

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1923

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Cheltenham Findings.

THE Eighth Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, clerical and lay, held at Cheltenham on May 23, 24, and 25 under the presidency of the Rector, the Rev. Canon H. A. Wilson, considered the general subject of Prayer Book Revision. The following Findings were agreed upon at the final Session of the Conference. They are to be taken, as in previous years, as expressing the general sense of the Conference, and not as representing in detail the views of individual members.

1. The Conference has approached the consideration of the Report on Prayer Book Revision with grateful appreciation of the devotion, learning, and careful and painstaking work of the Committee responsible for its production. It finds much in the Report which it cordially welcomes as supplying many real needs and promoting the depth and sincerity of public worship by bringing the Book of Common Prayer into closer relationship with the circumstances of our own day.

2. The Conference is in full sympathy with the general desire for such revision, on true Anglican lines, as will bring the Prayer Book into fuller correspondence with modern needs.

3. The Conference holds that it is the duty of all Evangelical Churchmen to make their contribution to the work of revision.

4. The Conference generally approves the proposals in the Measure (N.A. 84) with the exception of those concerning Holy Communion.

5. The Conference urges upon the Houses of the National Assembly the desirability of dividing the Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923, into two Measures, one to consist of all clauses relating to the Offices of the Holy Communion and the Communion of the Sick, the other to consist of the remaining clauses, and urges the prior consideration of the latter Measure.

6. The Conference feels that responsibility to future generations demands that not expediency but the maintenance of truth shall be the guiding principle of revision. It would point out that Holy Scripture has always been recognized as the final court of appeal

in matters of faith and worship by Anglicans of all schools of thought.

7. The Conference holds that the doctrinal position here stated is in full accord with that of the great body of English Churchmen since the Reformation and with that of theologians of such varied types as Cranmer and Hooker, Cosin and Andrewes.

8. The Conference regards the proposal to provide an alternative book as a dangerous measure dictated by considerations of expediency alone, and urges that alternative forms, if any, should be embodied in the services of one book.

9. The Conference believes that an alternative liturgy would inevitably harden and perpetuate existing differences, and create fresh divisions among those who now use the present book.

10. The Conference would welcome some further addition to the proposals of the Measure such, for example, as special services for Foreign Missions, thanksgiving for the blessings of Harvest, forms for men's and women's services and children's services.

11. The Conference feels that while there are many proposals in the Measure which in its judgment require amendment, there are some which in their implications and cumulative effect call for the strongest opposition. Among these it would include :

The legalization of the Mass Vestments ;

The proposed changes in the Prayer of Consecration ;

The Reservation of the Sacrament, and

The Commemoration of All Souls.

12. The Conference regret that although as many as twenty-nine additions have been made to the Calendar, no Reformation or post-Reformation names, such as Tyndale, Cranmer, Hooker, Andrewes, and Butler have been included.

13. The Conference cannot forget that the Prayer Book is the heritage, not only of the Church of England, but of the British race, and would deplore changes which might raise further obstacles to re-union with our brethren of the non-Episcopal Churches.

14. The Conference, while realizing the advantage to the Church of a Revised Prayer Book, urges the paramount necessity of establishing some authority to enforce obedience to the new book when it is ordered for general use.

15. Though to its regret the Conference has been compelled to engage in this controversy, it desires to express its deep conviction that the greatest need of the world is the presentation of the Gospel of Christ in all its fullness. It recognizes with thankfulness the signs of spiritual revival which are now abundantly manifest ; and the earnest desire in all schools of thought to use the opportunity thus afforded for a renewed and more earnest effort to extend the Kingdom of God.

These Findings need no comment from us, but we
 The Conference. may be permitted to express our thankfulness that
 the Conference was evidently so largely in agreement
 with the Revision policy which has been advocated consistently

by the National Church League ever since the Report of the Revision Committee was published. Nor is it necessary for us to add anything on the general question of Revision. The papers read at the Conference explored so fully every aspect of the subject that we prefer our readers' attention should be centred on these ; they are printed in this number. But to make the narrative complete we must say that important contributions were made also by Prebendary C. W. Wilson, Vicar of Swansea, the Rev. R. Bren, Vicar of Christ Church, Malvern, and Mr. T. H. Hilken, member of the National Assembly, as well as by others who took part in the general discussion. It should be pointed out also that Revision did not occupy the whole time of the Conference. Each session was preceded by Intercessions, and at the opening meeting the subject of Spiritual Revival was considered, the paper being read by the Rev. the Hon. W. Talbot Rice, Vicar of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, who was followed by the Rev. J. J. Summerhayes, Vicar of St. John's, Ealing, as selected speaker. At the Holy Communion Service at the Parish Church a devotional address was given by the Rev. E. Davies, Vicar of Charles, Plymouth. Thus was the Conference spiritually prepared in mind and heart for discussing the more controversial questions.

“ Liberal
Evangelicalism.” The writers of “ Liberal Evangelicalism ” have issued a volume that has deservedly attracted considerable attention within and without the Church of England. It has been criticized as “ a soulless Modernism ” and has been welcomed as a proof that Evangelicalism has leaders, who can lead not only the members of their School but also the whole Church to a correspondence between Christian teaching and modern thought. The writers would probably disown equally both suggestions, for they are intent on putting forth a general policy, that will serve as an eirenicon between Evangelicals who are separated from one another by different approaches to and different conclusions from the study of the Truth they hold in common. The book calls itself an “ Interpretation ” and professes to be a restatement by men who have burst the shackles of a traditionalism that preserved what was falsely accepted by all as true in the past and was associated with the essential message of the Gospel. Some, who have read carefully its pages, find greater

emphasis on "Liberal" than on "Evangelicalism" and an eagerness to accept modernist ideas in contrast to a lack of adherence to the generally accepted tenets of the School. The Editor states that on two subjects especially there is uneasiness among the younger Evangelicals—the Inspiration of Holy Scripture and the Doctrine of the Atonement. Both need restatement. But the most striking feature of the book is the assertion that its presentation of theological truth will in due time pass like the presentations of the past, and that the modern Evangelical will find his own effort at interpretation replaced under the guidance of the Holy Spirit by new efforts in relation to new modes of thoughts.

We have as much faith as the writers of this book
 Permanent or
 Temporary? in the progress of critical inquiry on sound lines.

We have no desire to close our eyes to facts or really "assured results," as the most thoroughgoing Modernist. But more than once we have asked when reading a passage, "Is not this conclusion based on a theory that has no claim to permanence and is only a temporary working hypothesis?" "Is not this concession offered in the interests of peace, without regard to a historical background which teaches the exact opposite to the view of the writer?" It sometimes has seemed to us that writers placed before themselves the ideal "the age needs this and that—at least this is my opinion—how may I adapt the Gospel to give what I think the age needs?" On these principles it is possible to interpret with full consciousness that such interpretation is only temporary, but is this the right attitude for Evangelicalism—either Liberal or Traditional—to adopt? The infallibilities may have gone, indefectible certitude may be a dream, but surely Christian truth is something more than the partial adaptation of a part of the Gospel to a part of the *Zeitgeist*? We commend the book to the attention of all students, as it is an honest attempt to represent a type of approach to Truth which is prevalent in our time. With very much in the book we are in complete approval, but with a great deal we respectfully disagree as incomplete and at times something like a reversal of what Scripture teaches.

EVANGELISM.

BY THE REV. W. J. LIMMER SHEPPARD, M.A., Vicar
of Holy Trinity, Ripon.

II

IN the previous article we have considered Public Evangelism ; we now turn to consider the much more neglected, and yet much more needed, work of Personal Evangelism.

It has been contended that what the Church needs is to concentrate on this great duty of Personal Evangelism, and that in so doing the old method of Public Evangelism can be practically abandoned. I venture to think that, on the contrary, it is Public Evangelism that should be one of the main avenues by which the duty of Personal Evangelism may be brought home to the Christian conscience. The Parochial Mission, for illustration, if it has been the means of winning a number of persons for Christ in some Parish, should surely be followed by, or even include, definite teaching on the cardinal doctrine that Salvation must be followed by Service, and that the greatest of all service for Christ is that of Personal Evangelism. The history of the Early Church abounds in illustrations of the way in which those who had themselves found the Saviour immediately proceeded to lead others to Him. The Public Evangelism of Pentecost and the succeeding weeks is followed, after a time, by the members of the Infant Church, scattered abroad by persecution, going "everywhere preaching the word." Cornelius gathers together his kinsmen and near friends, that they may share his blessing ; the households of Lydia and of the Philippian jailor enter the kingdom with them ; the Thessalonian Church sounds forth "the Word of the Lord" far and near. The whole of the story of the Church of the first days is impregnated with this great fact, that those who have themselves been won for Christ at once become winners of others. Personal Evangelism was the universal practice. The great need, therefore, of our time for the extension of Personal Evangelism in the Church, calls also for the increase of the work of Public Evangelism, since it is through this method that multitudes may be won for Christ so as to become themselves Evangelists.

There is no question of the greatness of this need. Among the congregations of our Parish Churches throughout the land how many

of the laity are to be found who are really winners of others for Christ? Is it not the all but universal idea among our Communicants that soul winning is solely the work of the Clergy, and that there is no duty in this matter resting upon the ordinary Christian in any way? His or her work is to ensure their own salvation, to support their Church, to take part in the Parochial organisations—but never to endeavour, personally and privately, to lead others to the feet of the Saviour. Even those engaged in such definitely spiritual work as, say, Sunday School teaching scarcely ever make any real effort to lead any of the children in their classes to Christ. Yet that one work alone holds great possibilities. Some years ago, in a Mission in an Irish Parish, I had three petitions put into my Prayer Box, in the same handwriting, and at three different times; the first ran thus:—“A Christian worker asks prayer to be made ‘wise to win souls.’ Too long satisfied with sowing the seed and gathering but few sheaves, there has been stirred up a great desire.” The next petition was worded: “Please pray for my class of nine girls in our Sunday School, that while they are young their hearts may be given to the Lord Jesus”; thus the general desire to win souls was now focussed on the definite object of the Sunday School class. The final petition was for thanksgiving; “A Christian worker desires hearty thanks for being spiritually stirred up during this Mission; also for answered prayer in the conversion of two girls in her Sunday Class”; these girls were, I believe, won by the Teacher’s own efforts before the Mission ended. I recall a similar instance in Sheffield, where a Teacher of a class of senior girls was herself first brought to Christ; she at once asked for some Decision booklets that she might, for the first time, attempt definite Personal Evangelism in her class, with the result that five of its members immediately accepted the Saviour. In almost every department of Church work there is opportunity for such Personal Evangelism, but, of course, it is not confined to Church work, nor does it always begin there. The first disciple to lead another to Christ brought his own brother, and nowhere is this personal work needed more than in the family and the household. At the same time nowhere is it more difficult; there the timidity which seals the lips is felt the most, and so it is often found that the work of Personal Evangelism is confined to those outside the home, instead of beginning there.

I well remember a Church Army Sister, one of my keenest helpers at a Parochial Mission, who suddenly herself became convicted by the fact that, while she had been working hard for the conversion of the outsider, she had never attempted to reach her own sister, nor could she rest until the same night she had sent off to her a long letter pleading with her to accept the Saviour. It is the birth of this spirit among the Communicants of our Church which is so sorely needed, the deep conviction that Personal Evangelism cannot and must not be left to the Clergy alone, but that it is both the duty and the privilege of every true member of the Church of Christ.

But if this desirable consummation is even to be partially attained, there must be a definite and clear call to the work given by the Clergy to their people. The Free Churches in this respect have moved ahead of the Church of England. More than a year ago it was decided to initiate a campaign throughout their membership, by which Personal Evangelism should be recognized as an essential feature of the ordinary Christian life. The President of the Free Church Council recently issued a letter to all Free Church ministers, in which he says :—

“ The happy results that have already attended this particular method wherever it has been put into practice embolden me to urge it upon those who have not hitherto adopted it, and I venture to prophesy that they will be astonished by the harvest that will ensue. . . . The Church itself needs to return to its first principles. It must get back before it can bring back. The need can only be met by personal return, personal concern, and personal testimony. . . . Too often the specific work of Evangelism is left to the minister, whereas it is the business of every member.”

A series of pamphlets has also been issued broadcast by the Free Churches on this great subject, the following being some of the titles and writers : “ Personal Evangelism : The Supreme Need of Our Time ” (Dr. Clifford) ; “ Ministers and Personal Evangelism ” (by the same writer) ; “ Personal Evangelism : How to Begin ” (Dr. F. B. Meyer) ; “ Disciple Makers : Hints to Beginners ” (Rev. R. C. Gillie) ; “ Personal Evangelism : Disciple Making To-day ” (Rev. G. E. Darlaston) ; “ The Guidance of the Holy Spirit in Disciple Making ” (Hon. Emily Kinnaird). In the first of these pamphlets the writer states that, at a meeting of Free Church Ministers, the estimate of those members of the Churches who practised

Personal Evangelism did not reach 20 per cent., 10 per cent. being considered the more probable proportion ; at the same time it was believed that in the Salvation Army the proportion would be over 70 per cent., and among Christian Scientists higher still. One wonders what is the proportion within the borders of the Church of England ! At any rate what is really needed is a definite and clear call to this work from the leaders of our own Church, followed by the patient and persistent pressing home of this duty upon our Communicants from the pulpit. How often—or rather, how seldom—has one ever heard a sermon upon this great subject ! Yet in it lies the secret of the vitality and vigour of a Church's life.

At the same time the mere call to the work is not enough. The pamphlets to which I have just referred are excellent in their way, and all breathe a spirit of intense earnestness, but they are, it seems to me, singularly lacking in instruction. They consist almost entirely of *exhortation* to the work of Personal Evangelism ; they practically give no directions as to how it is to be done. Possibly that is left for some later publication, or for the various ministers to carry out among their own people. But in any case, so far as our own Church is concerned, the keenest and most earnest workers almost always require some kind of training in Evangelism, and very few of them ever obtain it. A good many years ago, in the town in which I then lived, a United Church Army was being planned, the Bishop presiding over a gathering of all the Clergy of the Parishes concerned. At the end of the meeting the Church Army Officer, who had come down to assist in the arrangements, told the Bishop that one of their needs at the Mission would be that of workers who could help in the inquiry rooms, and who knew something of leading souls to Christ. The Bishop turned to the Clergy and asked how many of the nineteen Parishes present could help to supply this need ; only two Parishes had any one with any experience of this work ! That is to say, that only in one-tenth of the Parishes of that particular town was there any teaching on Personal Evangelism, or, probably, any work of the kind being done.

One very great advantage of the Parochial Mission is the opportunity it gives for new workers to essay the untried task of Personal Evangelism. Again and again has some Vicar, at my request, called together on the first Saturday evening of the Mission a little

band of his keenest and most earnest workers, whom he has previously approached on the subject, and who are willing—often with real fear and trembling—to attempt to deal personally with anxious souls. These are gathered together, not for exhortation but for instruction, brief and inadequate as this may have to be—instruction as to the best method of leading an inquirer to the Saviour. My own firm conviction, based upon a long experience, is that it is of the greatest possible use in this work to be provided with a Decision booklet, which sets forth very simply and clearly the way of salvation. The use of such a booklet is referred to below; here I only mention it in order to explain that, at the meeting of Mission workers just mentioned, a copy of this is placed in each person's hands, the booklet is carefully gone through, and the workers are instructed during this process in the way to deal with the many points that constantly arise in this most delicate and difficult work. But, given the very best instruction, there is really no teacher like experience itself, and the Mission usually provides this for the workers as it progresses. Over and over again has one of the best results of a Mission been the formation of a little band of men and women who have had their first beginning in the work of Personal Evangelism.

Of course, if occasional After-Services are held in a Parish as a part of the ordinary Parochial work, then the same opportunities will occur without a Mission, but it will still be necessary to gather the selected workers together, only that in this case the instruction given can be much more adequate and extend over a longer period.

Nor does there seem to be any reason why in any Parish, if willing workers can be found, a kind of Study Class on Personal Evangelism should not be held, say for the six weeks of Lent, in which the methods of the work can be carefully discussed, difficulties met, and prayer offered unitedly for practical results to follow the Study Class. It is probable that those willing thus to be trained will only be very few in number, but leaven will always spread, and even one or two keen workers who practise Personal Evangelism will, in time, make a very great difference in the work and life of a Church.

In such a Class it will be found that what is needed most is instruction in the actual practice of Evangelism. One important branch of the subject is that known as "The Approach." How is the worker to get into touch with any particular person on such a matter

as their spiritual condition and needs? It is needless to say that this requires the greatest care. There must be, of course, most definite prayer, together with the worker's entire committal of himself to the Holy Spirit for guidance. On the one hand, a brusque and tactless approach may only offend and repel. On the other it is quite possible to let splendid opportunities slip. Frances Ridley Havergal used to say that she never tried to make opportunities; she left it to God to *make* them, her one care being not to fail to *take* them. At the same time, prayer and thought will often lead up to the provision of the opportunity desired. Dr. Trumbull, the well-known American worker, once came across a young man of agnostic tendencies, whom he desired to win, but with whom he had no common ground at all. Presently he discovered that this man was deeply interested in a certain branch of science, of which Dr. Trumbull was entirely ignorant. But he set himself to master the subject; he gathered every book on the matter that he could find, and spent some weeks in the study of them. Then one day he mentioned these books to the young man in question, and invited him to use them at any time. Interested at once, the young man found that here was some one who knew far more about the subject than most people, and discussions naturally followed, until from that common ground sprang the longed-for opportunity for Personal Evangelism—an opportunity only won at much sacrifice of time and study—through which the student was won for Christ. Sir George Williams was accustomed to say, when asked the best way of reaching a young man, "Don't argue; ask him to supper!" When himself in business as a young man, he found that one man who held a good position in the concern was bitterly opposed to those who, like George Williams, were earnest Christians. Quite undaunted, Williams determined to win him. Discussing with some of his friends the opponent's special tastes, he elicited the information—given half in fun—that he was a lover of oysters! Straightway Williams arranged with his friends to hold an oyster supper, to which the opponent was cordially invited. Partly from amusement at such an invitation from such a source, and partly out of bravado, he accepted. The supper was a great success, the evening a most lively one, while, at Williams' strict directions, not a word was said about religion. A great deal of the opponent's prejudice against the Christian men was thus broken down, and

later on he accepted another invitation, this time to a definitely religious gathering. So came the desired opportunity for Personal Evangelism. When George Williams afterwards founded the Young Men's Christian Association this former opponent was one of the first twelve members!

I have already alluded to the value of a Decision booklet. This can be used in many cases as the avenue of approach. It is quite easy for the worker to say to some friend, in whose spiritual welfare he is interested, "Have you ever seen this pamphlet?" and on receiving a negative reply, to hand one over, saying, "Have a look at it, and tell me afterwards what you think of it." Of course the friend *may* plainly indicate, on returning the booklet, that he does not wish to discuss it, in which case the wise worker will not make the mistake of trying to force a conversation; but in many cases the friend will willingly enter into discussion, and so give the opportunity for a straight personal talk. But the chief value of such a booklet is in the actual work of showing the way of salvation to a person who is really anxious to find it. In the first place it dispels a considerable amount of awkwardness and timidity; it is so much easier to talk when both are holding and looking at a booklet than without it. Then it holds the worker to the actually necessary points of instruction, and to a great extent prevents that wandering off to side issues, which is so unprofitable and yet so extremely easy. Again, the person who is being instructed can remember the teaching which is given far better when it is focussed around certain points in such a booklet, especially as he actually has the booklet in his possession afterwards, and can go over it again and again. Nor does its least value lie in the fact that, in most cases, it has a space in which the owner can record the date of his own decision, thus making it to him a perpetual reminder of the crisis in his spiritual life. The six great points in the booklet which I myself use, are Renunciation of Sin, Prayer for Pardon, and Faith in the Saviour's Word; then the consideration of Him as the Forgiver, the Keeper, and the Ruler. These are introduced by some plain statements about Sin, designed to awaken, if necessary, a sense of need, and concluded by a list of results that should follow if the decision for Christ is right and true. For the work of Personal Evangelism the worker should, of course, know the booklet practically by heart, and, as time goes on, he will be able to reinforce its

teaching and illustrate its points by incidents drawn from his own experience, or sometimes from that of others. I have found that nothing helps an enquirer at a point of difficulty more than the brief account of a case somewhat like his own. At the same time the worker must refrain from the temptation to recount his own spiritual history at length, as it is rarely edifying or helpful to the anxious soul. I well remember once seeing a girl, really anxious about her spiritual condition and keenly desirous of being led to Christ, but absolutely "bored stiff" by the well-meaning but entirely mistaken lady worker who was dealing with her, and who was simply pouring into the poor girl's ears at interminable length the narrative of her own spiritual experiences. The worker who guides the conversation along the lines indicated by the booklet, and simply endeavours to explain its contents, will be able to avoid this snare.

