

court, as to whether these were legal or not, and because they were unwilling to run the risk of embroiling their parish in the miseries of a prosecution in a secular court.

It seems possible, nay, even probable—now that the Archbishop of Canterbury has pronounced as legal certain practices which have hitherto been doubtful, and the Privy Council have endorsed his Grace's judgment—that some of the clergy will consider themselves justified in at once introducing into their services those points on which the Archbishop upheld the Bishop of Lincoln, and that consequently considerable friction and uneasiness may arise in many parishes. It would, I feel confident, be a most deplorable circumstance if such a condition of things should arise. As I said in my first paper, the judgment is permissive, not obligatory. Far more harm may be done by premature insistence on matters of detail regarding which people feel strongly than any good resulting from the education in Catholic principles which it might be hoped would accrue. We need to be very careful not to allow ourselves to be ever-persuaded by those who are constantly demanding alterations, and who would prefer an advanced ritual, even if it appeared to the majority of the congregation to be a mere array of meaningless ceremonies, rather than a simpler form of service which all could appreciate and enjoy.

The truth is that too often ritual is made a precursor of doctrine instead of a follower; and it is not surprising that some of our brethren, in their eagerness to help forward the Catholic revival, should shrink from the slow and tedious path of gradually leading their people by steady, consecutive instruction in Church history and Church doctrine, to claim their privileges as members of the Catholic Church, when, to all outward appearance, the same result may be attained by the rapid introduction of the outward symbols. They do not realise that in the one case there is a solid building up in Church principles, while in the other there is merely a hollow and unstable edifice. The introduction of ritual, when the people are ignorant of doctrine, serves only to bewilder and irritate. But as the congregation are gradually and tenderly instructed in doctrine—not laid down dogmatically, but shown, step by step, to be the teaching of the reformed Prayer-book, and proved to be in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture—then all the accompaniments of the service will become real living lessons instead of empty forms.

There are comparatively few among those who worship, Sunday by Sunday, in the Church of England who have ever taken the trouble to read the Preface or the succeeding Articles. Though these were written about three hundred years ago, it is astonishing how applicable much that we find there is to the controversies of the present day. The Reformation, when the Church of England threw off those superstitions and errors which had crept in through her communion with the Church of Rome, was of the nature of a compromise. Concessions had to be made to the extreme section in order that the main principle might be carried, and thus many customs were abandoned for the time which the more moderate of the reformers would gladly have retained.

It seems almost absurd to have to refer to one of the most elementary facts of English history, but the misconception arising from ignorance, and from reiterated misstatements, is so frequently met with that, at the risk of appearing tedious, I would repeat that the Reformation was *not* the work of Henry VIII., and that the Church of England did *not* take her origin from him. The Reformation was commenced in England under Archbishop Warham, in the reign of Henry VII.; it was a Reformation from within the Church, and was not forced upon her from without; the quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Bishop of Rome served merely as an additional weight in the scale of Anglican resistance to papal aggression. In a word, as it has been pithily put, 'the Church of England washed her face, but was still the same Church.'

It is astonishing how difficult it is to eradicate those misconceptions, which arose from ignorance, and which have, through succeeding generations, acquired the authority of well-established traditions. For example, there are those who, while acknowledging that David was a 'man after God's own heart,' and glorying in his title of 'the sweet Psalmist of Israel,' protest vehemently against the singing of the Psalms in the service, forgetting, or ignoring, the fact that they were written for that purpose, and were universally sung in the synagogues and in the Temple, and that our Lord frequently took part in singing them. There are those who object to the practise of turning to the east during the recital of the Apostles' Creed, regarding the symbolism as meaningless and trivial, who have nothing to say against the same symbolism when their loved ones are laid in the grave with their feet towards the east. There are those who look almost contemptuously upon the observance of saints' days and fasts, disregarding the fact that they are ordered by the Prayer-book, both in the Calendar and in the pages succeeding the Calendar, to keep those days in a special manner. And, once more, there are those who glory in calling themselves Protestants, and regard with pious horror the term Catholic, who entirely pass over the fact that, whenever they join in the services in God's house, they profess their belief in the Holy Catholic Church, and join in praying for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it may be guided and governed by the Holy Spirit.

