mentioned. It is this. It is, we are told, most undesirable to submit the Prayer-Book, or any alterations thereof, to the present House of Commons. The Prayer-Book, as we have it authorized by Act of Parliament, it is said, was authorized by a House of Commons composed entirely of members of the Church of England. Now, every form of religion is represented in

<sup>1</sup> Report of Upper House of Convocation of York.



Parliament, and there are more Nonconformist members in the House of Commons now than in any previous assembly. Well, that is true. But it is hardly likely, I think, that "the present House of Commons" will be asked to consider any proposals for revision. What the next House of Commons will be it would be rash, perhaps, to speculate. But in any case, for good or for ill, the Prayer-Book is annexed to an Act of Parliament, and would have to be submitted to Parliament for alteration. It would be lamentable indeed were sacred matters of doctrine to be debated across the floor of the House of Commons. We may earnestly hope and pray that such might never be the case; that the dignity of the assembly, and the not yet lost religiousness of the nation, would prevent any such thing. But there would be no irreverence and no Erastianism—only a recognition of the circumstances of the case—in presenting a schedule of the changes I have classed under (*a*) and (*b*), and which form by far the largest part of the proposals for revision, to Parliament to be passed by a short and enabling Act. It would be better, of course, had the Church power to act solely on her own initiative, and we may hope and work for the day when it shall be so. But it is not necessary, surely, to wait until she secures that power to obtain the reasonable alterations referred to.

Where, therefore, we can safely gain liberty, and help in any way the spiritual life of the Church, by wise alteration and addition in non-essential matters of practice, let us, as a living Church, go forward and strive to meet the needs and thought of the present day, undeterred by any fears of dissension and disunion, where all is done for the glory of God and the common weal; recognizing that the blame for dissension and disunion, if it came, would rest with those who opposed such reasonable and desired reform. But where principles of truth are at stake, and where the changes proposed would favour doctrines which the Church of England has distinctly repudiated, let us, for the present, at any rate, hold our hands. Let us, as Evangelical Churchmen, take our stand upon the principle that some changes in the Book of Common Prayer are both expedient and neces-

sary, and will conduce to spiritual life in the Church ; but let us at the same time steadily resist any changes which would destroy the present balance of principle and practice in the Church, take away from its primitive and Scriptural standard of doctrine, and take the Church of England in its authorized formularies back to " the Romeward side of the line of deep cleavage which separates the Anglican from the Roman communion."



### Father Tyrrell and the Jesuits.

By G. G. COULTON, M.A.

MUCH that has been written concerning the late Father Tyrrell's death and burial is plainly beside the mark. For good or evil, the modern Roman Church is, *par excellence*, the Church of rigid discipline. Its ideal cannot be more pithily stated than in the *Catholic Times'* leading article of February 22, 1901: "The Holy See, in its wisdom, ordains the law; the Bishops, scattered over the earth, receive its provisions. The Holy See decides the Faith; the Bishops, each in his respective diocese, guard its purity, and seek to preserve it from admixture of error. Surely this is the true Catholic doctrine." This is the body which Father Tyrrell joined in his rising manhood—on more or less false pretences, as he himself seems to have realized clearly enough afterwards—but on this particular point he must have known fairly well what to expect. Moreover, of his further choice he joined the Society of Jesus, and accepted that "Ignatian ideal of obedience" which "requires in every Jesuit, in all that is not sin, perfect obedience to the Divine will as interpreted to him by the holy constitutions of his Order, and explained to him by the living voice of his superiors, who stand to him in the place of Christ, according to those words of Christ: 'Whoso heareth you heareth Me'" (Father Coupe, S.J., in the *Monitor* for August 9, 1901). We have therefore every reason to believe that he, like Newman, faced at first as