In all Evangelism, whether Public or Personal, the result must never be deemed satisfactory unless the enquirer does really understand the way of salvation, its conditions and obligations, and, having done so, does definitely and personally accept Christ. In a good deal of modern Mission work nothing of this kind seems to be attempted. A number of persons in an audience or congregation signify their desire to become Christians, but often nothing is done to follow this up by personal dealing, or to make sure that they really understand the way in which to attain their desire. One of the maids in a friend's house, where I was staying, had attended some kind of undenominational mission service, and had there expressed her desire to accept Christ as her Saviour, but her mistress was doubtful as to her having really done so, and asked me if I would have a talk with her. On doing so, I found that the girl having signified at the mission a really genuine desire, had then immediately been hailed as a really converted person; people shook hands with her, and expressed their delight at her salvation, but no attempt of any kind was made to explain to her what salvation meant, nor did any one attempt to bring her into actual touch with Christ; all this was simply taken for granted, while in conversation with her I soon ascertained that she actually knew nothing of it! She was really in earnest, and it was an easy task to bring her to Christ, but no one had even attempted to do it, although she was reckoned as a convert by those at the mission. **There can be no doubt that a great deal of actual personal work is**

neglected in many evangelistic efforts, when as a matter of fact the very greatest care should be taken that an enquirer be given every possible instruction and help by some worker who is qualified to do so.

Nor must the personal evangelism stop there. A great deal depends on the thought taken for the "after care" of those who are genuinely converted. Would that we could see the day when a congregation were so keen on the winning of souls that every case of conversion was hailed with joy by the whole body, and welcoming hands held out on every side to help the convert in the new life just begun! How few congregations show the least interest in any addition of living members to the Church of Christ! Therefore all the more care is needed in the shepherding of the newly converted, and in bringing them into touch with Church life and work. When Confirmation follows, there is, of course, a great opportunity afforded of keeping in close touch with the young Christian for some time. In other cases much can be done through Classes, Guilds, etc., to strengthen and foster the new spiritual life, while, as soon as it is deemed wise, some definite Church work should be assigned to the new convert. Above all, he should be taught the urgent necessity of practising that Personal Evangelism through which he himself has been brought to a saving knowledge of the truth in Christ. The first chapter of St. John's Gospel is a striking study of the evangelized becoming the evangelist. St. Andrew is brought to Christ, and brings his brother Simon. The two then bring Philip, for, as Professor Godet points out, the apparently irrelevant insertion of the information that "Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter" (verse 44) really indicates that it was through the instrumentality of the two brothers that Philip was brought into touch with Jesus. Then Philip proceeds to bring Nathanael to the Saviour Whom he has just found. Thus does Personal Evangelism stand in the very forefront of the Gospel story, for the Church's instruction and example, as the great Divine method by which her every member should endeavour to extend the spiritual kingdom of his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

ABBOT ÆLFRIC AND HIS OPPOSITION TO TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

IN the present state of disturbance of financial and political circumstances, and the troubles that they bring on us in our personal affairs, little interest appears to be taken in ancient Church History. Yet the flow of the stream of novels from the press seems to be undiminished. If we had eyes to see and ears to hear, the Story of the Church of God would be quite as interesting as any novel. The lives of great men, and of saintly writers and workers are fascinating subjects for study, and to trace the influence of the Holy Ghost inspiring spiritual movements is very animating as an encouragement to ourselves. Moreover, we cannot adequately understand the questions arising in the Church of to-day, without knowledge of the past. A further consideration may be added, change of thought is restful, and a few excursions into ancient times may be fairly regarded as a relief from the contemplation of our present political anxieties. In this point of view I invite attention to the state of the Church of England in the tenth century. The life and writings of the Anglo-Saxon Ælfric (pronounced Alfric) have been studied by English and by German students, yet to our Churchpeople they are little known. Bishop Browne, formerly of Bristol, has rendered valuable help by bringing down his expert knowledge of that period to the level of popular books,¹ but he does not appear to have as yet written about Abbot Ælfric. I propose in these few pages to indicate to the reader the main features of interest in the Abbot's life and work. A brief outline of his life is necessary for the understanding of his writings.

The exact year of his birth is not known, it was somewhere near A.D. 955. He was educated in the monastery of Winchester, under Æthelwold, at one time Abbot of Abingdon, afterwards Bishop of Winchester. Of Æthelwold he remarks that it was a pleasure to him to be occupied in teaching young men and boys, and to render books into English for them, and to exhort them with humorous talk to rise to better things. He desired to win

¹ Published by the S.P.C.K.

them, and not merely to drive them, and while he maintained a strong hand, and exact discipline, he was full of genuine kindness. He taught the boys by translating the Latin into English so as to facilitate their study. For this he has been criticized in our own day by Dean Hook, who remarks, " though a popular master, we may doubt whether he was a good one, for one of his practices was to turn Latin books for them into English. We have heard of the use of *cribs*, but this is perhaps the only instance of their being provided by the master." We may, however, observe that copies of books in those days were inevitably few, and no doubt Æthelwold read out the Latin and construed it into English, and the boys learnt to repeat what he read and said. Ælfric was deeply impressed by his kindly spirit, and afterwards imitated the benevolence of his teacher, as is shown by the colloquy between master and boys which he wrote later on. Eventually, he wrote a life of Æthelwold.

From Winchester, where he had become a fully instructed monk, he was sent to Cerne Abbas in Dorsetshire, to guide the monks in that monastery in the adoption of the Benedictine rule. On returning to Winchester he brought out two volumes of Sermons for the Clergy, dedicated to Archbishop Sigeric, and called *Catholic Homilies*. After that his interest in boys led him to publish a Latin Grammar in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular. Another set of Sermons followed, and some translations from Holy Scripture.

In the year 1005, Ælfric was appointed Abbot of Eynsham, near Oxford, by the ealdorman Æthelmaer, when the latter refounded that monastery, and desired the introduction of the Benedictine rule. Here he remained for the rest of his life, influencing the neighbouring thanes by his personal character, and by his writings, and he never seems to have sought any higher position, realizing that it was his special vocation to help on his countrymen by writing on educational and religious subjects.

He has been supposed to have become Archbishop of Canterbury, and several of our historians have described him as such. But it is clear that there were many persons bearing the name of Ælfric, one of these was Archbishop, and our Ælfric was never given that title by his contemporaries, but simply that of " Abbas." The German writer, Dietrich, proved conclusively years ago that he could never have been Archbishop. Our Professor Skeat, an

expert in Anglo-Saxon, agrees with Dietrich. He was devoted to what he felt to be his own special vocation, the task of making known to the Anglo-Saxon thanes, and to the humbler classes, in their own language, the truths of the Faith. He was filled with the desire to promote vital religion and good works among his countrymen, by the sermons and translations, and hortatory writings that he supplied to them. Had he sought promotion to the episcopacy, or accepted it, he would have been immersed in official business, and the exercise of his special gifts must have ceased. He had the wisdom to know what he was most suited to doing, and the faithfulness to adhere to his task. His earnest and devoted life came to an end about the year 1025.

This outline of his career may prepare the reader for some fuller consideration of his writings.

Three great aims pervaded his efforts. In the first place he was above all else anxious to provide Christian teaching for all classes, for old and young, for rich and poor. Secondly, he was bent on temperance reform, for habits of drinking were widely prevalent; and thirdly, he lamented the indolence of his countrymen in resisting the call to military efforts against the cruel Danes. For he was not inclined to peace at any price, but regarded the defence of the land as a duty incumbent on every citizen. These three great objects shall now be noticed.

To understand his writings we must look back, and find the foundations for them in an earlier period. Latin, brought in by missionaries, both Irish and Roman, was the language of scholars, but in Wessex the native tongue had come into prominence, and the great King Alfred (871-901) had been so wide-minded as to desire to extend knowledge as far as possible among all classes of his people. Therefore, with the assistance of learned men, he brought out some of the treasures of literature in the Anglo-Saxon language for all who could read. A work by Pope Gregory on the clerical office was translated by his scholars, and a copy was sent to every bishop in England. One of these, for the Bishop of Worcester, is now in the Bodleian Library. Another translation intended to suit the tastes of the people, was that of the *Dialogues of Gregory the Great*, a series of stories and anecdotes. For Church History a part of Bede's work was rendered into the Anglo-Saxon tongue, and for general knowledge the Geography of Europe and

Asia by Orosius followed. In a translation of the *Consolations of Philosophy* by Boethius, Alfred inserted many reflections of his own, which are vigorous and helpful. We must not, however, linger over the great King's literary labours. But the impulse that he and his scholars gave was followed out by other writers, especially by Homilies in the language of the people for the use of the clergy. These are called the Blickling Homilies, and the Homilies of Wulfstan. In the latter, the unwillingness of the English to defend their country against the Danes is severely scourged. These sermons, intended for the popular ear, gave a precedent for the most prominent labours of Ælfric's life. He realized that few of the clergy were preachers, and set to work to publish two volumes of Homilies for their use. He based them on Holy Scripture, and the writings of the Latin Fathers. Yet he was very far from being a mere copyist, for he introduced many racy observations of his own, and cast the discourses into the style most suitable for unlearned audiences. Later on, he drew up two more volumes, which were teachings from the Lives of the Saints. All these were dedicated to Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury. Besides their hortatory value, they are of great interest to students who desire to know what the doctrines of the English Church were in those days, and being dedicated to the Archbishop, we may fairly regard them as decisive as to the tenets of that age.

A few quotations from the Homilies shall now be given. These were translated by Mr. Thorpe, F.S.A., in 1846.

“The Saviour fled from worldly honour, when He was chosen King, but He fled not from reproach and scorn when the Jews would hang Him on a cross. He would not encircle His Head with a golden crown, but with one of thorns, as it was done at His passion. He would not reign for a while in His life, Who rules eternally in heaven. This world is not our country, but is our place of exile; therefore should we not set our hope in this deceitful life, but should hasten with good deserts to our own home-land for which we were created, that is, to the Kingdom of heaven. Verily it is written, ‘Whosoever will be a friend of this world, he shall be accounted a foe of God.’ Christ said in a certain place that the way is very narrow and steep which leads to the Kingdom of heaven, and it is very wide and smooth which leads to hell torment. The way which leads to the Kingdom of heaven is narrow and steep, in order that we should with difficulty gain our country. If we desire to obtain it, we should love mercy and chastity and truth, and righteousness and humility, and have

true love to God and to men, and give alms according to our means, and be moderate in our food, and observe all other holy things. These things we cannot do without difficulties, but if we do them, then may we with those labours, through God's support, ascend the steep way which leads us to eternal life. Peter the Apostle said, 'Christ suffered for us, and gave us an example that we should follow His footsteps,' that is, that we should suffer something for love of Christ, and for our sins. Well suffers the man, and acceptably to God, who strives against wickedness and promotes goodness, as best he may. He who will suffer nothing in this life, shall suffer against his will in the life to come" (p. 117).

On the equality of all men before God.

"All Christian men, whether high or low, noble or ignoble, and the lord, and the slave, are all brothers, and have all one Father in heaven. The wealthy is not better on that account than the needy. As boldly may the slave call God his Father as the King. We are all alike before God, unless any one excel another in good works. The rich for his wealth is not to despise the poor, for the poor is before God often better than the rich. God is our Father, therefore should we all be brothers in God, and hold the brotherly bond unbroken; that is true peace, so that each of us love others as himself, and command to no one that which he would not another should command to him. He who observes this is a child of God, and Christ, and all holy persons who thrive to God are his brothers and his sisters" (p. 119).

On recognition.—In the next world.—"There will be known those who were known before, and those who were unknown, dwelling in brotherly love with God, ever to eternity" (p. 121).

Again—of the recognition of our dear ones.

"When God's chosen come to death, then they find our heritage. A great company of faithful friends will await us there, secure for themselves, yet anxious for our salvation. Let us therefore hasten to our country, that we may see our friends, and greet our kinsmen" (p. 138).

For Septuagesima Sunday.

"My brothers, what justification can we have if we abstain from good works, we who from the child-cradle came to God's belief? My brothers, behold your conduct, and see if ye yet are God's workmen. Let everyone consider whether he labours in God's vineyard. He who in the present life toils for himself, and not for God, is not yet come within God's vineyard. They truly toil for God who seek not their own gain through covetousness, but meditate on God's tillage, how they may suppress unrighteousness and further righteousness, and benefit other men with the diligence of true love, and they who care with wakeful mind how they may gain the souls of men to God, and lead them to everlasting life. He who lives for himself, and he who lies in his fleshly

lusts, is rightly accused of idleness, for he cultivates no fruit of divine work."

Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost.

"In Ezekiel the four beasts had eyes on every side of their bodies, because God's chosen should consider their deeds beforehand, on every side, so that they ever desire good, and guard themselves against evil."

A prayer.

"Lead us, Almighty God, to the number of Thy chosen saints, with the everlasting bliss of Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared from the beginning of the world for those who love Thee, Thou who livest and reignest with the Eternal Father, and the Holy Ghost for ever and ever. Amen."

The years from 991 to 994 were full of trouble from the Danes. Ælfric remarks: "With sorrowful mind, distressed by the many evils received from wicked pirates, we have, lest we should be found false to our promise, completed this book." It is probable that it was finished in the terrible year whose horrors are sufficiently indicated in the *Saxon Chronicle*.

The next work of Ælfric was directed to the teaching of boys. For higher Christian education King Alfred had already advised the teaching of Latin, and in the days of Ælfric it was in any case necessary for youths who were to become parish priests, or to go into monasteries. Therefore he prepared a Grammar and Glossary for them. With the common sense that pervaded all his efforts he decided to compose this in the English language, so as to facilitate the studies of beginners. Grammars had usually been left entirely in the Latin in which the Italian grammarians Donatus and Priscian had edited them. Those had been days when in Italy the Latin language was still in common use. But so obstructive has been the conservatism of educationists that because Roman boys had their grammars in Latin, the custom was maintained for ages, and only recently have our public school boys been freed from the needless difficulty of learning the elements of Latin through rules given in that language only. Yet as far back as A.D. 995, Ælfric shows his common sense by composing for his Anglo-Saxon boys explanations of Latin grammar in their own vernacular. Knowing that this departure would expose him to criticism, he thought it prudent to apologize in his preface. In his preface he writes:—

“I Ælfric, as one of slight wisdom, have chosen these extracts from the smaller and from the larger work of Priscian and have translated them into your own language for you little boys of tender years, that having read through the eight parts of speech of Donatus, you may be able to receive both languages into your tender minds, while you progress towards higher studies. I know that many persons will blame me for having been willing to occupy myself with such work as the turning of grammar into the English language. But if my method displeases anyone let him criticize my translation just as he likes; we are content to follow the teaching we have received in the school of Æthelwold, the venerable prelate who inspired many with goodness.”

The colloquy between the Master and his boys, which has been already alluded to, is extremely interesting.¹ It shows the pleasant relations which existed between them, and the boys speak with more freedom to their teacher than has been usual in later ages. Besides this, a most spirited account is given of the various occupations to which boys passed on in those early times, each boy being questioned by the Master as to what he has begun to do. One has the honour of being a huntsman to the King, another is a merchant, another a fisherman, another a ploughboy, while the rest follow other still existing trades, and the last who speaks is preparing to be a monk.

After this effort, returning to his labours on behalf of older readers, Ælfric brought out two more volumes of Sermons, called *Lives of the Saints*. In these he included some of our English martyrs, such as St. Alban and St. Edmund, and with a view to encouraging the indolent among his countrymen to resist the Danes, he quoted the example of the brave Maccabees. Yet he did not omit to lay stress on higher efforts than those of earthly warfare, and he urges on monks and clerics the importance of the spiritual warfare, of which bodily contests are a type.

His efforts were not thrown away. Notable men such as Æthelmaer and Æthelweard became his friends, and requested religious translations from him. They were ealdormen. The word *ealdorman* is, of course, identical with our word *alderman*. But in those days the name implied a much higher position. The ealdormen were nobles, and were often great landowners. In relation to the King they were in their county position somewhat similar to our

¹ In my book, *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot*, I have translated from the Latin this interesting and amusing Colloquy. Full quotations will also be found there on the subject of the opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation, p. 88 ff. (Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. Price 4s.)

Lord-Lieutenants. Æthelweard is greeted with respectful friendliness by Ælfric. He says, "Ælfric humbly greeteth ealdorman Æthelweard, and I tell thee, beloved, that I have now collected in this book such Passions of the Saints as I have had leisure to translate into English, because that thou, beloved, and Æthelmaer earnestly prayed me for such writings, and received them at my hands, for the confirmation of your faith by means of this history, which ye never had in your language before." He afterwards translated portions of the Old Testament for Æthelweard, the Gospels and parts of the Psalms being already available in the Anglo-Saxon language. In the year 1005, Æthelmaer showed his esteem for the earnest and industrious Ælfric by appointing him Abbot of the monastery that he was re-establishing at Eynsham, in Oxfordshire, and where he was introducing the Benedictine rule.

Being raised to the rank of Abbot, Ælfric was now the social equal of the landowning thanes of the neighbourhood. Several of his letters to them still exist. They appear to have been good fellows in their way, but liable to the common weakness of liking a glass too much. To Wulfgeat of Ilmington he writes that "the Word of God forbids drunkenness, we ought to teach the foolish and the careless, else God will require their souls at our hands. God grant us to tell you often of His holy love, and to you to turn our teaching into good works." To Sigward of Asthall he writes, complaining "that thou wouldest fain have persuaded me to drink for pleasure more than was my custom. Our Saviour Christ hath forbidden drunkenness to all who believe in Him. Suffer then every man that will, to obey the ordinance of Christ." From these words it is clear that Ælfric was no prohibitionist, but he adds, "holy teachers since the Saviour have forbidden this evil habit, and have taught that men should do no injury to themselves, for drunkenness surely destroyeth both a man's soul and his health." While thus admonishing with due moral courage the friends who needed it, he urges them to good works in proof of the reality of their religion, and he continues to encourage them by making translations from the Bible into their own language.

Of these a recent student remarks,¹ "that Ælfric is incontest-

¹ See a very readable and valuable book, by Dr. Caroline Louisa White, *Yale Studies in English: Ælfric* (Lamson, Wolfe & Co., Boston, New York and London).

ably a master in the portrayal of Biblical story, understanding well how to weave into the narrative his own practical application and comments. Avoiding as far as possible superstitious additions to the legends of the earlier Church, he places before his readers the more important and primary truths. He sets forth with vital freshness and sincerity the mystery of redemption and the work of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit for man." Ælfric's style was the expression of his character. It is evident that he was not thinking of himself when he wrote, he was not aiming at fine compositions that might advance his literary reputation. It is clear that he had two main thoughts in his mind, as to his style, how he could most suitably adapt himself to his hearers or readers, and how best to represent the ideas of his authors in the language of the people. Humbly as he speaks of himself, he was far from being a mere translator; while faithful to the sense, his sentences were cast in the mould of his own keen and earnest mind, and many racy comments were added by himself, to impress the lessons that he was conveying. He had a wholesome horror of being prolix, and he abridges freely to sharpen the matter in hand. Hence simplicity, clearness and vigour are his characteristics. He valued his learning not so much for his own personal satisfaction, as for the benefit of the clergy and laity to whom he could make it useful in a popular form.

What, it may be asked, was the attitude of Ælfric to the Church doctrines and questions of his day? A clear answer can be given from his writings. He took his stand on the teachings of Holy Scripture and the early Western Fathers, and deprecated unauthorized additions of legendary matter into which some recent writers had fallen. The Anglo-Saxon Church had in the main taken its doctrinal beliefs from Gregory the Great, through Augustine, and *we cannot honestly say that all these were free from superstition.* But Ælfric was well aware of the danger that existed of dangerous doctrinal developments, and a conspicuous instance of this attitude of his mind is to be found in his *opposition to the approaching theory of transubstantiation.* His writings on this subject did not escape the notice of our Reformers, and in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Archbishop Parker, with thirteen of his suffragans, republished the views of Ælfric with the intention of showing that the Anglo-Saxon Church had not held the Roman tenets existing in their day as to the

Holy Eucharist, though they added that they did not wholly agree with Ælfric's teaching. As to this question, some notice of it must be entered on, even in the present short paper on Ælfric's life.

If we go back to the Greek Fathers of the East, we shall find that some of them expressed themselves in words that went very near to transubstantiation, but no doctrinal decision had then been imposed on the mysterious subject of the Eucharist. On the other hand, some of the Alexandrian Fathers, such as Clement, had held a purely spiritual view, as put forth by Our Lord Himself, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."¹ But as sacerdotalism invaded the simplicity of the earlier Church, the material aspect of the Holy Communion came to be regarded as the vehicle of the spiritual, and by the time of Ælfric it is evident that both the Celtic Church and the Anglo-Saxon Church held, that after consecration by the celebrant there came into the sacred elements on the altar a mysterious though spiritual presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. A further step was now taken in the Western Church. Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbey in France in 844 composed a treatise for the younger monks, in which he expresses the opinion that the bread and wine cease to exist in their own nature, and were changed into the same Body and Blood of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary. This teaching was opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda in 825, who remarks, "the flesh of Christ rising from the tomb was so glorified that it could no longer any way be eaten." Similar opposition was offered by Ratramnus, Abbot of Orbais in 870, to whom King Charles the Bald addressed himself inquiring as to the views of Paschasius. The reply of Ratramnus, which still exists, was at considerable length; the leading idea being expressed in the words—"In the mystery of the Sacrament it is spiritual food and spiritual drink, spiritually feeding the soul, and bestowing the life of eternal satisfaction."

In a sermon for Easter Day, Ælfric closely follows the expressions of Ratramnus, and sums up at the close by saying, "This mystery is a pledge and a symbol, it is, as we said before, Christ's Body and His Blood, not bodily, but spiritually." The teaching of Paschasius was adopted and pressed forward by Lanfranc and others, and in

¹ St. John vi. 63.