If it is important that those who desire a more advanced form of service than they have been accustomed to should be very gentle towards those who view with suspicion the slightest alterations, it is equally incumbent on the reactionary party to be willing to acquiesce in modifying the rigid tenets which they have inherited from former generations.

The Church of England is very wide (some people consider her to be too wide) in her sympathies. She embraces within the pale of her communion persons of widely differing views. So long as the essential doctrines and conditions of the Anglican Church, as embodied in our Creeds and Articles, are accepted, she is content to give a wide toleration to diversity of opinion and practice. It is this which has constituted her strength and influence in the past, and it would be a great misfortune if she were to suffer (as she assuredly would suffer) by an attempt to bind her children down to a dull uniformity. Uniformity does not beget unity. On

the contrary, it sometimes has a contrary effect.

It therefore behoves all who have at heart the welfare of our Church, who are proud of her Catholicity, who rejoice in return to primitive truth, which was, to a great extent, the result of the Reformation, to be very careful in reintroducing practices and points of ritual which are distressing to others, and to be very tender to all, of whatever thought, who claim allegiance to the Anglican Church.

Where the congregation desire it, and where the various points of ritual and their bearing on the doctrine are fully taught and explained, let them be introduced. To many people they are a real help to devotion, and they give a sense of earnestness to the service. But where the congregation is largely composed of people who, for years, have been accustomed to the simplest form of service allowed by our liturgy, and who are disturbed and troubled by a variety of practices which they neither appreciate nor comprehend, a sudden and violent alteration of the services may do much harm.

We clergy must never lose sight of the fact that, in the great majority of cases, our parishioners comprise men and women of every school of thought, and that it is our duty to be ministers to *all*. While it is totally impossible to give complete satisfaction to those who hold extreme views in either direction, it is incumbent upon us so to act in the ministrations of Divine worship as to include all parties, so that, while the High Churchman feels that, if there are points of ritual wanting which he would like to have, at least the catholicity of the Church and her sacraments is recognised and taught; and, on the other hand, the Low Churchman can accept the teaching without being disturbed by a variety of practises which only distract and trouble him. We must be prepared to be taunted with the charge of 'trimming' by the ardent spirits of either side. We can afford to ignore such attacks so long as we have the spirit of the great Apostle, whose boast it was that he was made all things to all men, that he might by all means gain some.

In this way we shall each be enabled to bring together, in however slight a degree, the various 'parties' in the Church.

It seems to me that a vast amount of the power and influence of the Church of England is wasted and squandered by the spirit of party, which has led, and is leading, to so much internal strife. It is the old cry, re-echoed from the time of the Apostolic Church in Corinth, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos.' Away with party cries and party shibboleths! The only party we ought to belong to is the Anglican branch of the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. It is in this that we profess our belief publicly in the House of God week by week; it was to defend her existence and the purity of her doctrine that martyrs, in all ages, have been content to lay down their lives; it is as members of this Church, which is Christ's body, that we claim the benefits of those sacraments which the Lord Himself ordained! it is to bring all men to the Saviour through His Church that we have been ordained, and that we are called to labour in His vineyard.

Let us never forget that our Master's example teaches us the paramount duty of individual work among souls. He was content to leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness while He sought out the one erring sheep. We must not, in our efforts to lead forward the many, run the risk of endangering the safety of the few. Let our ideal, however short of it we may come, be the words of the Son of God, 'Of them whom Thou gavest Me I have lost none.' M.F.

CHURCH PAPERS.

From our own experience we must say that the pastor who refuses to use the help which the Church newspaper gives him in his work makes a very grievous mistake, wrongs himself and his parish equally. The intelligent and interested