

way, in one of the slums of Lambeth, at the call of anyone who requires help. She nurses the sick or attends upon the infirm, working as a charwoman. The sacrifice is purely one of love for the cause of charity, as Miss Tait is well provided for.

This one gentle, loving woman will do more good than a great many speeches on platforms.

Here is a good suggestion, offered by a correspondent to an English newspaper on behalf of the suffering and sick of our hospitals. "When passing one of these noble institutions last week," he says, "I saw an open carriage pass from the front door filled with patients. If those who are in a position to do so would send their carriages to our hospitals to be placed at the disposal of those patients who, though not obliged to keep their beds, yet are too ill to walk, they would show their sympathy in a very practical and Christian way, which would, doubtless, help to hasten the patients' restoration to health, and in many instances, the bread-winner or mother back to the family circle. One or two limitations may be mentioned: 1. No convalescent from any contagious disease. 2. Only one hour. 3. A nurse to accompany them."

If acts like these were to become common, if the spirit out of which they spring were widely diffused, then the evils of poverty would be immensely lessened, the rich and the poor would meet together as brethren, knowing that the Lord was the Maker of them all.

#### LIBERALISM IN THEOLOGY.

Liberality is an excellent thing; but there are limits. We do not mean that there are limits to the toleration of opinion. Intolerance is always bad; and persecution never did any good, unless, perhaps, sometimes indirectly, by purifying the persecuted; and it does most harm of all to the persecutor. On these points there is a fairly general agreement among us.

But we are in danger of going further, and saying not merely that opinion is to be tolerated, but that all opinions are equally tolerable and equally excellent, and that a man may be a good Christian and a respectable Churchman, whatever he may happen to believe or disbelieve. A very remarkable example of this kind has occurred in connexion with the arrangements for the approaching Church Congress in the United States. It would appear that all liberties of doctrine and of ritual are conceded to the members and ministers of the American Protestant Episcopal Church; but it has been generally agreed that only those should be invited to take part in the deliberations of the Church Congress who are, doctrinally, within those limits which are generally acknowledged as those (surely not very inelastic) of the historical Church of England.

It might perhaps be objected that such a theory is not quite logical. It might be said that a clergyman or a layman, who is recognized as such, who is, as we should say, in good standing, should not be excluded from any of the privileges of the body to which he belongs. But the answer is equally reasonable. If a man does certainly deny the truth of formularies which he is constrained to use, shall we put that man in a place of influence and authority simply because we have no convenient tribunal before which to try him?

As we have never heard the name of the clergyman before, and know nothing of his teaching, we shall abstain from naming him here, and will simply state the case as it is put in the New York

*Churchman*, and other American Church papers. It appears, then, that this clergyman has denied both the supernatural conception of our Lord and His actual resurrection from the dead. Now, as we have often said, we do not want in any way to persecute or punish those who deny these fundamental doctrines; but neither can we put forth one who denies them as one who holds the Catholic Faith. Why, the old Unitarians, and men of a much lower religious range than that of Channing, had no hesitation in affirming the resurrection from the dead; so that a committee of a Church Congress might as well invite a Socinian to its platform as a so-called Churchman of this type.

We cannot wonder that Bishop Potter of New York has lifted his voice in protest against such an appointment. There is not the least doubt as to the denial by the reverend gentleman of the two articles of the Creed to which we have referred; and one should suppose that this was disqualification enough for such a position. But a member of the committee has come to the assistance of that body, and has offered in its defence the plea that the Congress is "of the most pronounced uneclesiastical character"—which is very much, nay exactly the same, as though one should say that "the Church Congress is emphatically unchurchly."

One of two things, then, should be made quite clear, namely, that the Congress is simply an open arena into which all comers are welcome, or else that it sets up a platform on which all recognized schools within the Church are represented. The latter, as far as we understand the matter, has been the English theory throughout the whole history of the Church Congress, and it seems a quite reasonable one. If it is desired to work the other theory, it would be far better to organize a new institution on those wider lines, and then no objections could be offered to the appearance of any one, whatever his opinions, who might be thought capable of behaving with decency. In the meantime, we must agree with Bishop Potter that the Church Congress is not the place in which to proclaim that the Incarnation and the Resurrection need not be believed.