1050 this doctrine was maintained by a Council at Rome. At a still more important Council at Rome, in 1216, the doctrine of transubstantiation was declared obligatory by Pope Innocent III, and from this time it became established as part of the Creed of the Roman Church. In 1551, the Council of Trent decreed that "by consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood," and an anathema was pronounced on all who should deny such change of substance. Our own Church declares that this change alleged by the Romanists "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Yet not long ago I saw a leaflet placed in the seats of one of our Churches, "Hail true Body, born of Mary," etc., translated from the Latin of Thomas Aquinas. As our Article witnesses, so our Rubric declares, "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians, and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

It is evident that Ælfric did not hold the change of substance implied by the idea of transubstantiation, for in the dedication of his Homilies to Archbishop Sigeric he humbly requests the Archbishop to correct any doctrinal error into which he may have fallen, and as no such correction was made, we may confidently assert that the change of the bread and wine into the actual Body and Blood of Christ was not a tenet held by the Anglo-Saxon Church. This is still further proved by the fact, that Ælfric in his letter to Bishop Wulfstane of Sherborne says that Christ is not present "bodily, but ghostly," and in his communication to Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, his statement is similar: "this sacrifice is not to be regarded as the body in which He suffered for us, nor the blood which He poured out for us, but it is made spiritually His Body and Blood." In the Bodleian Library a publication of Parker and his suffragans is dated 1567. It is entitled, "A testimonie of Antiquitie showing the ancient faith of the Church of England touching the Sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lord, here publicly preached, and also received in the Saxon tyme, above 600 years ago." Parker points out that this is quite opposed to the ideas of the Church of Rome.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE PAPERS.

THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

BY THE REV. CANON H. A. WILSON, M.A., R.D., Rector of
Cheltenham.

I HAVE the great honour, my brothers, of welcoming you to the Eighth Cheltenham Conference. It seems as if it was but yesterday that we met together for the First Conference in these rooms. Few of us who gathered on that occasion realized that we were inaugurating a movement which was to become an annual institution. We met first at a critical time, when Kikuyu and all the questions related to that place were burning subjects of controversy. The following year Kikuyu questions and the Archbishops' Report on Church and State were to the fore in our discussions. In 1918 we met in London to comply with Government requirements for the reduction of railway travelling, and for the third time reunion occupied the greater part of our attention as was also the case in 1919. The following year the attention of the Conference was divided between reunion at home and abroad and the Enabling Bill, which soon became law. In 1921 we tried the interesting experiment of inviting Anglo-Catholic and Broad Churchmen to address our Conference with a view to determining what common ground could be discovered between us and them. And last year we endeavoured, by emphasizing the basic truths of Evangelicalism, to heal the wounds in our own party. Looking back on the past, no one can doubt the courage with which we have faced anxious questions, and, I think, few can deny that we have really contributed something of value to a great variety of controversies. This year we are facing a subject which is a matter of most anxious concern—Prayer Book Revision. I have no doubt that we shall express a view worth attention at the close of our discussions.

No gathering is more competent than ours to express the mind of the Evangelical School for, as I would remind you, we are not representative of a mere section of Evangelicals. We have here men who can speak for every shade of Evangelical opinion. And here is the unique value of our Conference. Other gatherings may be larger, may have a more imposing membership, but we alone both welcome all who profess and call themselves Evangelicals, and also debate and publish our conclusions. I want to emphasize this fact this year, because I am sure that the opinions of the rank and file of Evangelical clergy are not only needed in the Prayer Book controversy, but they are also wanted. Our serious and well-weighed opinions will, we may be sure, receive careful attention and full consideration. I will not occupy time by summarizing in any detail how the position stands at the moment. But in brief

it is as follows : there is, first of all, our Book of Common Prayer, then the National Assembly Book (N.A. 84), then the E.C.U. Book, then the "New Prayer Book," and to all this bewildering literature is added the Archbishop of York's suggestion to adopt the Prayer Book of 1549. There is no reason to think that the stream of invention has dried up, and any day we may have another sample Prayer Book put before us. It is really a Gilbertian situation, and despite the stout assurances we hear that all these suggestions are to be welcomed one cannot but feel that they do not add to the dignity of the Church of England. I do not suppose *we* shall decide to draw up a Prayer Book at our Conference, though "you never can tell," for Prayer Book compilation is "in the air," and apparently a large number of people consider themselves quite competent to undertake what has in the past been considered the supreme test of literary skill, careful scholarship, and deep spirituality. We shall probably content ourselves by expressing our opinions and offering suggestions.

It would be most improper for me to attempt to tune the Conference by any opinion of my own, but a few general observations may be offered.

In the first place we shall have to consider the large question of Alternative Prayer Books. I doubt if it is possible to deny that this proposal is anything but a sad confession of failure. It was never contemplated when the original committee was appointed, and it has only emerged as the impossibility of reaching general agreement became more clear. At best it is a sorry expedient, and it is hard to see how it can fail to harden our differences and accentuate party spirit in the Church.

In a speech in the House of Bishops, one who is justly and highly honoured among us made the most able defence of alternatives which could be made. Let me read you his own words :

"I believe that modern life must express itself in divers ways. I want to make a strong point of that. I know it may be said that everybody should pray exactly alike, and everybody should do exactly as everybody else does. That may seem ideal, but I think it is absolutely contrary to the present spirit of the age. We have already (unauthorized it is true) alternative uses. I have to preach, as Your Lordships have, Sunday by Sunday, in different Churches ; and whether it is a so-called advanced or a so-called Evangelical Church, when I get there I never know what is going to happen : prayers are put in of all kinds ; not one of them has been submitted to me as Bishop, but there they are. It is not a new thing, even with our present Prayer Book, which we all love so much, to have the principle admitted of alternative use ; you may do this or that ; it is not a new principle introduced into the Church of England, it is an extension of that principle—a very great extension, but only an extension. . . . In the Reunited Church each individual group would be allowed to retain to a large extent its own mode of worship. If that proposal comes

to fruition, we shall have a great number of alternative uses. The question arises whether, that being so, it is not right now in our own borders to have a greater variety than we have ever known before."

Now this is a strong argument, and undoubtedly it carries us a long way. The Bishop might even have added a reference to the alternative "uses" in pre-Reformation days. No one objects to ordered variety in worship. But the Alternative Prayer Book, when it reaches its final shape, will not simply give us more variety in the conduct of public worship; it will present us with alternative doctrine, and that is surely an absurdity in a Church which claims to have a mind of its own. I am not saying that "N.A. 84" really presents in its Order of Holy Communion a doctrine different from the present Prayer Book. I know some people think it does; personally I do not, at any rate at present. But the whole trend of the controversy now is away from the Holy Communion proposals in "N.A. 84" to something much more mediæval in form. The Archbishop of York, e.g., pointed out, in the debate already referred to, the futility of the "N.A. 84" order of Holy Communion:—

"Turning to the suggestions of the Committee, they are many and admirable; but, without elaborating the point, I think it is obvious that these things have to be said about them—namely, they will certainly not satisfy those who desire no permissive change in the Order of Holy Communion; and they will equally not satisfy those who desire that such a change should be permitted. To put it in a sentence, they will distress those who object to any permissive change, and will not satisfy those who desire it."

I think this is probably true, and as a result the final alternative will be much more mediæval in form, and will certainly vary in doctrine from the Book of Common Prayer. Especially is this likely to be so if it is moulded on the Prayer Book of 1549, for it will be remembered that Bishop Gardiner considered that book agreeable to his view of Transubstantiation, and hence Archbishop Cranmer deliberately altered the form of the Communion service to destroy this argument.

Our Alternative Prayer Books will thus contain alternative doctrines, and if this is so it is not very easy to deny the claim which has been voiced for alternative creeds. The line between matters of doctrine and matters of faith is not so clearly marked as the line between matters of doctrine and forms of worship, and if the line between the latter two may be transgressed, why not the line between the former two?

An argument freely used is that in these days we ought to make experiments. I think there is very much to be said for this. We certainly do want very wide liberty in our services, and undoubtedly recent years have given us a freedom in which we rejoice and which we should not care to surrender. But the experiments made in the Communion service, even in the case of the temperate recommendation in "N.A. 84," are all of them returns to past forms of

worship which our Church discarded at the Reformation. The re-arrangement of the canon, the sanctioning of Reservation, the permissive use of the chasuble, the observance of All Souls' Day, can no more be described as experiments than the arming of our troops with muzzle-loading rifles could be called an experiment.

I confess I am quite deficient in the liturgical sense, therefore my next remark is probably worthless. What is there so irresistibly attractive about the liturgy of the Roman Church? Is it really such a perfect arrangement of prayer that it is impossible to improve upon it? Has the Church of England no individuality of its own? Is it incapable of making a real experiment in the Service of the Holy Communion?

I question very much whether the driving force behind the movement for approximating to the ancient Western liturgy—for it is noticeable that in every point the E.C.U. suggestions choose the Roman way in preference to the Eastern way when the two conflict—is really reverence for the past. It is, we suspect, rather a desire for the re-introduction of the views which the Roman liturgy embodies. Nor will the people who crave to follow the Roman way ever be satisfied with anything short of this. They have received in "N.A. 84" most remarkable concessions—Prayers for the Departed, the observance of All Souls' Day, a re-arrangement of the Communion Office, the authorization of the sacrificial vestments, and Reservation for the sick. All this has been conceded in the hope of achieving unity in the Church.

Now if these serious modifications of our liturgy could produce that result it would be an enormous gain. Think of the Church as it is to-day! It is really not too much to say that one-half is virtually out of communion with the other half. Imagine the situation if we could achieve unity: the blessed cessation of our strife at home and abroad; the spirit of true brotherhood and mutual trust and the end of all suspicion; our Church facing the great opportunities of to-day as one united communion. It is a picture so fascinating that we feel almost anything might be well paid to achieve it. Personally, I do not shrink from saying that if the concessions made in "N.A. 84" would accomplish this, if the needs of the Anglo-Catholics were fully and finally met, however distasteful they may be to us, it would be our bounden duty to strain our convictions to the uttermost, and accept "N.A. 84" *not as an alternative but as the New Book of Common Prayer*, and so achieve at last a real unity in worship. But these are but idle words. We might make the offer, but no one could really hope that that offer would be accepted by the Anglo-Catholic party.

The last point I want to make is to consider what are the guiding principles upon which a right revision should be conducted.

The supreme consideration must be *truth*. It is a sad reflection that the Church of England has ceased to be theological. In the many and lengthy discussions of the subject, the method adopted has been one of haggle and barter. A great many people want this concession; can we allow this, or how much of it can we allow,

without upsetting another large number who don't want this. In secular matters this, no doubt, is a proper way of proceeding. But methods appropriate for arranging say the affairs of Ireland are thoroughly wrong in dealing with religious matters. Is this demand right? Is it based upon a true view of God and the redemption wrought by Christ Jesus? These are the questions a Church should ask in arranging its worship, and the answers given should be taken as settling the matter finally. Indeed, it may be added that surely it is quite hopeless to expect a real solution which God can bless except this method be adopted.

At any rate, we in Cheltenham are not likely to overlook the second necessity in revision. It must be carried out in the light of the reunion of Christendom. I will not weary you by attempting to deal with this question at length. I will only make two remarks:

(1) N.A. 84 is not likely to advance reunion with the non-Episcopal Churches. Not one of the five great concessions to which I have referred make the least appeal to them, and indeed they are probably all repugnant to them. These Churches are in the main definitely Protestant, although there are here and there to be seen a few abnormal persons of other ways of thinking.

(2) As I have remarked, the Anglo-Catholic desires have no larger purpose than approximating to Rome. Their suggested liturgy is deliberately Roman: the Reservation of the Sacrament for adoration is purely Roman and contrary to the practice of the Eastern Church. To accept their suggestion means the preference of Rome to the East, and the end of all hopes of home reunion.

My last word must be the expression of the earnest hope that by our united efforts we may achieve what is the most difficult task which has ever fallen to the lot of our Conference; to say something really helpful in this anxious and difficult hour, when our Church is definitely at the cross-roads, and to utter a prayer that the Holy Spirit of God will teach us in our deliberations what we ought to say.

ALTERNATIVE USES AND HOME REUNION.

BY THE REV. J. J. R. ARMITAGE, Public Preacher,
Cathedral and Diocese of Coventry.

OUR subject is divided into two main parts: Home Reunion and Alternative Uses, with sub-divisions: (A) Home—Reunion—I. With whom? II. With whom not practicable? III. Fundamental differences between Rome and England IV. Historical importance of these differences; (B) I. Alternative Uses: no valid objection. II. Nature of suggested alternative use. III. Would suggested alternative use be acceptable to Free Churches? IV. Would suggested alternative use satisfy Anglo-Catholics? V. What of the future?

(A) HOME REUNION.

I. The great body of Free Churchmen are the people with whom Home Reunion is practicable. The ideas of their fundamental doctrines are generally identical with those embodied in the present Prayer Book, as published by authority. When we regard the state of mutual feelings between loyal members of the Anglican Church on the one hand and the Nonconforming Churches on the other, we can, without hesitation, say that there are more important principles on which, without reservation, we all agree than there are matters on which we may differ.

II. With whom Reunion is not practicable.—Can we consider the possibility of reunion with the representatives of the Latin Mission in England? In clear and unmistakable terms the issue, so far as they are concerned, cannot be better defined than in the words of Dr. Salmon. "There can be no union with the Church of Rome except on terms of absolute submission—a submission, moreover, involving an acknowledgment that from our hearts we believe things to be true which we have reasons—good reasons—for knowing to be false." The position as between ourselves and Rome is also clearly set forth in the words of the Report to the Lambeth Conference of 1920 (quoting the Report of 1908): "We realize that any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created and which we cannot ourselves remove." Churches of communions other than Rome have expressed themselves willing to discuss terms of difference between them and the Anglican Church. Rome has not done so; instead she is making great and ever-increasing efforts (openly and secretly) for the conversion of England to "Catholicism," her object being to present this nation as a dowry to Mary. To the terms of Rome the people whom we represent will never submit. Why? Because of—

III. The Fundamental Difference between the Roman and the English Conception of God; His attitude to Man; Man's approach to Him.—Rome stands for an interpretation of the Christian religion entirely different from that which we have in the Bible and in the Prayer Book. We insist upon the Bible as our standard of faith and worship. In doing so we do not necessarily imply that there cannot be a Church rite or rule without a Scripture text to authorize it. The New Testament was not intended as a code of ceremonial, but it is right to require that no ceremony should be sanctioned which is contrary to the letter and to the spirit of the New Testament, particularly, as being, with the Old Testament, the Word of God—the Revealed and Inspired Word of God, when compared with the traditions, sacred writings, and customs of the non-Christian religions. If we reject the Bible as being both the standard of faith and as in general terms defining a rational method of approach to God in praise, and in prayer, and in sacramental communion, then the way is immediately opened for the introduction of all sorts and every kind of superstitious fad and fancy—and

the more grotesque and irrational they may be, the more will they appeal to some persons. Rome puts tradition on an equality with the Bible; the Anglican Church, as defined in her Prayer Book, does not. Further, it must be emphasized that the Anglican Church, with the great Nonconformist Churches, insists upon the soul's capacity and right to approach the throne of God direct through the one—and only one—mediator between God and man—Himself man—Christ Jesus. Rome rejects such an assumption. Her system is essentially built upon the soul's incompetency to deal directly with God. Her many sacraments, celibate priesthood, and ecclesiastical authority are barriers avowedly put between the individual and God. The eternal destiny of the individual is, by Rome, committed to a chain of human beings—a procedure pagan in origin and in complete contradiction of the New Testament teaching. Between Rome and England there would seem to be irreconcilable differences.

IV. The Historical Importance of these differences.—In our discussion of Prayer Book Revision and of Alternative Uses we are not influenced merely by what a minister wears in the house of God as such, or by what he does in the performance of his ministerial duties, estimated simply as actions. We can understand many "Catholics" who have said, "We are not much concerned with theology. We like the music, the pageantry, and the pictorial beauty of a ritualistic service." We can admit that there is nothing inherently wrong in such a declaration. But we would point out that the æsthetic sensibility can be, and ought to be, satisfied without any necessity for the introduction of baseless, reasonless, and pagan superstitions and practices into the twentieth-century worship of the living God and of His Christ. Our concern in this controversy is primarily with what are the ideas the minister's vestments symbolize, and what are the motives for his actions, and what may be their effect on the community when let loose into the stream of life—the market-place and not the sanctuary is the final testing-place among men of the reality and practical value of a religion. For what does "Catholicism," as conceived by Rome and by the "Anglos" of that ilk, stand in history? The men of England clearly understood at the time of the Reformation the meaning of the blight of Roman Catholicism. Has history proved they were wrong in their diagnosis? Shall the errors discarded in the sixteenth century be revived? Herein, we suggest, lies the crux of all our discussions: What effect will the practical interpretation of the idea of God as presented in any new Prayer Book have upon individual and national character? We have need to ponder the suggestions of Benjamin Kidd, and of other minds like unto his, when they imply that "the resulting difference in character between Romanism and Protestantism, which may mean much or little in theological discussion according to the standpoint of the observer, assumes, however, profound importance in the eyes of a student of our social evolution." The Protestant religion has produced in history a deepening, a strengthening, an independence, and

at the same time a refining of character which, prior to the sixteenth century, had been generally unknown. The sociological significance of the Reformation and of the eighteenth-century Evangelical Revival is as of great consequence as the theological. The driving force behind the whole onward movement with which our age is identified has its source in the Protestant character. The multitude of philanthropic and humanitarian undertakings which are a feature of all English-speaking communities are the direct product of Protestantism. "Catholicism" spells social stagnation; Protestantism means ordered liberty and reform. Has England to continue to lead the nations?

(B) ALTERNATIVE USES.

I. If reunion with the Free Churches is to become an accomplished fact, to alternative uses as such there can be no valid objection. There are different "uses" among the Nonconformists. There can, however, be unity in diversity, without the sacrifice of any of the following fundamental principles: (a) the profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Jesus the Christ; (b) the observance of the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself; (c) a ministry representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work; (d) the assurance that there will be no return either to the mediæval doctrines rejected at the Reformation or to the forms of worship in which those notions were embodied and expressed.

II. What is the nature of the Alternative Use the Anglican Church is asked to sanction?—It is essentially a reversion to that false interpretation of the Christian religion from which England deliberately and intelligently shook itself free four hundred years ago—action which the history of progress has demonstrated to have been correct. The whole doctrinal position of the Church of England is now threatened under the camouflage of Prayer Book Revision. To accept Mass Vestments, the Reservation of the Sacrament, the Canon of the Mass in the Communion Service, the Commemoration of All Souls, and Prayers for the Dead will be to deliberately flout the authority of God's Word written, and will involve the scrapping of the Thirty-nine Articles. It will mean the establishment of two kinds of religion, one of which will be Christian and the other an alloy of Christianity and Paganism—and this in an age of enlightenment. What a spectacle for the ubiquitous "man in the street." How comic if it were not so tragic.

III. Will the suggested Alternative be acceptable to the Churches with whom Reunion is sought?—It will not lead to an official reunion with Rome; her position is unchanged. It will bring not peace but a sword into the Anglican Church: of this let there be no mistake—it is no use hiding our heads in the sand. It will not be accepted by the Free Churchmen—of this there is not the slightest shadow of doubt. What Free Churchmen are asking is: "Is the

Church of England going to move towards us or farther away from us?" If the Anglo-Catholics succeed the prospect of any sort of reunion with the Free Churches will pass out of view. Reunion with them might as well be dismissed as out of the question. Will this be in accord with the Will of God?

IV. Will the suggested Alternative Use satisfy the Anglo-Catholics?—No one can be associated with them in private or in public, or read through the report of the English Church Union Committee on Prayer Book Revision without coming to but one conclusion: the suggested revision will not be agreeable to what is called the "Catholic mind"—whatever this may be. As casuists and opportunists, they might accept an alternative use for the time being. They say: "In our opinion there is no other course open to 'Catholic-minded' members of the Church of England than frankly to resign themselves to an era of liturgical experimentation and 'alternative rites,' to endure the resulting confusion and discomfort as best they may, and to concentrate their efforts upon securing permission to build up a really august and majestic English Catholic rite." This is their object. They obviously wish to make confusion more confounded—themselves the authors of the lawless chaos in the Anglican Church to-day, chaos which is reflected in the social and economic life of the country, and of which the Anglo-Catholics are supporters. Have you ever given a thought to the psychological affinity between Anglo-Catholicism and Socialism—as a philosophy and system of economics? Have you given a thought to the inner meaning of the memorial recently signed by five hundred ministers of religion and presented to the leader of the Socialist party in the House of Commons? What are the signs of the times? If the Anglo-Catholics were honest in motive, they would leave the Anglican Church, and at once find their true home—the Church of Rome. Every idea of their Catholicism is Roman in origin. They have given the world nothing that is new. Their eyes have a backward cast to the Middle Ages: we need the forward look to the New Age and the coming of the Kingdom of God, new out of heaven.

V. What of the future?—The time has come to definitely state our principles; to sound "No more unavailing compromise," "No retreat," "No surrender," and to abide by the consequences. The Church of England, as defined at the Reformation Settlement, is either right or wrong. The Church of Rome is either right or wrong. If Rome is right—and to accept the principles involved in such a revision as is suggested means that Rome is right—then have done with apeing her, and let us go over whole-heartedly to her, confessing that, after all our four hundred years of marvellous and undoubtedly God-guided history, our forbears were wrong, and that we ourselves have been the enemies of Truth. If, however, Rome is wrong, then let the Church of England to herself be true.

