

them in the way now done by those who pretend to be guided by His example. We have an affecting prayer *for them* recorded in St. John's Gospel when they were present, but it is not a prayer in which they could take part. When our Saviour prayed it was *alone*—in a desert place, or on the mountain side. There is a remarkable expression used in the Gospels which shows that even when His disciples were with Him He practised silent or mental prayer—"It came to pass as He was *alone* praying His disciples were with Him."—St. Luke, ix. 18.

He denounced the hypocrisy of the Pharisees for praying standing at the corners of the streets to be seen of men, for using vain repetitions, and for their long prayers, but never for using forms, which they certainly did use, in their acts of devotion.

Then again the accounts we have of public worship in the Acts of the Apostles, and the references made to worship in the Epistles all agree with the use of forms, and could not possibly be said of the extempore way of worship. One of the four characteristics of the early Christians is—they continued steadfastly in . . . "the prayers."—Acts ii. 42, (Revised Version). We find the expression, "They prayed and said," Acts i. 24; "They lifted up their voice with one accord," Acts iv. 24; "Prayed with them all," Acts xx. 36. The mode of expression is quite different when preaching is spoken of—"Peter standing up with the eleven lifted up *his* voice and said," Acts ii. 14; and similarly with every other recorded sermon, however many of the Apostles were present. If extempore prayer had then been the practice, surely we would have been told on some *one* occasion who said the prayer, when we are told so plainly on *every* occasion who preached the sermon.

The use of responses and saying "Amen" is also manifest from such texts as "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," Eph. v. 19; "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," Col. iii. 16; "Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen, at thy giving of thanks," 1 Cor. xiv. 16. And this last comes as it were incidentally, as if referring to a well-known custom in the Corinthian Church.

From these texts we also learn that the practice prevailed of joining voices upon occasion, as well as that of making the petitions their own by saying Amen when they did not so join voices, as we still do in our Church services, and as almost all Christian communities have ever done since the days of the Apostles.

With such a superabundance of Scriptural proof, with the example of God's people in all ages, and throughout all dispensations, surely we have good and sufficient grounds for claiming Divine authority for the use of forms of prayer. It must seem to us very strange that any should think otherwise. Forms were used throughout the old dispensation. A prophet and an apostle both tell us that the

worship in heaven is according to forms. Why should it be otherwise on earth and only during the Christian dispensation? Can the extempore way be anything but a human invention?

A WAY TO PEACE.

MUCH, if not all, of the strife at present in the Church of England is due to mere misapprehension, which might be largely abated, if not removed, by mutual explanations. Schools within the same communion are more favourably situated than separate bodies for a negotiation of the kind, because they have more joint ties of association, more share in the very same interests and ideas, than they are always conscious of. There is the great initial difficulty in an attempt at reunion with outsiders that one or the other must needs give up something which it clings closely to; but members of the same communion who are at variance have seldom to sacrifice any solid possession in coming to a better understanding. They have little to do save to exercise mutual toleration. We are very far from laying all the blame of the misunderstanding upon Evangelical shoulders. High Churchmen must take their full share of it. Any person who can remember how Baptismal Regeneration was preached some forty years ago, will feel no surprise at the complete misconception which Low Churchmen formed of the nature of that doctrine, and how natural it was for them to suppose that it as completely summed up all High Church theology as Justification by Faith once did that of a section of their own school. And to the present day there are survivals to be found, who have never added any other tenet to this except Apostolic Succession, not having the smallest glimmer of consciousness as to the incompleteness of a creed with only these two prominent factors. The younger and more unlettered High Church clergy are much given to making rash and crude statements, needing much qualification before being such as a theologian would ratify, for which they claim unquestioned currency as "Catholic,"—save the mark!—when they are no more Catholic than Mr. Booth's new sect is. All these clumsy deliverances are accepted by opponents, reasonably outraged by them, as accurately representing High Church theology, from which accordingly they revolt still further, and small blame to them, so far. On the other hand, this unfamiliarity with theology, partial amongst High Churchmen, is all but universal amongst Evangelicals, whose range of reading is usually much narrower, and who are in the bonds of a much more restrictive tradition.

One result of this is that arguments which are very weighty to a theologian have no cogency at all for them. For example, it is nearly useless to ply them with the argument that certain tenets which they disapprove can be shown to have been maintained by the most eminent Christian writers of ancient times; and, contrariwise, some favourite doctrine of their school to be definitely traceable to some one innovator of comparatively modern

times, say Luther or Calvin. Their training intellectually has not enabled them to grasp the notion of historical continuity as an important factor in religion, and they are so entirely in the bondage of tradition that they believe themselves to have personally recognised from Scripture opinions not only absent from it, but never read into it till a recent period by some teacher who had influenced their teachers. Thus they are quite certain that views which in any way conflict with such opinions are definitely unscriptural, and to be rejected on that ground, as mere human corruptions of the truth, not any the better for being very ancient.

Nevertheless, when the main points in dispute between the two schools are calmly surveyed, it will be noticed that the actual agreement is vastly greater than the surface conflict. At the present time, the doctrines of the priesthood and of the Eucharist are those mainly in debate between the two schools, and it is unfortunately true that if there is language used on one side which seems to those of the other to be superstitious, it is met by fanatics on their part with words which are ribald and blasphemous, scarcely, if at all, removed from the category of those scandalous caricatures of the holiest passages of the Gospels which outraged public decency a short time back. Probably no pleas would have any deterrent effect upon the authors of such productions save those backed by physical force, which are the worst for the purposes of conversion. But when we take the saner members of their school into consideration, we find their attitude and language to vary remarkably according as they are expressing their positive opinions in word or action, or their negative opinions for controversial purposes. Take the present Bishop of Exeter's "Companion Hymnal," for instance, a compilation on exclusively Evangelical lines, and see what provision it makes for Eucharistic hymns. No doubt, there are conspicuous gaps, in absence of some of the finest ancient and modern verses for the purpose, but let us see what is provided. We find, then, Doddridge's "My God, and is Thy table spread?" with the second stanza unaltered; Ray Palmer's translation from St. Bernard, "Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts;" Montgomery's "According to Thy gracious word;" Monsell's "I hunger and I thirst;" Bayne's "Jesu, to Thy table lead;" Neale's translation, "Draw nigh and take the Body of your Lord;" Bonar's "Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face;" Conder's "Bread of the word, in mercy broken;" and several others, breathing deep and faithful devotion, and contrasting with some polemical manifestoes, as the song of the angels does with the yells of demons.

Again, take the broad fact that modern Evangelicals, unlike the seventeenth century Puritans, are perfectly content to use the Book of Common Prayer, and that the section amongst them which calls for a revision in the Puritan direction is small and powerless, being discountenanced by wiser spirits, who