#### SOME LITURGICAL STUDIES.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 7.

The Liturgy of 1637 proved a failure, as it was unsuited to both the time and circumstances, and, as regarded Scotland, it was more of a costly experiment than a natural product. Even in England, the revision of 1604 was all that could safely be attempted, and though a great convulsion afterwards changed the features of both nation and Church, yet the rejoicing over the king's return in 1660 had not put the temper of the people into a liturgical form. In fact the Act of Uniformity closed up the natural approaches in that direction, and except for a few verbal changes and the omission of some special services, our Prayer Book is now as it was given us by the revisers at the Savoy. But with the greater liberty that was enjoyed outside the councils of the English Church, there grew the desire to amend the liturgical forms and attain a higher ideal of worship. This has given us three distinct Communion Offices—the Non-jurors, the Scotch, and the American: they adhere to one type, and this is the order of their derivation.

When the Revolution settlement was made in 1688-9, some of the best men in the English Church were content to lose their ecclesiastical position rather than forswear their former allegi-

ance, and they sought to be loyal to the Church, though not to that which was by law established. There was an effort for a time to organize a counter system, and the scholars, who belonged to that party, were devoting much of their attention to Eastern studies. While some were unwilling to imagine a fault in the authorized service book, others were trying to supply its supposed defects with prayers taken from other sources, and still another portion of them fell back upon the First Book of Edward VI. In Scotland the object was usually attained by a slight alteration in the order of the parts and the insertion of other prayers. At the same time there was a movement in favour of intercommunion with the churches of the Eastern obedience, and thus there was brought into prominence the question of all the essentials for a valid consecration of the Eucharist, and consequently the shortcomings of the English Office. The fruit of these studies and discussions appeared in 1718, when the Non-juror's Office was published; it was "taken partly from the Primitive Liturgies, and partly from the First English Reformed Common Prayer Book." The earlier rubrics of the Office are in Collier's rough, quaint and unpolished style, but state their object with great succinctness. The Introits were brought back from Edward's First Book, and the summary of the Commandments was appointed to be read where the Second Book appointed the full code: the want of the *Gloria in Excelsis* here took away from the jubilant tone of the earlier opening. After the Offertory Sentences there was inserted a prayer which was entirely new in form and conception: it made a formal oblation of the bread and wine newly placed upon the altar, and corresponded to the Great Entrance in the Eastern Church; the prayer was made to the Father for a blessing upon the offerers and their material offerings. The *Sursum Corda* and Proper Prefaces were followed by the Consecration Prayer, which was the most characteristic passage in the Office, and differed in almost every respect from its predecessors. Taking up the keynote of the *Tersanctus* and proceeding in a highly theological strain, it introduced the narrative of the Institution, and added the Oblation and Invocation "that he may make this bread the Body of thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of thy Christ." Also in the same long prayer there were petitions for different classes of the living, and commendation "unto thy mercy, O Lord, all thy servants who are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now rest in the sleep of peace." This sequence is peculiarly Eastern, and it is evident from the manual actions that the Invocation was introduced as necessary to the Consecration; in the First Book the Invocation had stood first of the three, and the only manual action was the using the sign of the cross at the words "bless" and "sanctify," while in the other Offices the manual actions were restricted to the Words of Institution; the commemoration of the faithful departed was one of the usages so much discussed last century. The wording of this prayer is heavy and evidently belongs to the Office: it is almost prolix in seeking accuracy of theological statement. After the prayer of Consecration the Office closely followed the First Book, but the Lord's Prayer wanted the Preface, "As our Saviour," and there was inserted the *Gloria in Excelsis* and omitted the *Agnus Dei* and the *Post Communion*. This was the type on which the Scotch and American Offices were afterwards moulded, but each wrought out in detail its own ideal, and the work upon the Scotch Office is not even now entirely ceased. This Office of 1718 was