The Church of England has always been comprehensive, but there is a limit to comprehension. Anglicanism does historically stand for a definite position, "and its claims cannot be allowed to go by default in favour of a nebulous thing called 'Catholicism,'

spurned by Rome and anathema " to the overwhelming majority of the thinking virile men of England, to whom sacerdotalism is an abomination. As the *British Weekly* has recently said: " If Evangelicals in the English Church had a fraction of the courage and consistency of Anglo-Catholics, they would be brave enough to carry their convictions on this matter into practice. They would refuse to go on any longer treating Free Churchmen like strangers and foreigners outside the household of God. They would dare, if need be, to create precedents, and to show their faith in Christian unity by their works."

We conclude by quoting two sentences from the writings of the late Professor Gwatkin: " Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England, and its future chiefly depends on their willingness to receive new truth from the world around them; and of such willingness there are many hopeful signs. If they will only thank God and take courage, they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them."

Gentlemen, shall we thank God and take courage?

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THE HOLY COMMUNION SERVICE OF OUR PRESENT PRAYER BOOK.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, B.D., Rector of Bradfield,
Berks.

MOST of the great movements which have influenced the history of the world have been complex both in their origin and in their results. The world movement, known as the Reformation, was no exception to this rule, but whatever combination of circumstances contributed to bring about the Reformation, and however manifold the results of the Reformation have been on the subsequent history of the world, it can be said with truth that the Reformation is crystallized in our present Holy Communion service. Pre-Reformation England is the England of the Roman Mass; post-Reformation England is the England of the Holy Communion service.

At the outset of the consideration of the subject we are faced with an apparent paradox, for Dean Field, of Gloucester, declares that " the canon of the Mass, rightly understood, is found to contain nothing in it contrary to the rule of faith, and the profession of the Protestant Churches. . . ." ¹

The statement is important in emphasizing the difficulty of interpreting theological phrases at their face value—a fact of peculiar significance to the English Church of the sixteenth century as of the

¹ Field, *Of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 96.

twentieth—but the assertion is largely true. The actual words of the Roman Missal which, for example, prays that the bread and wine “ may to us be made ” the Body and Blood of Christ, are capable of a most Evangelical interpretation ; the prayer in the canon for the faithful departed has no purgatorial reference or implication ; the prayer for the intercession of the saints is not without a certain amount of Biblical support ; the offering of the bread and wine to God can be explained with reference to primitive custom, and is consonant with Evangelical idea. *Prima facie*, therefore, the Canon of the Mass offers little for criticism, and shows the difficulty of interpretation without having due regard to the actual facts of history which govern the interpretation.

Let us therefore look at the matter from the historical standpoint. Green, in his *Short History of the English People* (p. 241), says that “ it was by his exclusive right to the performance of the miracle which was wrought in the Mass that the lowliest priest was raised high above princes.” When we seek for information as to “ the miracle wrought in the Mass,” which raised the priest above the prince, we get an answer from the Lateran Council of 1099, which declared that it was “ a thing too execrable that the hands which had been so highly honoured as to be allowed to do that which no angel could do, namely, to create God the Creator and offer Him for the redemption of the world, should be degraded to become the servants of those hands which were polluted by obscenity or stained by rapines and the unjust shedding of blood.”¹

This quotation, while it indicates the attitude of the clergy in the matter of lay investitures, which was then a burning question, will also serve the purpose of showing what was the real teaching of the Mediæval doctrine of the Mass. The phrase “ to create God the Creator ” is striking enough, and utterly repellent to our ears, but it is the vigorous if crude expression of the dominant feature of the Mass. Transubstantiation, or “ to create God the Creator,” is the prop of the mediæval conception of the priesthood and of the Church, whether we regard it from the standpoint of the noble intentions of Hildebrand or from the more commercialized standpoint of Alexander VI.

The other phrase used at the Lateran Council to “ offer Him for the redemption of the world ” sums up the sacrificial conception of the Mass, and completes the unique position occupied by the Mediæval priest.

Both of these important points are summed up in the official teaching of the Council of Trent in the following words :

“ After the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God as well as true Man, is contained truly, really, and substantially under the appearances of these things which are perceived by the senses.

“ Whereas in this Divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass that very Christ Himself is contained and immolated without the shedding of blood, Who on the altar of the Cross once offered Himself

¹ Perry, *Student's English Church History*, i 187.

with the shedding of blood, the holy Synod teaches that the aforesaid sacrifice is truly propitiatory. . . . Wherefore not only is it offered for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful living, but also rightly, according to the tradition of the Apostles, for the dead in Christ not yet purified to the full."

The canon of the Mass, therefore, both by the official teaching of the mediæval Church and also by the rubrical injunctions incorporated in the canon, has as its doctrinal basis: (i) Transubstantiation; (ii) "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood," and (iii) the offering of that Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood both for the living and the dead.

It is upon this threefold basis that the doctrine of the Roman Missal was based, and it was by the same three dogmas that the Canon of the Mass was interpreted.

In the evolution from the teaching of the Roman Missal to the doctrine of our present Prayer Book, the Prayer Book of 1549 occupies a very important place. Broadly speaking the 1549 Prayer Book was both a compromise and a stepping stone. The break away from Rome and the fierce theological controversies of the first half of the sixteenth century had brought a certain amount of fluidity into the realm of dogmatics, and the 1549 Prayer Book was therefore to a large extent tentative. The main characteristics of the Communion Office are the following:

The Canon followed the line of the mediæval Missal, and comprised the Prayer for the Church Militant, our present Consecration Prayer, our present first Prayer of Thanksgiving after Communion, and the Lord's Prayer. In this Canon we notice a prayer for the faithful departed, a prayer that the Holy Spirit may sanctify the elements, and the statement that "we thy humble servants, do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make. . . ." The *Agnus Dei* is said immediately after the Consecration, and the first part only of the present words of administration is used.

Now with the background of the doctrinal teaching both of the Roman Missal and of the Reformers in our mind, we can see that some of the important statements of this Prayer Book are capable of more than one interpretation. For example, the prayer that the sanctified elements "may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ" is capable of an interpretation agreeable to modern Evangelicals, but it is equally capable of a Lutheran interpretation. In the same way the statement that "we . . . do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make . . ." lends itself both to the teaching of the Roman Missal as well as to Zwinglianism.

The inevitable result was that rigid Romanists, like Bishop Bonner, complained of the heresies involved in the omission of the Adoration of the Host, in the omission of the "oblation" of the "Host," and in the omission of the prayer that the bread might be "made" the body of our Lord. On the other hand, Bishop Gardiner

declared that the teaching of the 1549 Prayer Book on "the true faith of the holy mystery . . . is well termed not distant from the Catholic faith, in my judgment." He could see the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the words of administration, in the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, and also in the Prayer of Humble Access being placed after the Prayer of Consecration ; whilst one of the rubrics at the conclusion of the service lent itself to the same interpretation when it declared of the broken pieces of wafer that "men must not think less to be received in part than in whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Therefore, what we see in the 1549 Prayer Book with reference to the three cardinal features of the Roman Missal is the following, i.é. :

1. With regard to Transubstantiation, Bishop Gardiner and his fellow Roman Catholics see this dogma in the words of the Canon wherein (to use Gardiner's own words) "we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the Body and Blood of Christ, which they cannot be, unless God worketh it and make them so to be." . . . He also insists that the words of administration teach a Real Presence localized in the consecrated elements. In opposition to this we have Cranmer's own interpretation that "in the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may *be* the Body and Blood of Christ ; but that they may *be to us* the Body and Blood of Christ, that is to say, that we may so eat them and drink that we may be partakers of His Body crucified and of His Blood shed for our redemption" (*Gasquet*, p. 205, note).

2. With regard to "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood," evidence in support of this was seen in the use of the vestment or chasuble, which was one of the vestments allowed by the fourth rubric, and in the use of the term "altar." These are counterbalanced by the permission to use the "cope," which was not regarded as a sacrificial garment, and also by the use of the term "God's board" for the Holy Table.

3. Bishop Gardiner could see the teaching of the Roman Missal of "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood, both for the living and the dead," in the retention in the canon of the commendation of, and prayer for, the faithful departed. Cranmer, on the other hand, had ceased to hold the view "that Christ is therein offered by the priest and people" (*Gasquet*, p. 129).

The main difference between the two points of view can be narrowed down into the difference between those who connected the presence of Christ with the act of consecration, and those who connected the presence of Christ with the act of communion on the part of the faithful recipient.

It has been necessary to lay emphasis upon the character of the 1549 Prayer Book, because in this way alone can be understood the changes which were effected in 1552, changes which made our present Prayer Book what it is.

That the 1549 Prayer Book was looked upon as a compromise, and a temporary compromise only, may be gathered from the

evidence of contemporaries like Bucer, who declared, on April 26, 1549, that the "concessions made to the infirmity of the present age . . . are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion, and that rather they may be won over" (*Original Letters*, p. 536).

It is also clear that even before the issue of the 1549 Prayer Book, Cranmer and his fellow-reformers had already given up any belief in Transubstantiation, or in a "Real Presence" in or under the form of bread and wine, and also had discarded the accompanying dogmas of the offering of the Divine sacrifice of Christ without shedding of blood both for the living and the dead. This is evidenced by the Great Parliamentary Debate of 1548, and is emphasised by Cranmer's treatise on the Holy Communion, which was published in 1550.

With these facts before us it is obvious that as soon as circumstances permitted a doctrinal position of a more Reformation character would be adopted. The opportunity came in 1552. In the interval from 1548, at least eight new Bishops favourable to the Reformation had been appointed, which in itself presaged changes of a Reformation character, and so we are not surprised to find that the alterations effected in 1552 concern the very points which made the 1549 Prayer Book a compromise.

The first important change had reference to the words of administration. Bishop Gardiner had declared of the words of administration of 1549 that he and his fellow Romanists "agree in the form of teaching with that the Church of England teacheth at this day in the distribution of the Holy Communion, in that it is there said, the Body and Blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine."

Cranmer had controverted the statement, declaring: "they say that Christ is corporally in or under the forms of bread and wine; we say that Christ is not there, neither corporally nor spiritually, but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine He is spiritually, and corporally in Heaven."

The 1552 Prayer Book cut the difficulty by changing the words of administration into the second half of our present form, and this was a clear assertion of Cranmer's teaching that Christ's presence is to be found not in the bread and wine but in the worthy receiver.

The second great change was the breaking up of the Canon, and this also was done with a deliberate intention. Bishop Gardiner had declared that the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Consecration involved the Real Presence in the elements; the Invocation, therefore, was omitted. He asserted that "Masses for the dead" were supported by the prayer for the departed in the first part of the Canon: this prayer was also omitted. Gardiner had found the Real Presence in the fact that the Prayer of Humble Access followed the Consecration; the Prayer of Humble Access was therefore placed before the Prayer of Consecration.

Instead of the offering of the consecrated elements, as in 1549, which could be interpreted as the offering of the Body and Blood of

Christ, the Prayer of Consecration declares that Christ Himself had made "a full, perfect, and sufficient . . . oblation . . . for the sins of the whole world," and the part of the Canon which speaks of "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is transferred to the post-Communion service and made into our first Thanksgiving Prayer.

The re-arrangement of the Canon, therefore, was not the work of a blundering iconoclast, but was dictated on the one hand by a desire to remove ambiguities, and on the other to frame the service in such a form that its doctrinal intention should be clear. The Canon of 1549, as the evidence of Bishop Gardiner shows, was quite capable of being used as the Mass of the Roman Missal; the alterations effected in 1552 did away with such a possibility, and it is the 1552 Prayer Book, therefore, which witnesses to the truth that Cranmer changed the Mass into the Communion service. The re-arrangement and omissions nullified any idea of Transubstantiation or of the Real Presence in or under the form of bread and wine, and emphasized the Presence of Christ in the worthy receiver; the changes repudiated the sacrifice of the Mass, and taught instead the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves as a living sacrifice to God in return for the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice made for us by Christ on Calvary.

The Prayer Book of 1552 is important, because the changes which have taken place since then have been few in number. The combination in 1559 of the 1549 and 1552 words of administration in no way altered the doctrinal teaching, because the interpretation of the 1549 words was governed by those of 1552. The omission of the Black Rubric in 1559 was covered by the condemnation of Transubstantiation in the Thirty-nine Articles of 1571. I am not unmindful of the assertions of those who import a doctrinal significance to the changes of 1662, but the statement of Gasquet holds true (though it has a very different significance for him than for us), that "as regards the English Book, what it was in 1552 it practically remains to the present day. The position which was deliberately abandoned in 1549 and still further departed from in 1552 has never been recovered."

To sum up, our present Holy Communion Service, by its re-arrangements, omissions, and additions which mark it off both from the Roman Missal and from the 1549 Prayer Book, occupies the following position with reference to the main subjects upon which the Reformation turned, i.e.:

i. In reference to the question of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, the Anglican position is stated by Hooker in the following terms: "The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ *when* and *where* the bread is His Body or the cup His Blood, but *only* in the very heart and soul of him that receiveth them" (Book V, c. lxvii, 6).

ii. In reference to the question of sacrifice in the Sacrament, the

Anglican point of view is summed up by Archbishop Laud in these words: " At and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices : one by the priest only—that's the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death represented in bread broken and wine poured out ; another by the priest and people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we received by the precious death of Christ ; the third, by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both, all the rest of his life, for this blessing then bestowed on him " (Conference with Fisher, quoted by Meyrick, *Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, p. 40).

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF N.A. 84.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON (Member of the National Assembly).

IN view of the statements by members of the Prayer Book Revision Committee, e.g. by Lord Hugh Cecil at the last session of the House of Laity, that no change in the doctrine of the Prayer Book is made in their Report, it may seem unnecessary and even ungracious to seek for any special doctrinal characteristics in that document. But if you first read your own doctrine into the Prayer Book and then make proposals which would bring out that doctrine more clearly, people who are unable to find it in the Prayer Book may be excused for thinking the proposals do involve a change. Moreover, it is clear that a large number of Churchpeople, belonging to more than one school of thought, are of opinion that the alterations made in the Prayer Book in 1552 greatly changed its doctrinal complexion as compared with the Book of 1549. Proposals, therefore, which have for their effect a reversion in many important features to the 1549 Book must be supposed to carry with them the doctrinal implications of such reversion.

It is important to bear in mind that N.A. 84 is only an instalment of revision, and it is a reasonable inference that the further revision contemplated by it will be in the same direction as that we are now asked to follow. It is further important to remember that many of the proposed changes are of the nature of concessions to those among us who are already teaching a system of doctrine quite alien to that which is contained in the Prayer Book, and we cannot overlook this when interpreting the meaning of these concessions. In the time allotted to me it is only possible to indicate a few of the chief points in the Measure which appear to distinguish it doctrinally from our present book.

To begin with the Calendar, it is very remarkable that while as many as twenty-nine additions are made to it, no name later than 1380 has been deemed worthy of commemoration. If Anskar

of Sweden, Thomas of Aquinas, and Ninian, Bishop of Galloway, are to be given places, we might at least have expected that the men to whom we owe our English Bible and English Prayer Book—Wyclif and Tyndale, Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer—would also have been included. As it stands in the Measure, the Calendar has a truncated, lopsided appearance, and even so, why were Grosseteste and Wyclif excluded, for they both come within the period which it covers. These and later omissions are rendered significant by the fact that in 1914 a Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury presented a Report on the Calendar recommending the addition of the following, among other names: Grosseteste, Wyclif, Cranmer, Bishop Morgan, George Herbert, Jeremy Taylor, Latimer, Hooker, Andrewes, Thomas Ken, Bishop Butler, John Wesley. If these, with perhaps one or two others, such as Tyndale, Cosin, Henry Martyn, Bishop Hannington, had been included, the Calendar would then have had an historically balanced character, and the collect provided for days for which there is no special collect could then have been used with a purely general reference. As it is, we are asked to thank God for the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and others whose doctrine the Church of England has expressly repudiated.

This matter is itself important, but there is another which goes much deeper—the insertion, on November 2, of the commemoration of All Souls, which takes us behind even the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. This commemoration is to be found in the Sarum Missal, as it is also in the Roman; but it has not had a place in our formularies since the Reformation. The commemoration of All Souls is open to two objections: it introduces an unreal and unscriptural distinction between Christian people—those described on November 1 as “All Saints” and those referred to on November 2 as “All Souls,” and it is inseparably associated with the doctrine of purgatory. If I may quote from the Protestant Dictionary: “The earliest mention of this special day, November 2, cannot be traced higher than the tenth century, when Odilo, Abbot of Clugny, having heard of an awful dream seen by a pilgrim from Jerusalem, in which he beheld the suffering of souls in purgatory, set apart this day of intercession for them. If All Saints’ Day be observed, All Souls is superfluous, unless superstitious doctrine be held respecting the state of the dead.” In view of the origin of this commemoration, and of the fact that the doctrine of purgatory is already being taught by the Anglo-Roman party in our Church, objections to its revival are strengthened. Moreover, the language of the special Collect proposed for use on this day is as follows:

“*Collect.* Almighty Eternal God, who wouldest have all men to be saved; Be merciful, we beseech Thee, to the souls of thy servants who have departed from this world in the confession of Thy Name, that they may be joined to the company of thy Saints; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*”

However appropriate these petitions might be to the state of those who had died in impenitence or unbelief, or to those whose

state was doubtful, they are wholly out of place when referring to the *faithful* departed. Such a prayer would be strangely out of harmony with that for a sick child in the Visitation service, ". . . or else receive him into those heavenly habitations where the souls of them that sleep in the Lord Jesus enjoy perpetual rest and felicity"; and with that in the Burial Service: "Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity."

In the same category must be included the prayers "for the faithful departed" which are contained in the Revision Committee's Report. If these do indeed enjoy "perpetual rest and felicity," it would seem reasonable to believe that they have passed beyond the need of our prayers.

We find, moreover, that in the Burial of the Dead there is provision for a "special celebration of the Holy Communion," a provision which was removed from the First Prayer Book in 1552. It is difficult to avoid seeing in this a concession to those who now celebrate Masses for the Dead, a superstition bound up with the doctrine of purgatory.

¶ We come next to two proposals which have aroused strong opposition—the permission to use the chasuble (for that is what is meant by the word "vestment"), and the alteration of the Prayer of Consecration.

The chasuble is the vestment which in the Roman Church is distinctive of the Mass. It is always worn by the celebrant at Mass, and is not worn except on that occasion. The use which prevails in the Scandinavian Churches where chasubles are worn on a great variety of occasions, and its exceptional use by deacons at penitential seasons in some Continental Churches, do not affect the general truth of this statement. It signifies the doctrine that the Holy Communion is a sacrifice offered to God, and is claimed by most of those in our Church who now use it as emphasizing that doctrine. But the New Testament represents the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a gift from God to us, and not an offering from us to Him. Moreover, our Lord's last utterance upon the Cross was "It is finished," and there is now no more sacrifice for sin. There is therefore no place in the Christian Church for such a sacrifice as that which is supposed to be offered in the Mass, and our Prayer Book not only contains no provision for it, but in plain and express language rejects it. It will be remembered that in 1906 Lord Halifax, speaking as President of the English Church Union, said, "We value the vestments, other reasons apart, because they are a witness to the fact that the Lord's Supper is neither more nor less than the Mass in English."

The same teaching is to be found in the changes in the Prayer of Consecration. This now ends with the recital of the institution by our Lord, concluding at the words "do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of Me." The proposal is to add the following words:

“Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death of Thy dear Son, His mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, looking also for His coming again, do render unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which He hath procured unto us; and . . .”

Then is added the first of the two prayers provided in our present book after the communicants have all partaken. Then come the words: “And now as our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say,” and the whole is concluded with the Lord’s Prayer.

There are two principal objections to this change, slight as it may appear to be. One is that the additions afford opportunity for acts of adoration to the consecrated bread and wine which would then be upon the Holy Table, such as genuflection and elevation. The other is that by incorporating the first post-Communion Prayer in the Prayer of Consecration, support is given to the claim that the priest is performing a sacrificial action on behalf of the people. In its present place the language of the prayer is appropriate and beautiful. The communicants have all partaken of the sacred emblems of the Saviour’s love. With thankful and uplifted hearts they return to their seats, and then anew dedicate to God the lives which He has redeemed. “Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee . . . and although we be unworthy to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service.” At this point of the service there is no possibility of misconceiving these words, but the introduction of such sacrificial expressions into the Consecration Prayer, while the consecrated elements are yet upon the Holy Table, would greatly lend itself to erroneous and unscriptural teaching.

In the proposal to permit Reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick, it might be possible, if the new rubrics were strictly construed and loyally obeyed, to acquit the change of any doctrinal intention. At the same time it ignores the rubric as to spiritual communion; and it is hardly a want of charity, in view of the very explicit statements which have actually been made, to doubt whether the restrictions will be observed.

Five members of the Revision Committee signed the following Memorandum which appears in the Report :

We regret that we are unable to concur with the majority of the Committee in approving of the proposed new rubrics to the Order for the Communion of the Sick (numbered 145 in the Schedule to the Report), which contemplate Reservation of a part of the consecrated bread and wine and (in the event indicated) “further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying.” Notwithstanding the care with which those rubrics have been settled, we do not think that it is possible adequately to safeguard the practice from abuse. We do not admit that

the practice of Reservation is either primitive or Catholic ; and we believe that the teaching associated with it is not conformable to Holy Scripture.

