

and introduced it into the Scottish churches. In 1560 it was formally adopted by Act of General Assembly, and became the established liturgy of the Presbyterian Church.

There was wide divergence between these liturgies in many respects. Cranmer's could scarcely claim to be more than an amended edition of the Roman Missal, expurgated of its grosser errors, and translated into the language of the common people. That of Luther diverged more widely, though still following in large measure the order of the Roman Missal. The liturgies of Calvin and Knox were to a considerable extent independent compilations, had comparatively few responses, and made provision in certain parts of the service for extempore prayer. But they were all liturgies in the strict sense of the word, and it would be an interesting inquiry—though one in which the readers of *THE REVIEW* would not be likely to agree—how it came about that some of the largest representative bodies of Christendom have ceased to be liturgical, and are to-day so strenuous in their opposition to all liturgical forms of service.

Leaving this question to church historians, and writing now from the standpoint of a minister of a non-liturgical church—one consequently from which may be expected a more disinterested survey, and a more impartial estimate of the relative strength or weakness of particular forms of liturgical service—the writer desires to call attention to a few matters which seem to him worthy of consideration, and which may at least awaken inquiry and stimulate further discussion.

I. First then, it may, we think, be accepted as a maxim that the chief strength of a liturgy lies in the provision which it makes for the responsive element in worship. The old sea captain gave expression to the truth in very homely but very significant phraseology when he said that he liked the service of the Episcopal Church because "the preacher gave a fellow a chance now and then to jaw back at him." To let the people feel that they have a distinct and audible part, not only in the singing, but in all the devotional exercises of the service, is unquestionably an element of power in any church ritual. As far as public prayer is concerned, this feature of responsive service can claim for itself apostolic sanction and scriptural authority. From 1 Cor. xiv : 16 it is evident that, according to the usage of the apostolic church, there were certain points in the service at which the congregation had the privilege and duty of making response by uttering an audible *Amen*; for the Apostle gives as a reason why those who had the gift of speaking in unknown tongues should not exercise this gift in the public worship of the sanctuary, "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."

If any should object that the utterance of a responsive Amen is not necessarily liturgical, since our Methodist brethren who eschew liturgy