EDWARD CLARKE.
H. C. HOGAN.
G. A. KING.
ALBERT MITCHELL.
EUGENE STOCK.

It cannot be denied that Reservation is in practice largely associated with superstitious teaching as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, and many very grave abuses are prevalent in connexion with it. It is clear that doctrinal motives influence the demand for its restoration, though purely practical considerations are those which are generally used in support of the claim for it.

It is this doctrinal bias of the Measure which makes concession or compromise impossible. Truth is ours to profit by, to defend, and to maintain, and not to barter or to sacrifice in the supposed interests of peace and unity. We must stand fast, that the Truth of the Gospel may continue with us, and that as "with freedom did Christ make us free," we be not "entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE USE OF N.A. 84.

BY THE REV. CANON GEORGE BUCHANAN, M.A., Vicar of
Holy Trinity, Hull.

IT is not easy to fulfil the terms of the subject allotted to me, because it is largely hypothetical. If N.A. 84 be adopted, what will be the effect? but if it be largely amended, what further effect? Again, if it be not used by large sections of Evangelical Churchmen, what effect can there be, except to accentuate their divergence from their brethren? And further if, where it is used, it is regarded as being of a temporary and transitory nature, then what effect will its use in the meantime have on the permanent book to be adopted say twenty years hence?

In spite, however, of so much that is hypothetical, there are three points that are to be reckoned on as certainties:

I. *Very many Evangelical Churchmen will use it.* It is idle to suppose that the *odium theologicum* will prevent the large body of younger Evangelicals from making use of its provisions, and any thought of counting on that may, in my judgment, be dismissed. Even if it be amended by the E.C.U. Report, it will still largely be used, at least you cannot count on any innate antagonism that would automatically prevent this. The fact is that, for better or for worse, innate antagonisms have largely died among the better type of Churchmen; a wider view of the universe and a deeper study of

history have made the present generation know more and forgive more, have at any rate prevented a priori antagonisms. Therefore one can be almost certain that while a number of their elders will be disinclined to use the Alternative most of the younger Evangelical Clergy will use it freely, or so much of it as suits their needs.

II. *Its use will colour our Evangelical outlook.* It is idle again, to suppose that continual use, and presumably continual instruction in regard to it, will not leave a definite impression on the mentality of all concerned. It will, and that is what makes the present moment so critical: you are settling to-day formulæ of worship that will make a vast difference in the attitude of those who shall be called upon to establish the permanent forms later on. Impressionable Evangelical curates in 1923 will be dignitaries of first (or second) magnitude in 1943. They will (I hope) still be Evangelical, but they will no longer be merely impressionable; rather will they be already impressed deeply with the tone and tendency of the interim book they will have used for twenty years. Note this, above all, that what matters is not 1923 but 1943.

III. *It is useless to discuss N.A. 84 without reference to other suggested alternatives.* There is the E.C.U. Report, admirably drawn up and subtly efficient from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint. There is the excellent, if somewhat complicated, series of suggestions published under the authority of Dr. Temple, Bishop of Manchester. There is, of course, the 1549 Book already before us, but brought recently within the margin of our corporate consciousness by the suggestion of the Archbishop of York.

N.A. 84 has to run the gauntlet of all these and more, and it is obvious that every distinctive point in each of them will be brought forward by way of amendment. No one can tell what the result may be, but it is safe to count on a good deal of alteration if the proposed Measure is to get through at all. Any attempt then to estimate the effect of using the Alternative Prayer Book must reckon with a distinct coloration in some of its most vital clauses before it becomes law.

Supposing then it is eventually adopted with all due amendments, what effects are likely to occur? From many aspects, notably in regard to the less central services, it is reasonable to say that it will make for—

I. REALITY IN PUBLIC PRAYER.

Let us be honest, there will be much of gain in it, and the Committee deserve our gratitude for their labours. Speaking generally—apart from the Communion Office—it will be a great gain in the direction of reality for us to have a book that makes our services more compact, and at the same time allows them to cover a more adequate range of thought and vision. The consequence of using N.A. 84 will be that we shall no longer imagine that definite Missionary work is covered by a prayer for “all sorts and conditions of men,” that social problems and the relationship of employer to

employed are altogether outside the scope of common prayer. It will be a gain, also, to rid our people of the idea that we talk crudely at a marriage service about matters on which the contracting parties are particularly sensitive at the moment, or that at a funeral we ignore the innocent simplicity of child-life, or the personal grief of the bereaved. In these and a dozen other ways the Committee have made a bold gesture of common sense, that must, one would think, make for reality in worship.

Alas, that in other directions, the same cannot be said. Recognizing that the position of the Committee was one of "give and take," which means that members had often to "give" away what they wanted to keep, and "take" what they did not want to receive—recognizing the necessity of compromise in the Book, the resulting consequences of its use are likely to be not a little disturbing. In some ways, for instance, the use of the book will make for—

II. UNCERTAINTY IN DOCTRINAL TRUTH.

What the *Ecclesia Anglicana* stands for was never easy to say, but now it will be impossible. To begin with, what will the Declaration of Assent really mean? The clause in the preamble of the proposed Measure infers that while assent will still be given to the present book as containing the doctrinal basis of the Church's teaching legally enacted, this assent will also cover variations in it "so far as is permitted in the Alternative Book." But if, as many think, the two books are fundamentally antagonistic in doctrine, each built on a basis that is, in the last analysis, contradictory, how can assent be given simultaneously to both? Surely here we shall have a strange and not very edifying spectacle. If the clergyman thinks he is assenting to both he is guilty of a contradiction; if he means only to assent to one, then he may be guilty of a paradox, for he may be officially "assenting" to a book he is not going to use, and officially using a book to which he has not "assented."

Further uncertainty will arise out of this, and we may ask, will the clergyman believe the Thirty-nine Articles or will he not? Indeed, will the Church expect him so to do? Not a word has been mentioned about altering the Thirty-nine Articles, yet it would surely be difficult to reconcile the tendency and even some of the actual proposals of N.A. 84 with these Articles. If it be strictly understood that the Alternative is merely an expedient to cover say twenty years of a transition period, we might well put up with the anomaly. But that only postpones the inevitable clearing up of the difficulty: it gives us an uncertainty now, and leaves us not at all certain that the uncertainty will be rectified later.

In quite another direction uncertainty (due to compromise) seems to rule. Take prayers for the dead, and the cognate doctrines: apart from a somewhat definite collect for All Souls' Day, we may ask, Does the Committee believe in prayers for the dead or does it not? Does it want the Church to believe in them or does it not?

If it does not, why does it insert what purports to be such? and if it does, why does it not insert prayers on more definite lines? Can a Church that purports to believe in *real* prayer for those who are departed be content with this?—"Shed forth upon Thy whole Church in Paradise and on earth the bright beams of Thy Light and Comfort." What is the spiritual personal prayer-value of that? Is it worth dividing the Church over? Again, after the mention of the B.V.M. and patriarchs, etc., we are to beseech God that, "encouraged by their examples" (not their prayers) and "strengthened by their fellowship (not their intercessions), we also, etc." If this were intended to emphasize the Communion of Saints one could understand it, but if it be meant to acclimatize us to prayers for the dead, it is of little use. Even in the Burial Service, the historic petition about "eternal rest" and "perpetual light" is nullified, or at least made uncertain, by the rubric which only says "*may be said:*" The similar use of "God's mercy" in the committal at the grave is merely an alternative, and that in a book itself already only an alternative. What does the proposal in the Measure intend us to stand for? There is no doubt about the proposed prayers in the E.C.U. Report. There you know where you are, even if you do not like where they take you. But this leads nowhere definitely except by default, and one cannot help thinking that the Committee drew it up with one eye on those who wanted the whole thing and the other on those who would stir up trouble if anything definite were granted. We have used the word compromise; dare we suggest the further word "camouflage"? Read that prayer over again, *read it aloud*—"Blessed Virgin Mary, the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs . . ." Can it be that the Committee imagined that (like the blessed word Mesopotamia) the very resonance of its vocal utterance would hide from our minds the paucity of its spiritual prayer-value? The E.C.U. proposes definitely to ask that "strengthened by their *intercessions*" we may be found meet, etc. If we believe in the intercession of the saints let us say so, but if we do not, then let us avoid phrases that are historically linked up with the idea. In this connexion it is pathetic to remember that the original purpose of the King's Letters of Business was to put an end to that uncertainty that produced charges and counter-charges of "lawlessness." If this be all we are to get, one fears that the mental confusion will be worse confounded. And the average layman hates such doctrinal uncertainty: it makes him feel that he is not sure of himself, and what is worse, not sure where his vicar is going. The net result is disastrous; it produces within him the feeling that somehow "those parsons are doing him," coupled with the humiliating reflection that he himself is not just competent to say where. Unity is about the last thing that is likely to arise out of such a situation.

A further consequence of the use of N.A. 84 goes beyond a mere negative element like uncertainty; it will, in a positive manner, pave the way for a new—

III. OBJECTIVITY IN SACRAMENTAL WORSHIP.

As to the actual proposals of the measure, it is perhaps unfair to say that this is a necessary consequence of their use, for the Committee have manifestly tried to avoid any such action directly. But, as we all know, effects are cumulative, and the tendency of a number of comparatively small items must be taken into account.

The suggestion of four different variations of Vestments is one of these. It is not in my province to discuss the significance of Vestments as such, but only the consequence of using them. Undoubtedly and confessedly it will help to focus attention not only on the sacramental nature of the service, but on the relation and status of the priest in regard to it. If anyone doubts this, then the words of Lord Halifax will make it plain, to the effect that Vestments are desired not for their æsthetic beauty, but because they "witness to the fact that what we are celebrating is nothing more or less than the Mass in English." Again, another comparatively small detail is to be noted—the use of half the words of administration if and when the whole sentence has been used once at the outset.

On the grounds of utility, as shortening a service, the emotional strain of which we cannot overlook, this curtailment is admirable, and will be largely availed of. But the fact that between the two halves of the sentence there is historically a gulf should make us pause. The present Prayer Book bridged this over by combining them, but the Alternative Book looks like breaking down the unity which the bridge provided and allowing each bank to declare itself as separate from the other.

There is little doubt that the effect of using continually and solely the words referring to the Body and Blood of Christ, will tend to assist the general sense of an objectively real presence in the Sacrament, a presence apart from the "taking and eating," even though one is doing both at the time. All this will pave the way for the Reserved Sacrament, which will *par excellence* meet the needs of those who want to have the objectivity complete. Frankly, Reservation for the sick as such is, I think, harmless and even beautiful. In so far as it is merely an extended administration, a celebration extended in its most practical form to the sick parishioner across the street—in this respect it is much to be desired as a particularly touching symbol of the unity of the Body Corporate. But it is not wanted for that purpose alone; indeed, I doubt if it would ever be wanted if that were the only reason for it. Quite candidly, it is wanted by those who demand it primarily, it may be, for the sick, but ultimately for *the faithful*. That means that it will be used in a manner that emphasizes the objective reality of the Presence more than anything else. N.A. 84 is permitting a custom that will inevitably lead to a Cult; it has done so before and it will do so again, and nothing on earth can stop it. Honestly, if I believed the premises nothing would stop me from the conclusion. If I had the mental ability (or should I say agility) to believe what some people believe as to the Elements after Consecration, then

I should go the whole way, for the psychological effect of such a Presence used in such a way is one of the most powerful on earth. With so alluring a possibility as this—alluring already to many Anglicans—common sense would surely urge the ancient maxim: "*Obsta principis.*"

One final consequence of the use of N.A. 84 will be—

IV. INSECURITY IN LITURGICAL SAFEGUARDS.

Apart from Ecclesiastical Courts, which the Archbishop of Canterbury warns us not to count on, the main safeguards are the interpretation of rubrics and the interposition of bishops, and it is hard to say which is the more insecure. The growing habit of solving all difficulties by throwing the onus on the Bishop is coming to be a menace both to Episcopacy as such and also to the Church of England. No bishop on the bench could solve all the parochial and liturgical problems now thrust on him, and at the same time attend to his business. Yet "by permission of the Ordinary" is the throbbing refrain of all legislation to-day. First, the Committee in bringing in the book say that all questions that may arise between the clergy and people "stand referred to the Bishop," who is told that he must consult each party and thereupon make "orders which shall be final." Then appended to the Order for Holy Communion there is a definite safeguard against supplementing or interrupting the course of the service by additional prayers. But this is entirely weakened by the clause, "Save so far as may be ordered or permitted by the Ordinary." Of course, in any Episcopal system, the Bishop must exercise proper jurisdiction and supervision, but in a system so unique, not to say anomalous, as the Anglican Church, the Bishop is not an institution appointed from one central, and almost impersonal, source, say in Rome. He is very much of an individual, and often—too often—a "party" individual at that, appointed it is true by the King, who acts on the nomination of the Prime Minister, who acts on the nomination of—well, shall we say, the keeper of his conscience! What safeguard have you here as to "ordering" or "permitting" extra liturgical rites and ceremonies? There are many items that circumstances might compel the Bishop of Chelmsford to "permit," items which, at the same time, the Bishop of London would only be too delighted to "order." Where is the safeguard between them? Is it "the custom or rule of the Catholic Church"? but where, pray, is that?

Rubrics are the other safeguard, but they need something like an Ecclesiastical Court to interpret, not to say enforce, them. Take that in relation to the Reservation of the Sacrament. The words "same day" and "with as little delay as possible" are as well-meaning as they are futile, for the same day may mean a very long day, and as little delay as possible may mean many hours on end, and *where are the elements in the meantime?* Then, "if not used the same day," they are to be kept in such place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall direct—as the Bishop of Liverpool and the Bishop of St. Albans, for instance, may direct. What

similarity will you expect? But to be fair to the rubric it concludes with words that mark a brave gesture of authority "so that they be not used for any other purpose whatever." Quite so, and will the bishops, on the day the book becomes law, order all receptacles where at present the Reserved Sacrament is used for "other purpose" to be instantly and permanently removed? Will they? After this daring show of Episcopal authority, it is somewhat of an anti-climax to read that where this is not sufficient, "the curate," i.e. the clergyman, may make "further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying," with due permission, of course, from his superiors. With that loophole, surely safeguards are at a discount.

And if rubrics or bishops cannot safeguard manual acts, how will either safeguard mental intentions? For instance, take the removing of the Prayer of Oblation from its present position to a place in close relation to the consecration of the elements. Personally, I like the Anamnesis and prayer with the Lord's Prayer in this position as giving due testimony both to the glory of the Ascended Lord and to the consecration of the worshipper. But then, I would not read anything more into it. What is to prevent much more being read into the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and into the words, "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord"? Who can prevent any priest reading into it a meaning relating to the Presence alleged to be in the consecrated elements at that moment on the "altar"? It did not need Einstein to teach us the doctrine of relativity in language; we all know that a phrase is as sensitive as a chameleon to every change in its environment. For instance, "O Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" means one thing as said at a revival meeting in a Mission Hall; it means something quite different as said or sung at the Eucharist. The *Nunc Dimittis* is the same. After the "Gospel" Lesson it is very beautiful and spiritual to say "Mine eyes have seen Thy Salvation," but every child can see the additional significance that is attached to it as sung after the celebration. So with the Prayer of Oblation; it seems to me impossible to safeguard the use of the words "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord" from a relation to the Lord sacramentally rather than spiritually present. The only safeguard here is to leave the prayer where it is; anything else will be futile to prevent an evil that is mental, or indeed temperamental, and will always be able to evade direction. If Daniel O'Connell could drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament that was ever enacted, it seems to me the average Anglo-Catholic could drive the doctrine of intention through any safeguard that was ever imposed.

To sum up: the consequences of the use of N.A. 84 may be summarized in four words relating to four different entities who will be faced with the Alternative Book—Antipathy, Affinity, Opportunity, and Gravity.

(a) *For the older type of Evangelical* the consequence of its being authorized will certainly be *Antipathy*—much greater divergence in thought from his brethren than before.

(b) *For the younger type of Evangelical*, one may venture to say *Affinity*—much immediate gain from its use, with a gradual and subtle development of an attitude acclimatized and attuned to the atmosphere of the mediæval.

(c) *For the Anglo-Catholic*, *Opportunity*—no immediate satisfaction, but the chance of his life for the propagation of ideas that will one day lead to a “frank and complete legal recognition of Catholic faith and practice.”

And *for the Church of England*—which, after all, is the thing that counts—GRAVITY is the only word—a grave period of uncertainty as to whether at this solemn crisis she took the wisest course, and later on, a still more grave period of decision, when she must ultimately decide what her position is in relation to the Catholic Church, and must embody what she stands for in one permanent Prayer Book which will bring to all her sorely-tried members that unity which is vital to religious life and essential to spiritual efficiency.

THE REVISION THAT IS NEEDED:

ILLUSTRATED BY N.A. 84.

BY THE REV. C. L. THORNTON-DUESBERY, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone.

A FEW weeks ago I came face to face in Switzerland with a chalet dated A.D. 1552. The date recalled Prayer Book Revision—even in the Swiss mountains one could not get away from it! (By the way, I did not find a 1549 chalet!) Before and behind the chalet was a well-cultivated Alp, and on one side a rushing stream of spring water, the food and water supply of the inhabitants of the chalet, through storm and sunshine, for four centuries and more. Yet even that chalet had come under revision: electric light had been introduced; telegraph and telephone wires ran near it; the peasants, at the time I saw it, were preparing the Alp for a potato crop with a plough and patent digger; the water was regulated by a system of pipes and irrigation.

Our Prayer Book is substantially that of A.D. 1552. Life in England has greatly changed since the sixteenth century; consequently there are many needs which the present book does not meet. All schools of thought within our Church demand a revision. Evangelicals will accept a revision willingly, provided it follows sound lines, nor will they expect it, when its final shape is determined, to be exactly what they wish. None of us can expect to get exactly what we like. They recognize that there must be a certain measure of give and take. We cannot pray as in A.D. 1661 (or even as before the War). In many ways our forms are anti-

quoted and deficient. Their length is often excessive—an hour seems sufficient for an ordinary Summer Sunday Evening Service; repetitions should be avoided; the Psalms are too long, and some of them obviously unsuitable for Christian worship. In the present book Sunday Morning Service really demands of us Morning Prayer, Litany, Communion, all in full, including two Creeds and several repetitions of the Lord's Prayer.

Now another kind of worship is needed—a worship that is congregational, not a duet between priest and clerk. Singing has come back to its place in worship. Repetition is tedious. Compression is demanded. The *real* needs of the age must come into it. Why should the twentieth century be tied down to the needs of 1661? I come back to my chalet. New light has come to us. We are a comprehensive body. The Holy Spirit is guiding the Church of to-day. The Lambeth Conference has met and declared that "the Catholic Church consists of the *whole body* of those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized in the name of the Trinity." The wires run round the chalet—all kinds of new messages are being flashed along the wires of modern life. The seasoned beams are there, brown with age and beauty. We shrink from the idea of changing the prayers. They are dear to us from association and custom, and because old things are sacred and deep. Yet there is an element which needs to be more up to date.

Hence the question comes, What are the fundamental principles on which a needed revision can take place? What does our Book of Common Prayer stand for? Will the proposals of N.A. 84 help us?

- (1) Revision must be based on sound liturgical knowledge.
- (2) Revision must look to the present as well as to the past. The last four centuries are important alike with those that went before. That which is Catholic must cover all.
- (3) Revision must be based on Bible Doctrine.
- (4) Our Prayer Book is "the child of the Reformation." Our Anglican position requires that all proposals should be tested in accordance with Article VI.
- (5) Revision must not disturb the doctrinal balance of the Prayer Book, i.e. the main Anglican comprehension—a comprehension which meets the "sober, peaceful, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

These are principles upon which it seems to me emphasis should be laid, and within which the revision that is needed must find place. How far then do the proposals of N.A. 84 rest on such principles, and how far do they meet our needed revision? We owe tremendous thanks to the makers of N.A. 84, to the wise generalship of their Chairman (the late Bishop of Gloucester), and not least by any means to the Evangelical members. All had a contribution to give, and all alike worked with consideration for one another's views and with painstaking and long protracted labour.

N.A. 84 attempts to unite all schools. It strives to be conservative in a reasonable sense; it is soundly liturgical, literary, and devotional; it tries to meet the needs and circumstances of to-day. Lord Hugh Cecil tells us (though many disagree with him) it does not disturb the doctrinal balance nor depart from the traditional teaching of the Church of England. It certainly provides greater elasticity and enrichment. This is very much. Why should anyone keen on revision turn it down as France turned down the German offer. *Punch* last week shows how the German Goose has commenced laying, and asks, "Why despise the first egg because it is small?"

THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Let us look at the proposals: I turn first to the sacraments. The Holy Communion is our highest act of worship. Here the new age would naturally demand alteration and enrichment. It is our Alp, from which we get spiritual food. New light shines on it. New messages pass over it. We have learnt a great deal since A.D. 1661 as to what the Communion Service may be like. Some desire an improved form. All of us feel the needed revision should supply it. It is well to face the question that probably there are defects in our service as it now stands, though probably all of us here are satisfied to die using it. As regards the Prayer of Consecration. In every Communion service the great prayer comes in the middle; it is the centre of the service; by all Christian tradition it is *the* prayer. N.A. 84 proposes an extended Consecrated prayer. It asks, Why stop at the Upper Room? Why cut a piece out of the wonderful story? Why not unroll the whole great story, including the mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension? "The proposal," Mr. Albert Mitchell tells us, "emerged in the Committee after a motion to leave the service unaltered had been lost and a more serious proposal negatived. The Committee allows the Prayer of Humble Access *before* Consecration; the exclusion of the words 'before Thee' after 'remembrance,' and the negativing of any invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements." It is true, I think, that the placing of the Prayer of Oblation, with its phrase "this our sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving," *before* reception instead of *after* does give colour to the application of the phrase to the elements, but, after all, it is part of the old prayer itself. Before lightly turning down the Committee's proposal as to the canon, it would be well to read the whole prayer through *aloud* in one's study. I have done so and found it very satisfying. It unrolls a *continuous* act before your eyes; it lifts the service above any moment of magical change, such as even is possible in our present form with its climax in the words of Institution. In the present form the celebrant has only to resort to elevation and genuflection, and there is a Roman magical moment, such as *we* desire to eliminate. For me the creation of a Real Presence by an act of consecration is gross materialism and superstition such as one's soul abhors. Anything that does away with the idea of a

magical or supreme moment, in which Christ comes nearer in the elements than He may be at any other time of worship, is to be welcomed. We know the phrase "the nearer the sacred elements the nearer our Blessed Lord." This is idolatry, falsehood, and superstition.

We shall hear later of other suggested forms, like that of the Grey Book, but if revision of the canon is to take place, then the N.A. 84 proposal must not be turned down too soon. It may not be easy to get anything better.

There are other proposals in the Communion service which come into the consideration of the needed revision, e.g. as regards convenience. In these days of many more communicants and of constant celebrations, the service sometimes needs shortening. Is it necessary to have the ten Commandments read every time? Might not our Lord's description of our Duty to God and Man suffice sometimes? According to the Prayer Book the long invitation should be said *every* time, but it is dropped. Would it not be well to get authority for this? Do we find it possible always to say the words of administration to each communicant? Would not relief here, such as N.A. 84 affords, be welcome? Do we not feel the omission of the prayer for the King and sometimes of the sermon is necessary? Do we not need additional collects, epistles, and gospels, and more proper prefaces?

These N.A. 84 seeks to give us. Most of us consider there are some suggested collects, epistles, and gospels we might well refuse, e.g. those for All Souls' Day; there are others we might wish to insert.

However, in spite of the words of the proposed rubric on the dress of the celebrant, viz. "for the avoidance of all controversy and doubtfulness," rather, I should say—just because *there is* so much "controversy and doubtfulness," and not only about the dress of the minister, but also about the canon and Reservation; because, too, our age has not produced very many liturgiologists; because Anglo-Catholics think N.A. 84 does not express their conception of Catholic worship and, generally speaking, will have none of it, and Evangelicals think it seriously affects the doctrinal character of the office, and are not satisfied with it therefore.

In view of all such acute controversy (where controversy is most of all to be deplored) it is perhaps best to divide this Measure in such a way that the Communion Office is left untouched until a more favourable time, when the Church is able to exercise and enforce its proper authority and make alterations which may secure a more ready and general acceptance. In an able article following a letter of Bishop Knox on May 4 last *The Times* newspaper says: "We ourselves would suggest that for *the present* the Holy Communion service should be allowed to remain as it is, and the task of revision deferred." In the same strain the Bishop of Ripon, speaking at the Birmingham Diocesan Conference: "I think the time is not ripe for the revision of the Prayer of Consecration."

RESERVATION.

A proposed rubric in the Communion of the Sick provides for *Guarded Reservation* of the consecrated Bread and Wine for the Communion of the Sick and for no other purpose whatsoever. We must not give ourselves away by being averse to allowing the Sacrament to be taken to the sick. If Reservation were demanded in the interests of the sick no sensible person would oppose it. But no sensible person for a moment supposes that this is the reason why the demand for Reservation is made. "A very slight knowledge of the psychology of religion," says some one, "suggests the potency of devout contemplative adoration to fasten itself upon external objects of acknowledged sanctity."

In a needed revision we must oppose adoration, exposition, benediction, worship of the tabernacle, and that unwholesome idea "the nearer you get to the elements the nearer to Christ." When the elements are kept there is nothing magical about them. We have a right to insist on the right keeping of the new form, if allowed. Evangelicals have a right to ask for guarantees. If Anglo-Catholics are asking for a Reservation for the purpose of adoration, and will give no guarantee, then we had better let it wait with the Communion service, and be satisfied for the time with the rest of N.A. 84. In any case efforts to limit Reservation have so far been singularly unsuccessful.

HOLY BAPTISM.

The proposed alterations in the service for the other sacrament, that of Holy Baptism, are not many, but the provision of a shorter alternative form makes for the revision needed. We welcome the rubrics requiring that Baptism be not deferred except upon "a great and reasonable cause"; that it is convenient, where possible, that Baptisms should be administered upon Sundays and other Holy Days, though upon any other day for sufficient cause; that when administered at evening all the prayers after the third collect, except that of St. Chrysostom and the Grace, be omitted. We welcome too the simpler exhortation at the end of the alternative service and the omission of archaic words like "vulgar" and the change of words like "damned" in the exhortation of the gospel in the service for those of riper years. We welcome too, as needed, the provision that parents may be sponsors for their own children, provided there is one other sponsor. With such small changes and the new proposals of Convocation for Private Baptism, this service of Holy Baptism should go on, like my Alpine stream, much the same as ever.

MORNING PRAYER.

Turning to daily prayers, we find a large number of suggestions about which there is no controversy, certainly no controversy on principle, though there may be differences of opinion as to method and content. There is much elasticity and enrichment such as revision needs. If Morning Prayer is followed by Holy Communion

it may begin with the versicle "O Lord, open Thou our lips," and end with the canticle after the Second Lesson. Think of the advantage of this on Sundays when there is a mid-day Celebration, but especially say on Christmas Day, when most members of the congregation have either communicated or are present to do so, and so join in the Confession and Absolution of the Communion office; when too, the service must be short, and when praise is naturally emphasized. Needed revision is met too by a discretionary use of the shortened exhortation "Let us confess our sins to Almighty God," and an alternative absolution; the invitatories to the *Venite*, for Special Days; the *Te Deum* printed in three paragraphs; the rubric before the Apostles' Creed which runs: "Then shall be sung or said the Apostles' Creed by the Minister and People, standing; except only upon Trinity Sunday, *if* in place thereof the Creed of St. Athanasius be read." N.A. 84 suggests much enrichment in new prayers and thanksgivings for special occasions as need may arise. The Bishop of Worcester thinks "this need for enrichment more obvious than a need for revision."

EVENSONG.

Evening Prayer may be shortened by an abbreviated exhortation, confession, and absolution. An alternative ending to the service gives opportunity for larger variation between service and service. Repetition is avoided, and undue length restrained. There is a good deal of simplification. The circumstances of to-day, as they differ from the time of the last revision, are taken into account in these services. There is no loss of the dignity and respect of the old services, no introduction of absurd services.

THE LITANY

may be shortened, when the Holy Communion follows, by the omission of all *before* the Lord's Prayer; at other times, as an alternative, *after* the Lord's Prayer, when one or more of the prayers for special occasions, which are provided, may be said. This meets a very urgent need. A much-needed suffrage is added for the work of the Church in all the world, and for sending forth labourers into the harvest.

The occasional prayers and thanksgivings include a considerable, though still insufficient, choice to supply the life, liberty, and progress of to-day, e.g. Missions, Convocations of the Church, the National Assembly, Electors, Industrial and Social Problems, increase of the Sacred Ministry, Candidates for Ordination, Vacancies in Bishoprics and Parishes, Universities, Schools, Hospitals, Harvest, a Commemoration of the Faithful Departed, etc.

CONFIRMATION.

The new order of Confirmation is a typical illustration of the change of circumstances since the last revision. The order as it stands at present tacitly assumes that all those who are confirmed,

are children who have been baptized in infancy in the Church of England. Large numbers of our Confirmation candidates to-day have not been so baptized. The new order takes that fact into account. The changes proposed are few: the old preface is changed into an opening rubric; the new preface is based on Acts viii., with its teaching that Confirmation is an outward sign, the laying on of hands with prayer, the effectual token of an inward grace which is the strengthening gift of the Holy Spirit to those who rightly receive it. The question to candidates is divided into the three parts of the Baptismal vow, to each of which the candidate is required to answer "I do." There is no reason in the new order *as there is not* in the old to read into it any mechanical theory.

THE SERVICE OF HOLY MATRIMONY.

supplies needed revision in a new form of exhortation stating the objects of marriage, and also in the prayer for the gift of children, and a collect, epistle, and gospel for use at marriage.

THE SERVICE FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD

is greatly enriched by the addition of a prayer for the bereaved, such as all revision must require. *The order for the Visitation of the Sick* is largely new. It is divided into six points, which the curate shall "say" or use "in like manner." Few of us use the form exactly as it is printed in the present book. All of us feel the need of such special prayers, exhortations to repentance, faith, and prayer, psalms and portions of the Holy Scripture to be read in the home, as are here suggested.

Looking at the proposals of N.A. 84 as a whole, we may believe that we have in them the beginnings of a revision, an enrichment, and an elasticity such as is needed. Worship in its varied forms depends much on temperament, but the question is not "Do I like, or object to, this or that in worship," but what is needed or not needed to help or hinder my worship in the eyes of God.

We cannot fix our Liturgy this time in an unbreakable mould. We must allow the Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth. We must all be prepared to countenance things of which we disapprove. If not, as the Bishop of Peterborough says, "We may as well bid farewell to peace in the Church, and still more to any hope of reunion with other Churches."

The Houses of Clergy and Laity will, in the week preceding the next meeting of the National Assembly, viz. July 2-7, meet to consider the proposals in Committee. The time seems too short to expect completion of the work, for presentation, for acceptance or rejection, to the National Assembly at its next session, especially as the findings of the Houses of Clergy and Laity must first be revised by the House of Bishops and presented by the Bishops in a final form.

THE REVISION THAT IS NEEDED: NOT PROVIDED BY N.A. 84.

I.

BY THE REV. CANON BRIGGS, M.A., Rector of Loughborough.

IN some ways the subject assigned to me is peculiarly difficult. N.A. 84 has made so many changes that it might seem to have left nothing more to be said. Most people are much more inclined to criticize the alterations already proposed than to venture upon further suggestions. On the other hand, my task is lightened in at least this respect: I am not asked to criticize N.A. 84. The critics are already sufficiently numerous, and I am quite incapable of saying anything which has not been already, and better, said. I take it that I am simply asked to make such practical suggestions, not embodied in N.A. 84, as experience teaches to be desirable: and my own experience, if it has no particular merit, has at least been a varied one. Whether it is of the slightest use making any further suggestions at this stage, is another matter. Some people will tell us that it is simply beating the air. But I have been asked to make them: and so I make them for what they are worth. They will be made in no narrow spirit. It is a misfortune, perhaps inevitable, that the question of revision is mixed up with doctrinal differences, which loom largely in any discussion. But this must not blind us to the fact that there are many points in which doctrine is not involved, and where the question is purely one of convenience and edification.

Let me begin by emphasizing one word—"revision." Revision is not rewriting the Prayer Book. If it were my business to criticize N.A. 84, I should say that it goes beyond all reasonable revision. It is in many respects a new Prayer Book: and I do not find that a new Prayer Book is generally desired. The old Book of Common Prayer is hallowed to Englishmen by long associations. The laity especially dislike changes of any sort; and unnecessary non-doctrinal changes are almost as unwelcome to them as doctrinal. Sometimes, I think, they are even unreasonable in their conservatism: but their opinion cannot be ignored. I am far from advocating any opposition to reasonable revision. The Prayer Book has been revised before, and must be revised again; and many of the proposals of N.A. 84 are most admirable. But we ought not to make changes for the sake of change. An ancient Service, like an ancient building, should not be lightly tampered with. A little improvement here and there, some addition, some subtraction, some division, and not too much multiplication, will meet most of the needs on which we can all agree. It is obvious, of course, that not everybody will be satisfied with changes which do not affect doctrine. That is no

new feature : at each previous revision there has been controversy upon points of doctrine. Our difficulty to-day is not that there are differences of opinion, which are inevitable in a living Church : but that the differences are so fundamental that it seems impossible to find a basis of agreement. If we accepted N.A. 84, would our Anglo-Catholic brethren ? However, there seems some hope that the doctrinal and the non-doctrinal questions will be considered separately. In any case, doctrinal changes do not come under the heading of a revision which is needed, from our point of view ; we are quite content with the doctrine of the Prayer Book as it stands. The revision which we desire is not controversial.

Moreover, revision, as we desire it, does not mean alternative services. It is argued that absolute uniformity is no longer possible. But if we must have alternatives, let us at least have them within the one Service. That is a practice already established in the Prayer Book : whereas an alternative service is a revolutionary departure. And, with a little adjustment, the same end could be obtained. It is obvious, of course, that alternatives with a different shade of doctrine are on a different footing from alternatives with no such object. But our initial objection to them would be hardly greater than to an alternative service. And there is one consideration which ought to weigh heavily. At present the Church of England is held together by the fact that there are many gradations in her usages. If the alternatives were within the same Service, some Churches would adopt more, and some less, of the changes : and there would be no single cleavage. We are told—though I cannot understand the authority for such a statement—that this will be possible if alternative services are adopted. But is it seriously contemplated that worshippers should have two Prayer Books open in front of them ? I am not advocating alternative uses : I am simply pleading that our Service, in any case, should remain single, and not be duplicated. And that is a position which, I find, is strongly held even by many who desire more latitude than the law at present allows.

But let us get down to particulars. The most popular of our services is undoubtedly Evening Prayer : and in that service I do not think any serious change would be generally welcome. There are minor changes which we should desire. The exhortation is commonly shortened by general consent ; and we should like legal authority for this, even when retaining our present Confession and Absolution. Our Reformers were better at writing prayers than exhortations : which is, perhaps, all to their credit. This exhortation abounds in vain repetitions. " Pray and beseech " is tolerable : " acknowledge and confess," " dissemble nor cloak " are distinctly worse : " assemble and meet together " would have done great credit to Mr. Micawber.

But there is little else in our Evening Prayer which calls for change. The Lessons have already been revised : in my humble judgment, to our lasting benefit. The revision of the Psalms is long overdue ; but of that I must speak separately. There is a

widespread notion that we need an entirely new set of prayers after the third collect. But there is one striking fact to which I would draw attention. During the war most of us adopted with great relief the new prayers which were authorized: but we have gone back with much greater relief to the old prayers. A few verbal alterations would be welcome. We might omit "who alone workest great marvels" from the prayer for Bishops and clergy. And when we pray, in all loyalty, for our "sovereign lord, King George," there is no need to remind the Almighty that he is "most gracious." Compliments are out of place in prayer. Also some additional prayers, for objects not contemplated by our present Prayer Book, are badly needed. But they should not be too numerous, nor too complicated. N.A. 84 supplies us with a very large number of prayers for several occasions: and each has a versicle and response of its own. The officiating Minister will choose them at his own discretion: but I am afraid that he will be half-way through before the congregation has time to find the proper response. There is something to be said for variety; but there is also something to be said for continuity and for simplicity. Revision should not be overdone: and especially in a service which seems dear to the heart of the people.

I have said that the present form of evensong is beloved by the average congregation. But there are exceptions. When I was a chaplain in the Royal Navy, I found that I could get twenty or thirty men to ordinary Evening Prayer, but many times that number for a more informal service. And there are many congregations for which a good deal of liberty must be allowed. The proposed service of Compline, whatever its merits or need on other grounds, obviously does not meet this case. The only way is to allow the incumbent to make abbreviations, with due consent, and always within the bounds of the Prayer Book service. And do let us get away from the regulation "when evensong has already been said." There is no virtue in mere legalism: and experience has proved that there is no protection either.

With regard to Morning Prayer, I am not at all equally contented. There are Churches—for instance, in residential districts, or at the seaside when congregations are overflowing, where it is a most inspiring service. But in the ordinary parish it makes much less appeal than the evening service. Perhaps the time of day makes a difference; perhaps our habit of combining Morning Prayer with Litany or Holy Communion. In any case, the experience is very general.

There are some who would, and do, take the very drastic step of putting a Sung Eucharist in place of Morning Prayer. Their plea is that the Lord's Service should be the chief service on the Lord's Day. On the principle I am entirely with them. Our Lord's own Service is the distinctive service of Christendom: and it should have first place, and not be relegated to the background. Let us make full and frank admission. Like other schools of thought, we have been learning, and we are still glad to learn whatever of good any movement has to teach us. With all our hearts we are ready to co-operate in exalting the Lord's own Service. But we

maintain that it must be the Lord's Service, and not some other ; and that the Service without Communion is not the Service as the Lord ordained it. We gladly recognize other aspects of the Service—of thanksgiving, of memorial, of the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies : but we insist that the communion of the faithful is at its very heart and centre ; and we are conscious that we have the Prayer Book and the whole tradition of our Church (to say nothing of the historic Institution) entirely with us. If our people generally desired to communicate at midday, we would gladly surrender Morning Prayer entirely, and put the Lord's Service in its place. But the fact is that, with few exceptions, Church people to-day have been educated to communicate before breakfast.

I have written this at some length, to make our general position clear. Perhaps it is an unnecessary digression, as N.A. 84 at any rate does not propose to displace Morning Prayer. But the Service requires further consideration : and I would even venture to go further than N.A. 84. Consider who attend. There are well-to-do people, and some old-fashioned folk who can stand anything in the way of length. But there are also, or should be, children brought by their parents. There are scholars from our Sunday Schools, who have already been to school. These cannot stand a long service. I have been asked very deliberately for greater simplicity. Now see what we provide. Morning Prayer is very like Evening Prayer : but there is much more singing, and at an hour when we are not so inclined to sing. The Venite is an extra : the Te Deum and Benedictus are much longer than the Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis. To compensate, I would suggest that the Psalms should be shorter than at Evensong. The Te Deum is so grand a hymn that one hardly dares to suggest a further alternative. But the Benedicite is only used at certain seasons ; and one sometimes gets weary of chants to the Te Deum, and still more weary of choral settings. If we could have a third alternative, of the type of the Gloria in Excelsis, the Te Deum would come in with increased grandeur.

But this is not everything. We tack on to Morning Prayer the Litany or Holy Communion.

Now it is necessary, at least once a month, to have Communion at midday. N.A. 84 proposes to allow us, when Holy Communion follows, to begin with "O Lord, open thou our lips" and break off with the Benedictus. That is quite acceptable : but it still leaves us with two full lessons, and with an epistle and gospel—four readings from Holy Scripture. I would venture to suggest that one lesson should suffice, and that from the Old Testament, since the New is read twice in the ante-Communion office.

When the Litany is combined with Morning Prayer, we are to have no such liberty of omitting the General Confession and Absolution. But why should we not do so ? The Litany is itself a long Confession. "O Lord, open thou our lips" is an historic beginning to Morning Prayer. And to open with praise, and end with prayer, is very much like what our Lord Himself has taught us. Such abbreviation at the beginning, and some further abbreviation of

the Litany itself, when combined with Morning Prayer, would make the combination admirable. It is true that N.A. 84 suggests shortening the Litany : but the only part it cuts out is that which has most variety in it. The suffrages need reduction.

I have already referred to the Psalter. Very occasionally the Psalms are a drawback : in some poor districts, and in other Churches when we have large numbers present who are not accustomed to the Psalms. This demands a certain amount of liberty. But by our own people the Psalms are beloved. Yet we need a bold retranslation. Some parts are hopelessly obscure. " When the company of the spearmen . . . are gathered together among the beasts of the people " is only one instance of mere gibberish. In less conspicuous instances there is sore need of an intelligent rendering. Our musical editors might help us more than they have done. And is there anything very terrible in missing out certain verses, of historical interest, but not applicable to us ? It is our own worship, not that of the Jews, for which we are providing. We read extracts from the other Scriptures without dishonouring the Bible. Why not extracts from the Psalms ?

And now for the Holy Communion, the storm-centre of controversy. But let us get away from controversy, and see where we are all agreed. Whatever our views about the Eucharist at a later hour without communicating, we all welcome communicants before breakfast. Some of us welcome them at any hour when they can come, but we can all agree to exalt the Lord's Service at the beginning of the day. In an ideal Church the whole company of the faithful would be gathered round the Lord's table. But the real difficulty to us all is that of administration. The shortening of the words is a relief, but a relief only. We want more hands to help. Some weeks ago, in the *Church Times*, there was an account of the establishment, in South Africa, of an order of subdeacons to administer the chalice, among other duties. Many of us would prefer a permanent diaconate : some would even accept Lay Readers. But whatever the status agreed upon, let us have the men. We need them. It is a point on which we can all agree.

With regard to the form of service, I have no suggestions for serious changes : my own people would certainly resent them. But some of the Epistles might surely be improved upon ; as for instance, the Epistle for the 4th Sunday in Lent, where the allegory conveys nothing to edify our people : and for All Saints' Day we might begin " After this I beheld," and go on to the end of the chapter. With the proposal to shorten the Commandments and to allow the alternative summary I am personally in sympathy, though my congregation are not. But I would venture on a suggestion which I have not yet seen made. Could we not have, in whole or in part, the Deuteronomy version of the Commandments ? Its account of the institution of the Sabbath is magnificent. It is the Day of Deliverance from bondage—not the Day of Rest, which we have over-emphasized, but the day of Mercy, which is our Lord's own emphasis.

The Prayer for the Church Militant should surely contain, in these modern days, the High Court of Parliament.

The E.C.U. Report contains two suggestions which we might heartily support. One is that the remains of the consecrated Elements should be consumed immediately after the Administration, and not after the Blessing. The other is the very beautiful mutual confession, and prayer for absolution, of priest and people. Could that find some place in our Service?

I have spoken of Communion early in the day; and of further provision, less frequently, at midday. But there are still two classes of people to provide for. There are the sick. I have a large industrial parish: and I find no need of reservation for the sick. But I have found it an appreciable benefit to take to them, on great Festivals, the consecrated Elements straight from the Holy Table. It is not reservation; it is simply counting them as sharers in the one Service. This could be authorized without any great danger of abuse: and it would meet most of our real needs.

There are also mothers of young children, who are only free in the evening. For years together they are practically excommunicated. Their one opportunity, without neglecting their children, is after evensong; and the service, if held then, must be somewhat shortened. Can we not raise this question above the level of party conflict? We all desire to make the Blessed Sacrament accessible to all. Is there really a valid objection to Evening Communion? I pass over the Lord's own example, though to ourselves it is conclusive. But surely, on any Church principle, it is illogical to provide Communion at noonday, and frown upon it in the evening. I understand—but cannot guarantee the authority for the statement—that one Church of "Catholic" views already has a celebration at 9 p.m. I know another man of "Catholic" mind who tried to combine Holy Communion with evensong. Personally, I dare not tamper with Evening Prayer, which draws large congregations. It is better that the Service should be separate. But it needs some abbreviation, to meet this special requirement. To begin direct with "Ye that do truly" is a practicable way. Could that be permitted, on condition that the whole Service had already been taken that same day?

To go on to the Occasional Services. The Burial Service I find adequate—but with some verbal alterations. There is already suggested a welcome omission from the Lesson. I should like to see certain verses, not appropriate to the occasion, omitted from the beautiful 90th Psalm. "When Thou art angry, all our days are gone," jars with "we give Thee hearty thanks." And there are other verses, historic, but not appropriate.

The Baptismal Service has one obvious defect, which N.A. 84 partly remedies. It is so long that we are driven to the desperate expedient of making it a service in itself, and so practically abolishing Public Baptism. We all agree that Holy Baptism should be at least as public as Holy Communion. The only remedy is a very drastic abbreviation. But there is one thing which I should even

like to add. It is a reminder, in the strongest terms, that the child is now not only the Church's child, but the child of our branch of the Church, and even of our local branch. Holy Baptism is a first-rate, and a legitimate, opportunity of enlisting recruits for our Sunday schools: and we ought to make every use of the opportunity.

The Service for the Visitation of the Sick has never been, I must confess, of much use to me. The revision of N.A. 84 is an improvement, but still far beyond me. Perhaps my people are not very well-instructed Church folk. I am certain that if I entered a house saying "Peace be to this house," people would wonder what was the matter with me. Nor would the sick person be prepared to undertake elaborate responses. Some of the suggestions of N.A. 84 are helpful; but if we are to have a set form, it should be more simple.

There remains the Marriage Service: and I find there the greatest need of change, and change that is not suggested. I take more weddings than most people, and I find the solemn pledges nearly always unintelligible. "According to God's holy ordinance" ought to be simple enough: but it is generally "holy audience," which, after all, is not bad. "Holy ornaments" is distinctly worse. What does "with my body I thee worship" mean to the ordinary man? "I, thee and thou" is an old joke, which I have not personally experienced; but the phrase "with all my worldly goods I thee endow," is simply not true, and ought not to be said, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "I plight thee my troth" assumes some strange forms. There is a legend in my own Church that a man once went to the extreme length of saying "I plight thee my clothes": which was a real vow. Altogether, there is ample room for revision. I hardly dare say it, but I should like to see omitted the word "obey": for I feel it to be unreal. The contract should be on equal terms. And are we really incapable of improving on the closing Exhortation? Does anybody nowadays read "and are not afraid with any amazement"?

I have tried to keep away from controversy. I do not know what weight we shall carry, or if any weight at all: but I know well enough that any merely negative position will be useless. Nor do we wish to take such a stand: we would make, if we can, our own contribution. We are not Low Churchmen: we repudiate the name. Even the noble term Evangelical needs to be properly understood. Nearly all schools of thought, to-day, have caught something of the true Evangelical spirit: and in any narrow sense the term does not apply to us. Our position is that of our Reformers, with their appeal to Scripture: which, as Gwatkin used to teach us, is the appeal to antiquity. We are Prayer Book Churchmen; and the Prayer Book is wide enough for Cosin and Andrewes as well as for Latimer and Jewel. I trust that even these, who would find Cosin and Andrewes, and Laud himself, much too Anglican, and even too avowedly Protestant, would find nothing offensive in my paper. As for the great body of English Churchmen, who love the Prayer Book as we love it, it is high time that both they, and we,

realized that our fundamental position, in all vital respects, is the same.

II.

BY THE REV. E. ARTHUR BERRY, M.A., Vicar of Drypool,
Hull.

We have listened to two very excellent and informative Papers on "The Revision that is needed" by Canon Thornton-Duesbery and Canon Briggs, and it makes it very difficult to add much to what they have said.

We have already had shown to us the many causes that make revision necessary and urgent. The sooner that urgency is recognised the better, in order that we may accomplish our task, and proceed with our real commission in life, to express to our people the Gospel of Jesus Christ anew.

There are many suggestions before us as to what the line of revision should be. We ourselves, unfortunately, have made no real contribution in preparing a suggested revision which might be before the National Assembly, but we have now at least four definite contributions towards revision:—

(a) *We have the E.C.U. Book*, and we are very grateful for the scholarship and care which have there been shown; but I am bound to point out that there is something very subtle about it, and I do not think its compilers are quite fair in putting in two parallel columns the things they do not wish for but are prepared to have in order that they may get the things they desire and which they think others may not be prepared to give. I see no parallel between the two.

(b) *The Edward VI Prayer Book*, which we must remember is being supported by several in authority, and we are bound here to remember that when it was first introduced, it was considered to be not merely non-Roman but distinctly anti-Roman.

(c) We have the *Communion Office* as prepared by the Life and Liberty Movement, with a foreword by the Bishop of Manchester.

(d) And the *N.A. 84*, which is the one we really ought to consider, and here the compilers have tried to:—(1) Modernise; (2) Enrich; (3) Abridge; (4) To restore the balance of doctrine, by which some mean the making of the Communion Service a greater aid to worship and more of an Eucharist than at present it is found to be; but by others it means the restoration of certain doctrines which by many are believed to have been set aside at the Reformation.

We remember that by the provision of *N.A. 84* we are to have an alternative book, and we find everywhere a growing dislike and a determined opposition to such a provision, and the longer revision is delayed, the less likely are we to see an alternative book accepted. If there be an alternative book, then we must remember that men may use either the old or the new, or parts of the old with parts of the new. In dealing with this matter we should remember, not

only the immediate but the ultimate effect upon the Church, say, in ten or fifteen years' time.

I find a growing tendency to discuss the question of revision in two parts, putting the subject of communion and the communion of the sick by itself, because of the growing feeling that the time is not yet ripe to face the matter of such controversy. Personally, I cannot believe that any revision will come unless there be a revision also of the Communion Office, and there are some of us who desire it, and in fact, by way of abridgement, we have already revised the service for ourselves. The difficulty will come when we remember that there are undoubtedly within the Church two schools of thought which are diametrically opposed the one to the other, and it is very difficult for us to see, if this be so, how the service can be so revised as to help and please them both. I would have you to remember the constituent members of the Prayer Book Revision Committee. The Evangelical Party were well represented on that committee, and while they reserved for themselves the right to express their opposition on other matters, they only signed a minority report against reservation, and therefore it is for us to assume that they more or less approved of the other provisions of N.A. 84.

In order that I may become somewhat constructive, let me emphasise the following points:—

- (a) Revision is necessary.
- (b) The revision must be worth while, and we remember here that Mr. Athelstan Riley stated that N.A. 84 meant great sacrifices on the part of some, and that those sacrifices would not be accepted by others, and therefore it was not worth the while.
- (c) The revision must maintain that Scripture is our ultimate word of appeal.
- (d) That revision must mean the adherence and loyal co-operation of all, without any mental reservation.
- (e) It must reflect the certainty of ecclesiastical truth.
- (f) The revisions I should suggest should be shown in schedule form as in the Scotch Prayer Book, rather than in an alternative book.
- (g) The revision should be carried out with a loyalty to our Anglican inheritance, while we should ever be prepared to look at and study it in the light of the history of past times.
- (h) In revision we must stretch forth to the future, and seek to emphasise our great spiritual work.
- (i) I do think we should give very general approval to N.A. 84, although I believe that that requires far more enrichment, and I think it does lay itself open to the charge that in it we shall lose much of the enchantment of the beautiful language of our present Prayer Book.
- (j) There should be, I feel, provision for special services for men, for children and for special occasions, and for use in our various guilds, which would take away the need of the many varying manuals now used by the clergy.

I would also make note of the following points:—

1. I do feel the need of abbreviation, such as is shown in the Morning and Evening Prayer, the shortening of the Commandments, and the words of administration.

2. That variety is needed as is shown in the alternative ending to, and the second Evening Service.

3. I think there might be further provision for Mission Services.

4. I welcome the special days for St. Mary Magdalene and the Transfiguration. Mary Magdalene is one of the saints who has always impressed me more than any other.

5. We do need extra occasional collects, epistles and gospels, and I should certainly introduce the one for Sunday and Day Schools and Training Colleges.

6. I welcome the alternative Baptism Service, and am glad to note further provision made, and emphasis laid on the need for baptism in the Morning and Evening Prayer.

7. The new visitation of the sick meets a real need, and many of us who rarely use the present service will be attracted, I think, to the new one.

8. The service for the Burial of the Dead will again meet a real need, and solve many problems.

9. I should like to have seen carefully defined, within certain wide limits, what are the ornaments of the Church. I do not notice that N.A. 84 deals with the ornaments in any way, except as referring to the vestments, and I rather wonder what will be the attitude of our brethren in the various ornate ceremonials that some so much enjoy.

10. I do feel myself that there is a real demand of revision of the Communion Service, and I believe that unless some consideration be given to it, we cannot satisfy a large section of the Church.

11. Much has already been said about the question of vestments and reservation, and there is no doubt that the question must be settled. In the demand for reservation, I am not quite sure what the desire really is, although it seems to me that many would not be satisfied with reservation for the sick and for the sick alone, and one does see the difficulty of providing safeguards that the reserved sacrament should be for them and them alone, and in dealing with this matter we must remember that the Communion Service is now said daily in most churches where the reserved sacrament would be desired.

The controversy concerning revision has made our love for the language of the old very much deeper, and it would be well perhaps if we sometimes looked once again at its language much more carefully, and from its Preface I would quote words that seem to be of help to us:—

“ It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy to keep the mean between two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience sheweth that

where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring) sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued ; and those many times more and greater than the evils, that were intended to be remedied by such change." . . .

" Our general aim therefore in this undertaking was, not to gratify this or that party in any their unreasonable demands ; but to do that which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church ; the procuring of reverence and exciting of piety and devotion in the publick worship of God," etc.

CHANGES IN MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER, LITANY, ETC.

BY THE REV. CANON G. D. OAKLEY, M.A., Vicar of Jesmond,
Newcastle-on-Tyne.

THE discussions to which the Revision of the Prayer Book has so far given rise have centred mainly round the Holy Communion Office, so that the proposals relating to the rest of the Prayer Book have been somewhat overshadowed—at least, they have not received that careful consideration which they deserve.

The paper which is to follow this will deal with " The Occasional Offices." I have been asked to confine myself to the proposed changes in Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, etc. Happily, these changes are, for the most part, of a non-controversial character, and we shall most of us probably agree that, on the whole, they go a long way towards meeting the demands of the altered circumstances of the time in which we live.

It is now nearly three centuries since the Prayer Book was revised. Those centuries have witnessed changes in our national and social life, the magnitude of which it is almost impossible for us to conceive. It is no small tribute to our Book of Common Prayer that during all those years of change and upheaval the English people have found in its forms of services the most fitting medium for the expression of their common worship.

It is not, however, a detraction to say that the time has come for the Prayer Book to be revised. Whatever differences there may be as to the particular form or forms which revision should take, there is, I think, general agreement as to the need of revision itself.

This *need* may be illustrated in three ways : First, there is need for shorter services ; second, there is need for services more in harmony with our modern conceptions of the Christian revelation ; third, there is need for greater enrichment. I will deal as briefly as possible with these three great needs, and endeavour to show how the

proposed changes in Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany are designed to meet them.

I.

In the first place—the need for shorter services. In the recent debates on Prayer Book Revision in the House of Bishops, the Bishop of Durham said that in his opinion there was no public demand for revision at all. That may be so, but what would happen if the Bishop of Durham, or any other Bishop, were to require of his clergy a strict adherence to the letter of our present Prayer Book? What would happen if, say next Sunday morning, the clergy throughout England obeyed literally the rubrics of the Prayer Book and had Matins down to the end of the second Lesson, then possibly a Baptism, and then the rest of matins down to the end of the third Collect, followed by the Litany, and ante-Communion service, Sermon, and so on. What *would* happen? I venture to think something would happen which would amount to a very real public demand for revision. The fact that there is at present no such demand for revision is, as the Bishop of Durham himself suggests, that changes have already been made without legal authority but with complete immunity from legal consequence. The fact is, the clergy, in order to adapt the services of the Church to the needs of the present day, have taken matters into their own hands, and I imagine no serious objection can be raised against such necessary adaptation, but unfortunately, when once the law is broken, persistently and with impunity broken, the way is opened up for the disregard of law and order altogether, and the result is every man becomes, in matters essential as well as non-essential, a law unto himself, and that is the state of things with which we are confronted at the present time. One of the main objects of Prayer Book Revision is to bring this present chaotic state of things to an end, and to make it possible to meet the demand for shorter services in ways prescribed by lawful authority.

Let us now turn to the changes proposed with this end of shortening the services in view.

1. Both at Morning and Evening Prayer the omission of the exhortation every Sunday, excepting the first Sunday in Advent and the first Sunday in Lent.

2. The provision of a shortened form of confession and absolution following the words "Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God."

3. The permission to commence Morning Prayer with the versicle "O Lord, open Thou our lips," when Morning Prayer immediately precedes the Holy Communion, and also permission to end Morning Prayer with the canticle after the second Lesson, or with the addition of the salutation and the second or third Collect. It will be observed that in all these proposed changes there is no contemplation of an Evening Communion.

4. The shortening of the Litany, and the further shortening of the Litany when it immediately precedes Holy Communion.

It may be well to observe at this point that the rubric regulating the use of the Litany requires that it shall be said or sung on Sundays—excepting Easter Day and Whit-Sunday. Now the question arises—At what time on Sundays? There is no provision made for its use as part of Evening Prayer. The rubric referring to the use of the Litany after the third Collect of Morning Prayer stands unaltered. So then, it seems that the Litany must be said or sung every Sunday either as a separate service or on Sunday morning with shortened Morning Prayer and with the Holy Communion when there is one. In this latter case the service will still be unduly long. The Revised Prayer Book of the Canadian Church seems to me to be an improvement on the proposals before us, in that it requires the Litany to be said at least one Sunday in the month!

Then, lastly, Evening Prayer may be considerably shortened by the use of “an alternative ending” after the third Collect. These, then, are the changes proposed to meet the demand for shorter services, and to make it possible to combine one service with another without imposing on the congregation too great a strain.

II.

Then there is the need for services more in harmony with our modern conceptions of the Christian revelation. One of the gravest defects of our present services, I venture to think, is that they contain elements which it is difficult for the ordinary worshipper to reconcile with his conception of the mind and spirit of Christ. It is not too much to say that many earnest and thoughtful people have been either alienated from the services of the Church altogether, or held at the cost of much heartsearching and pain because of the unchristian sentiments to which the worshippers, who take part in those services, are sometimes committed.

Take, for instance, the recital of the so-called Athanasian Creed, which our present Prayer Book requires on thirteen days in the year. I know some of the most devoted members of my congregation who absent themselves from church on Trinity Sunday morning, and many others who, though present, refuse to take part in the recital of that creed. They do not understand it, and they object to it on the ground that in its severity it goes beyond anything required by our Lord as a condition of true discipleship.

Or take again the Psalms. As the Bishop of Chichester said the other day: “There are passages in the Psalms where the text is corrupt or the meaning of the Hebrew quite uncertain and—and this is the point which I am emphasizing—Psalms or portions of Psalms which are liable to be used to express an unchristian attitude towards personal enemies.” I need not trouble you with references, but there is that notorious passage which runs: “Blessed shall he be that taketh thy children and throweth them against the stones” (Ps. cxxxvii). Thinking people nowadays simply refuse to give expression to such a sentiment as that. It is all very well

to say, in the words of the Report of the E.C.U. Committee on Prayer Book Revision, that "*the individual worshipper is free to affix his own meaning to traditional expressions which have come down from the past and require a subjective re-interpretation in order to fit them to the religious experience of the present,*" and there may be here and there those who understand and can make use of what is called "*the mystical or allegorical method of interpretation,*" but, as that report goes on to say, "*there are many members of the Church of England who have never heard of the mystical interpretation,*" and we might add—"who are quite incapable of performing the mental gymnastics which that method involves." It is for such folk as these that the Prayer Book needs to be revised. After all, the Prayer Book is for the Church, not the Church for the Prayer Book, and the Church is composed not of liturgical experts, but of ordinary men and women who mean what they say and say what they mean. One of the brightest features of modern times is what has been described as a "*Rediscovery of the Christ of the Gospels.*" To-day we see the Christ as we have never seen Him before, and no one who has really seen Him and caught His spirit can give utterance in Christian worship to those expressions in the Psalms to which I have referred.

To meet this demand for services more consistent with Christian sentiment the use of the Athanasian Creed has been made optional, the Creed itself has been revised and the Psalter has been revised. It has been revised on strictly conservative lines. To quote Dr. Ryle, who presided over the Revision Committee. He says: "Our revision leaves nearly forty Psalms wholly unaffected. There are over thirty Psalms in each of which only one verse is altered. Only such changes have been made as to remove from the Psalter the chief blemishes arising from obscurity, unintelligibility, or gross mistranslation, and those passages which are unsuitable for public Christian worship." The measure for the permissive use of the Revised Psalter only requires now the sanction of Parliament and it will become law.

III.

Finally we come to the need for greater enrichment. The great, joyful, and solemn festivals of the Church's year come round, and there is often little, or nothing, apart from special hymns, to draw attention to them. Easter Day is the one exception when, instead of the *Venite*, we sing the Easter Anthem, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, let us therefore keep the feast." It is proposed that both before and after the *Venite* an appropriate Invitatory shall be said or sung on the Sundays in Advent, Christmas Day, the Feast of the Epiphany, and so on down to Trinity Sunday. This will supply a long-felt want.

Moreover, it scarcely needs to be said that forms of services drawn up three hundred years ago cannot be adequate to express the thoughts and aspirations of the present time. Three hundred years ago England contained a rural population. There were

no large centres of industry such as we have to-day. Social and industrial problems were practically unknown. The invention of the steam engine, the growth of commerce, the discovery of electricity and of the uses to which it can be put—these and many other things have brought us into the closest contact with the nations of the world. We have our colonies in every quarter of the globe inhabited by our own kith and kin. Then there is the great heathen world with its tremendous claims upon the Church of Christ. It is only during the past century or so that there has been anything like an adequate realization on the part of the Christian Church at home of those claims. And so to-day the hearts of Christian men and women are filled with yearnings and aspirations for which our Book of Common Prayer provides no adequate utterance.

An attempt is made in the proposed changes to meet this need. Suffrages have been added to the Litany, and a considerable number of prayers and thanksgivings for use upon several occasions. I cannot say I think they supply all that we want. As one whose work lies in a great seaport and in the heart of a great mining industry, I should like to see special prayers for seamen and miners. The work in which these men are engaged is fraught with great peril, and congregations largely consisting of their relatives and friends would specially value some form of intercession on their behalf. In the prayers for missions there is no reference to medical missions and educational missions. There is a lamentable lack of prayers for work among the young, and no prayers suitable for children's services.

Personally, I should like to see a separate book of prayers, and intercessions and litanies on the lines of a little book recently published by the S.P.C.K. entitled *Acts of Devotion*, and permission to use such a book in conjunction with the Prayer Book. Nevertheless, the proposals of N.A. 84 are a great step forward in meeting the demand for greater enrichment, shorter services, services more in harmony with the Christian revelation, and greater enrichment. These are our present needs, and because the proposed changes in Morning and Evening Prayer go so far in meeting those needs I venture to hope that they will be accepted by all. It would be a thousand pities if our differences with regard to the Holy Communion Office were allowed to deprive us of so much that is really good and necessary. For myself I would say, let the Holy Communion Office remain as it is for the present; as for the rest of the proposals, let us have them, and the sooner we have them the better. For no longer will it be possible for anyone to say of us Evangelicals that we are law breakers like the rest who break the law in matters far more essential, and with a Prayer Book thus revised to meet the demands of our own time the Church of England will be stronger than she has ever been. She will hold her own; more than that, she will, I believe, reclaim many who have lapsed from her fold.

THE OCCASIONAL OFFICES.

BY THE REV. J. A. WOOD, M.A., lately Canon of Lahore.

WE have come to the last section of our long day's programme, the Occasional Offices, and I am thankful that the greater part of the changes proposed in them by N.A. 84 are not of the keenly contentious character of many of the matters relating to the Holy Communion which came before us earlier in the day. They are not, however, unimportant, but by reason of their bulk (they occupy forty-seven pages in N.A. 84) I can only touch on the more important of them.

May I begin by suggesting a fourfold test by which all proposals may be judged. Let us ask.—Do they make (1) for reality, (2) for simplicity, (3) for continuity in our doctrinal standards, (4) for spirituality?

(1) If a change relieves a service of that which only by a strained interpretation can reasonably be asked for from an intelligent and spiritually minded Churchman in the twentieth century, we shall welcome the change as making for *reality*.

(2) If, while avoiding a dull sameness, a permitted or appointed variation escapes that elaboration which led Cranmer to write of those "manifold changings of the service" that make the turning of the book "so hard and intricate a matter" that "it is more business to find out what should be read than to read it when found"—then rubrical simplicity has been secured.

Simplicity of language and diction belongs rather to my first test of reality.

(3) If the changes proposed do not alter that balance of doctrine which marks our Prayer Book as both Scriptural and Anglican and not superstitious nor Roman the third test is met, for the compilers of the Prayer Book aimed to leave Churchmen room to live and move and grow, putting "away from time to time the things they perceive to be most abused" and using "such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's glory," for "Christ's Gospel" was to them "a religion to serve God . . . in the freedom of the spirit."

(4) Do the changes make for a truly spiritual worship, a realized contact with God—Father, Son, and Spirit—and thus a means of grace, a true occasion when God's willingness to allow His Very Self to touch our human personalities is blessedly realized in life-giving power? If a modification has this as its successful object we shall give it a glad welcome. And such—thank God—is the case, not once nor twice, but often in the changes proposed in the Occasional Offices, even if there are others where we are more dubious.

I proceed to give instances under each of these four headings, in some cases of welcome, in others of caution or of objection.

I.

REALITY.

(a) The most important change which I would notice—and I do so with hearty approbation—is the change in the office for the Making of Deacons, in the question about Holy Scripture.

The briefest consideration will show us that none of us could answer the question “Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?” in the words “I do believe them” without some kind of mental reservation as to the difference of our attitude towards, let us say, Ecclesiastes and the Gospel of St. John, or to the imprecatory Psalms and the Sermon on the Mount. The new form of the question, “Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given of God to convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the Revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?” with the reply “I do,” makes such mental reservations, as I have indicated, unnecessary, and what is more, it puts the Bible in the right relationship to the person of our Lord. We love and honour the Scriptures because they tell of Him, because in and through them we come to our knowledge of Him Who is our very life. But the book is a means and not an end.

In the light of recent controversies no change is more significant, and because it makes for reality I trust I may carry the Conference with me in saying that none is more welcome than this.

(b) As to the omission of the reference to the Old Testament in the Baptismal and Marriage services which the E.C.U. Report imagines to be intended “to commend Christianity to the agnostic” and condemns as “an irritating piece of pedantic vandalism,” I see in the omission an honest consideration for those who do not think the marriage ideals of Abraham and Sarah (with Hagar in the background) are the most suitable to illustrate the ideal relationships of men and women whom the Holy Spirit has been leading onward into truth and assisting towards a fuller understanding of God’s ideal for those, whom He joins in marriage, than was given to His saints of old time.

(c) As to Noah and the Red Sea in the Baptismal service, I part with the references with more regret, for I believe they may be justified on adequate exegesis, but yet I must admit they do not help the ordinary devout Churchman to understand the meaning of Baptism, but rather that they tend to distract his mind in a service already somewhat difficult.

The good seed in our Lord’s parable is the message of God, but where it is not understood the birds snatch it away: and because I believe the proportion of those who understand the reference to Noah and the Red Sea is small I should agree to the omission, while protesting against the motive which the E.C.U. attributes to those who propose it. To aim at reality is commendable; to make concessions from fear is cowardly.

II.

SIMPLICITY.

(a) In the case of the Occasional Offices there is little to be said under the heading *Simplicity*. The rather long rubric as to what is to be done when a child is to be baptized and another to be received into the Church at the same time seems somewhat unnecessary, or to presuppose a rather unintelligent minister who cannot solve even a small problem for himself: nothing like as difficult a problem as the proper manipulation at baptism of a lusty child of three or four, whose schooling in obedience has yet to begin. But otherwise I note nothing which tends to make the services complicated or fussy.

(b) Of the second kind of simplicity, that of language, I do not join in the E.C.U.'s condemnation of the alternative simplified Baptism service, for I could sacrifice even some of Cranmer's English if I can help to make Holy Baptism a reality and not a magical charm to those who rarely darken a church door, except when another babe has to be christened.

(c) I regret the opportunity was not taken to bring the form of the Apostles' Creed in the services for Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick into conformity with that in Morning and Evening Prayer. A sick bed is not the place where the mind should be vexed with slight and unfamiliar variations in the form of the expression of fundamental beliefs; nor do I see reason why there should be verbal differences between the Baptismal Creed and that of daily repetition.

III.

CONTINUITY OF DOCTRINE.

You will note at once that I am making my third test not identity of doctrine but *continuity*. The ideal of the preface of the Prayer Book is that of a religion to serve God in the freedom of the spirit. Such freedom means life, and life means growth. Now all change is not growth. Some changes mark decay. Again, some changes mark a fracture, a breach, and therefore this my third test will need to be applied with circumspection, lest what is claimed to be a growth turns out to be a retrogression, or, to involve a breach, which means injury to a living organism.

Now, there are two changes proposed in the Occasional Offices which may involve some change in doctrine: (a) Prayers for the Dead; (b) the omission from the Catechism of the phrase "children of wrath," with corresponding changes in the Baptismal services. We will take these in turn.

(a) *Prayers for the Dead*.—Article XXXI condemns the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was "commonly said the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt" as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," and the reason of this very grave condemnation is contained in the first

half of the article, viz. that thereby is impugned the completeness of the one offering of Christ once made. To this article we have given and do give our assent. The desire to maintain the unique character of Christ's sacrifice of Himself was, we believe, the cause of the omission from our present Prayer Book of all allusions to the faithful departed, with but one clear exception—the thanksgiving in the prayer for the Church militant. In the face of the new proposals we have to ask, Was that complete omission entirely Scriptural, or do the new proposals fall within the liberty which the preface of the Prayer Book claims, in that the new proposals may be justified from Scripture? Let me remind you what is offered to us in the Occasional Offices:

(i) A new alternative form of committal in the Burial service: "We commend into the hands of Thy mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed . . . we beseech God's infinite goodness that when the judgment shall come, which God has committed to his well-beloved Son, this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight."

(ii) Some optional versicles, including, "Grant unto him eternal rest: And let perpetual light shine upon him." We have to ask, not Are these new? (that they obviously are), but Do they accord with the Scriptural basis in which our Prayer Book rests? We believe in the Communion of Saints, we remember them with thanksgiving before God, we share St. Paul's confidence that He which hath begun a good work will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ. If thanksgiving may be made for the faithful departed may we have nothing of the supplications, prayers, intercessions, which in the case of the living are linked with the thanksgivings enjoined in 1 Tim. ii. ? Or must all such be regarded as denying the completeness of Christ's one sacrifice? If the dying Christian may commend his soul to his Heavenly Father, what meaning is left for fellowship if his fellow Christians may not do so too, when his body is being laid to rest? If St. Paul may express the wish that the Lord may grant him who had shown St. Paul kindness to find mercy in the day of God, then I believe the changes in the alternative words of committal cannot be held to go beyond what is written, for they stop short at the boundary stone of apostolic example, and do not follow Roman error beyond that line in suggesting that any new sacrifice may be offered by the Mass priest.

Just because there are prayers for the dead which are unscriptural and involve dangerous deceits, those who desire to let their thought be guided by Holy Scripture need to beware lest, in their anxiety not to go beyond Scripture, they condemn those who desire to follow Scripture to the full. I must confess that our present words of committal with their mention only of the body seem to me to fall short of full belief in the Communion of Saints in having no reference at all to the soul. To the suggested changes I am therefore prepared to agree, and the more so that their use is not to be compulsory.

(b) The second doctrinal matter centres round the phrase

“children of wrath,” which is to be omitted from the Catechism answer to the question, “What is the inward and spiritual grace (of Baptism)?”—“A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, for being by nature born in sin and children of wrath we are hereby made the children of grace.” The Revisers also make two more or less consequential changes. In the certificate about the correctness of a Private Baptism, the words “who being born in original sin and in the wrath of God is now by the laver of regeneration, etc.” become “who being born in original sin is now by the laver, etc.,” and similarly the words “in the wrath of God” disappear from a like connexion in the first prayer in the service for the Public Baptism of Infants. But—and this is important—the words are retained in the corresponding prayer in the Baptism of Adults. The test is “What saith the Scriptures?” And we turn to Ephes. ii. 3, the common parent of all these passages: “We also all once lived in the lusts of the flesh and were by nature children of wrath.” Our existing Prayer Book has interpreted this in the Calvinistic sense, that by our original constitution we are children of wrath. But that *φύσει* does not always refer to origin is clear from Gal. iv. 8, *τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὄντι θεοῦ*, and Grimm, in his lexicon on Eph. ii. 3 makes *φύσει* to be “a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature,” and he is confirmed by Eph. v. 3-6, where, after a long list of active sins, St. Paul says because of these things cometh “the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience.” The Revisers in N.A. 84 apparently share this opinion, and, desiring to be true to Scripture retain the phrase referring to the “wrath of God” for adults, but expunge it in the case of the service for infants.

For a like reason they have omitted the phrase “children of wrath” from the Catechism, where, if retained, it will put a false meaning on Eph. ii. 3, and convey to the child learners of the Catechism the idea that children when born are objects not of God’s love and compassion, but of His wrath.

Sin is evil whether in act or in tendency, but thanks be to God, while we were yet sinners God loved us and gave His Son to die for us, and it is a clear gain, while retaining the emphasis on our sinful nature we should avoid a distortion of the image of the God who is LOVE.

The change is an instance of fidelity to the larger principle that our standard of doctrine is Holy Scripture, rather than to the lesser one of leaving the doctrine of the Prayer Book unchanged, and we cannot but be thankful it is so.

IV.

SPIRITUALITY.

(a) I may be forgiven if I refer yet once again to *Reservation*. It is to me a matter of regret that the revised service should not, in cases of real necessity, make it sufficient to recite in the hearing of the sick person that part of the Consecration Prayer which begins,

"Our Lord Jesus Christ the same night that he was betrayed," and thus maintain that important characteristic of our Prayer Book that the worshipper should have the opportunity of sharing intelligently in the service, for while many and weighty opinions of the early centuries may be quoted that the *Thanksgiving* is of the essence of the Consecration Prayer, the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which binds us if any modern utterance can do so, makes the "unfailing use of the words of institution" a necessary part of a valid sacrament.

Such use in respect of the thing consecrated rather than in the hearing of the worshipper seems to me to favour a view of the sacramental rite which is very near to the repetition by a Hindu pundit of the mantra, whereby what was a piece of brass becomes an idol indwelt by the God which it represents.

It is to avoid such a possible interpretation of the meaning of the *epiklesis* that the Life and Liberty book prays the Holy Spirit may bless and sanctify both the communicants and the elements.

Let us show all the intelligent brotherly understanding we can with the practical difficulties of the loyal High Churchman, who is, for example, chaplain in a big hospital, by a modification of rubrics where needed (the Priest, who has already communicated, should not be required to communicate with the sick person), but because Reservation has a tendency to a magical rather than a truly Christian view of the Sacrament, let us stand by our five brethren of the minority report to N.A. 60 in resisting it. But let us make it plain that in so doing we have sincerely sought to understand the practical difficulties which make many loyal High Churchmen ask for Reservation, and ask for it honestly intending to use it only for the sick.

(b) Amid many changes that are wholly admirable in the Visitation for the Sick, and which make the five parts into which it is divided and its concluding note on prayers and passages from Scripture a real handbook of pastoral theology, I must plead that in the last commendatory prayer, after mention of God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to-add:

"Go forth upon thy journey from this world, O christian soul."

"In communion with the blessed saints, and aided by Angels and Archangels, thrones and dominions, principalities and powers and all the armies of the heavenly host. Amen."

is to me an *anti-climax*. Angels have their blessed work of ministry—one ministered to our Blessed Lord Himself in Gethsemane—but the passage in Col. i. 16 is too much associated with the Colossian heresy and, to quote Bishop Lightfoot's paraphrase with an "ignoring and degrading of Christ," to introduce it here in a last commendatory prayer. Once again, as in the case of Reservation, we have a concession to what partakes of the nature of incantation and magic and not of the open-air simplicity of the Gospel:

"In communion with the blessed saints, who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,

and aided by Angels sent to minister to the heirs of salvation. Amen."

if you will, but for myself I would plead that my last thoughts be not confused with the mention of thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, dragged in by very questionable exegesis.

CONCLUSION.

What will stand the fourfold test of reality, simplicity, continuity, and spirituality let us accept with humble, grateful thanksgiving to God, such things, for instance, as the admirable rubric about the minister being assured of repentance, faith, and desire to be baptized before baptizing an adult in immediate danger of death, or the explicit recognition of Lay Baptism, which cuts at one root of magical as distinguished from spiritual efficacy, but things that fail to pass these tests, these let us seek to amend, doing so patiently, courteously, considerately, and courageously, for it will be by the temper we exhibit as least as much as by the arguments that we employ that we shall carry the great central body of Churchmen with us, or drive them into the arms of those whose allegiance is with a Latin rather than an Anglican form of Christianity.

"THE MIND OF THE SPECTATOR."

In previous issues of the *CHURCHMAN* we printed two delightful articles from the pen of the late Rev. G. S. Streatfeild on "Addison as a Student of Nature." They were very greatly appreciated by our readers, who will be glad to know that we have other papers on Addison by the same writer which we hope to print in due course. Meanwhile we desire to call attention to the volume entitled *The Mind of the Spectator under the Editorship of Addison and Steele*, written by Canon Streatfeild and just published by T. Fisher Unwin, price 7s. 6d. The volume is one of deep and abiding interest. Canon Streatfeild was a careful student of Addison, and, in this volume, written with all his wonted grace and charm, he has brought out for us the best features of Addison's work, and has shown with skill and precision the applicability of much of the great writer's message to the needs of to-day. We shall return to the volume later, but we must lose no time in urging our readers to obtain this most excellent volume and to study it for themselves. It is one that will be read from cover to cover with interest and profit.

Christ and Colosse; or The Gospel of the Fulness. By the Rev. H. H. Gowen, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages, University of Washington. *Skeffington & Son.* 3s. 6d. net. These five lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians are designed to supply a general introduction to the Epistle, that will enable readers to grasp its contents. They deal with—"The Instrument"; "The Question"; "The Answer"; "The Argument"; "The Application."

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY. By F. R. Barry. *Student Christian Movement.* 5s.

The late Principal of Knutsford has written a characteristic work on the relation between the New Psychology and religion. He is well equipped for the task, for he knows human nature, has living faith, and is the possessor of an acute intellect. Here and there we find proofs of rather hasty writing: Bergson as the apostle of the *élan vital*, the law of Reversed Effort as expounded by Mr. Barry, will not win the support of all psychologists, and he quotes the Authorised Version where the Revised Version omits words on which he places emphasis. Mr. Barry would be the last to assert that he is a specialist—he is something more, for he brings an extraordinarily acute intellect to bear on practical problems as illuminated by recent advances in psychological research. Unlike most writers on the subject, he does not dwell on pathological cases: "It is the weakness of William James and Starbuck that the experiences which they relate are nearly always thoroughly abnormal. To make them normative is fatal." We wish that this were more generally recognized, for it has always seemed to us that popular New Psychology strives to effect in mental life what would be accomplished in ordinary life by sending normal healthy folk to the chemists for their food supplies. The outstanding merit of this book is its breezy common sense and its clear grasp of leading principles. It can never be forgotten that even the New Psychology does not provide us with a solution of the great problems of thought and experience. It helps us to understand certain intellectual and emotional processes. That is all its results up to now have attained, as far as the normal man is concerned. In certain pathological instances it has discovered a curative method for restoration to normal, but we are by no means sure that its advances have been so great as its advocates claim.

Mr. Barry says, "We have shown, I think, that if we start with the faith in a Personal God to explain the universe, psychology makes sense; but not without it. That is, so far as it goes, a positive result for the theologian." We believe that there is no exaggeration in this statement, and those who wish to find the grounds on which it is based will do well to study "Christianity and Psychology," which begins with a useful account of the main principles that underlie current psychological treatises. We are impressed by the root fact that the will is free, and, after doing our best to give due weight to the arguments on the other side, we do not believe that any recent advances have made the slightest change in the evidence for and against the truth of our experience. It is not too much to say that the difficulties that puzzled our fathers have not been

increased by the New Psychology. The determinists who undertake the study remain determinists, for they overlook what the supporters of free-will have always maintained to be the determining factor in arriving at our conclusion, namely the verdict of our own consciousness. The discussion of the danger of subjectivity in religion is one of the most impressive in the book: "We demand with a more imperious necessity a really vital standard of truth and goodness by which we can appraise our experiences, which can be the goal of our will and our desire, and its light a trusty lantern unto our feet." "It is vital that men's religious beliefs be true; equally vital that they be few and simple."

We recommend all who have the wisdom to buy this book to study carefully Mr. Barry's remarks on Confession. "Personally I stand out for confession. I refused to be terrorized by party slogans from a God-given method of spiritual help. But a dominant school in the English Church to-day seems to me to be seriously in danger of turning a real and sacred means of grace into a mechanical kind of fetish. To teach the necessity of frequent confession as a primary part of Christian duty would appear to be psychologically unsound. It serves to defeat its own object. It reminds one of the old-fashioned type of nursemaid who used to administer 'doses' once a week, regardless of whether the child needed them. And the child grew up with a weakened constitution. But the object of a spiritual adviser, whether friend, psychologist, or priest, should surely be to make himself unnecessary." Apart altogether from the moral evils associated with confession and the consequent weakening of the will, there is sound common sense in this contention. Is it too much to say that the whole tendency of confession from the psychological standpoint is to make imagination take the place of the exercise of the will and to place the will, which ought to be the predominant factor by throwing personality on its side, the slave of the Confessor? As Mr. Barry says, "Psychology here agrees with Christianity that deliverance or redemption is completed by losing ourselves again in eager service, rather than by a merely passive experience or a transaction performed outside ourselves." It will be seen that there are certain points in this book that are not in accord with our view of sound psychology, but they are comparatively few in number, and we have no hesitation in recommending a sane, suggestive, and wholesome work to those who wish to form right opinions on the range as well as the limitations of a form of investigation which by its novelty is apt to be over-estimated in its bearing upon problems of life and conduct.

DR. FINDLAY'S KERR LECTURES.

BYWAYS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE: Studies in the Un-canonical Gospels and the Acts. (Kerr Lectures.) By Adam Fyfe Findlay, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 10s.

The Kerr Lectureship has already produced some noteworthy books, of which Dr. Forrest's *The Christ of History and of Experience*

is perhaps the most widely known, and the reader will take up this, the latest series, with a sense of expectation which will not be disappointed. The ground which it covers, though it has been long worked over by scholars, has not been of great interest to the general reader, and it will be a convenience to have so much of the results of study and research presented in an accessible and popular form. The immense gap between the inspired writings of the New Testament and the uncanonical literature of the second and third centuries has inevitably tended to lessen interest in the latter and to obscure the historical and literary value which they undoubtedly possess. As the Rev. J. E. Tasker says in his article on the Apocryphal Gospels in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, "the manufacture of fanciful traditions is not always to be ascribed to the zeal of heretics, but sometimes to an eager desire to satisfy—without critical discrimination between the nucleus of fact and the embellishments of fiction—curiosity in regard to those periods in our Lord's life about which the four Evangelists tell us nothing."

In this volume Dr. Findlay deals only with documents which profess to have a historical character: apocalyptic literature, for example, falls outside its scope, and his treatment is mainly descriptive and expository. He has a style which is very lucid and interesting and free from technicalities. We learn from the writings he describes how very diverse was Christian thought in those early and formative centuries, before a settled tradition had been established, and can see how, from the very beginning of the Christian Church, the Gospel had to struggle with the moral and intellectual influences in which the converts from Judaism and Paganism had been reared. It is saddening to note how the same influences are at work in our own day, as indeed they have been through the whole history of the Christian Church. Dr. Findlay selects three in particular: the craving for the miraculous, the legalistic conception of the Christian life, the influence of Hellenistic thought on Christian truth. He does not write with an apologetic tendency: he is mainly concerned with the documents which he describes with so much freshness and force and with full knowledge of the best scholarship on the subject; yet we can hardly leave these Lectures without having gained a deeper appreciation of what Dr. Findlay describes as the "incomparably rich inheritance we have in the New Testament books."

W. G. J.

Daughters from Afar. By Rose White (Bangalore). *Partridge*. 2s. 6d. The first section of this book tells the story of the Bangalore Jubilee Home in eight chapters: and an interesting story it is—of high ambition, brave endeavour and persevering continuance. The second, and by far the larger section, tells three life stories. This book will form a welcome addition to a parochial Missionary Library, and might be read with profit at "Working Parties," and such-like.