





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503



**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques



© 1987

ails
du
odifier
une
nage

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of Parliament and the
National Library of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shell contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

La Bibliothèque du Parlement et la
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

rrata
o

elure,
n à

32X

REVISION
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK
AND THE
ENFRANCHISEMENT
OF THE
LAITY.

BY A LAYMAN.


TORONTO:
DUDLEY & BURNS, PRINTERS, 11 COLBORNE STREET



REVISION
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK
AND THE
ENFRANCHISEMENT
OF THE
LAITY.

BY A LAYMAN.

TORONTO:
DUDLEY & BURNS, PRINTERS, 11 COLBORNE STREET



P R E F A C E .

THE chief object of this little work is to give to the Laity of the Church of England the most recent and satisfactory account of the Athanasian Creed, which "so few do understand," and to this end we ask their careful reading and study of the Report of the Ritual Commission, which we give verbatim, so far as regards this creed.

Another object is to show the necessity there is for a Revision of the Prayer Book. But as this has been talked of so long, and is still apparently so very distant, a more active participation by the Laity in the temporal management of the Church in which, as the Bishop of Manchester said, they certainly have the primary interest," it is thought would, to some extent at least, supply the want of it.

Our wish is not to find fault with, but rather to admire the formularies of the Prayer Book, venerable for its age, being now 227 years old: nevertheless, all unprejudiced persons must see some few glaring imperfections in it,—concomitants of age perhaps, the removal of which would not only disarm the bitterest opponents of the Church, but would greatly add to its strength, popularity and usefulness.

October, 1889.

TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
THIS LITTLE WORK IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED
BY THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The First Œcumenical Council or Conference, 1867.....	7
The Athanasian Creed	9
Report of the Ritual Commission, 1870	14
The Bishop of Durham's Speech	26
The Uniformity Act, 1872.....	29
The Second Conference, 1878.....	40
The Convocation of Canterbury, 1878	40
Revised New Testament, 1880	43
The Third Conference, 1888.....	46
Position of the Church of England in England and Canada..	52
The Evening Service.....	53
The Duty of the Laity	56

"The account given of Athanasius' Creed appears to me nowise satisfactory. I wish we were well rid of it."

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON, 1691.

"The highest object," said Erasmus, "of the revival of Philosophical studies, will be to learn to become acquainted with the simple and pure Christianity in the Bible."

"I should, therefore, have deemed it a wiser course had the Commission decided that the Athanasian Creed should not retain its place in the public service of the Church."

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. 1870.

REVISION
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK.

FIRST ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OR CON-
FERENCE, 1867.

When it was proposed by the Church authorities to assemble an Œcumenical Council, to be held at Lambeth, in September, 1867, it was naturally expected that those burning questions which had so long disturbed the minds of churchmen would be considered and some attempt made towards a satisfactory settlement of them. The Church's heart at that time beat high with expectation. The two great parties in her fold, it was said, would be brought closer together, each in their views would cultivate moderation and mutual toleration, and as at various times within the last fifty years, our Church authorities have discussed the expediency of altering the Prayer Book, yet little or nothing having been done, now, certainly, it was again said, we shall have revision. There was, in short, great rejoicing over the birth of this first grand gathering of the bishops of our Church.

Considering the magnitude of the interests involved in a first attempt to bring together, what might prove, no one at that time could tell, very discordant views in doctrine and discipline; it was perhaps discreet and proper to consider the great meeting a private and confidential one; and so permission to attend their deliberations was refused to the representatives of the press. They sat with closed doors. All, therefore, that the outside world—every anxious churchman—knew of what took place, was confined to a letter addressed to the members of the Church, signed by three archbishops and seventy-three bishops, urging “the desire for union, and the keeping whole and undefiled the faith once delivered to the saints.” We do not find one word said about those great and important questions of ritual and discipline which have so long and do still distract the minds of the clergy and laity in general. That they were considered there cannot be the least doubt. It was the prime object of this great and unusual gathering of the Governors of the Church. But very likely for good and sufficient reasons, if we only knew them, it was thought advisable for the Conference to keep its own counsel for the present. Great disappointment at the result was very general in Church circles, and the comments of the press were severe when at length the Conference broke up. The *Times* wrote, “It is one of those statutes that seem under a mighty influence, and full of vital energy, but make no advance and only paw the air.” The Conference is ended; the bishops return to their several dioceses, and we take our respectful leave of them for awhile.

We are glad, however, to think the public had not long to wait before some useful work at this conference became apparent. There issued shortly after its close, the Ritual Commission and this was soon followed by the Act of Uniformity. Both these measures we shall assume were suggested by the conference, and seemed to indicate a beginning of and preparation for the revision of the Prayer Book. We propose to notice them a little in detail :

First, the Ritual Commission so far as it relates to the Athanasian Creed, and,

Second, the division of the morning services as provided by the Act of Uniformity, and we shall notice the position of the laity and the action they should take in these and other matters.

First. The Athanasian Creed. We are oppressed with a sense of shame and sorrow in contemplating its history and the means resorted to, to impose on a world of ignorance and spiritual bondage this complex and elaborate confession of faith, which, even at the present day, "so few do understand." Canon Swainson says, that originally it was not a creed at all, but "a treatise, or a sermon, or an address to a congregation." As such there would be slight objection to it. We do not invariably accept as true all the remarks we hear from the pulpit which are simply expressive of the views of a learned and pious individual, however we may in our own minds question his judgment in giving them utterance, yet he is listened to attentively and with profound respect and no one would presume to object. But, "when we are called on to recite the whole of it as an article of faith," says Canon Swainson, "and proclaim

before God, and angels, and men, not that we believe so and so, but that this is necessary, and that is necessary, and that this is true, and that is true, the proceeding appears to me, as it does to others, a painful, almost a thrilling act of unnecessary presumption."

It was for centuries believed to be the composition of Athanasius. When the Archbishop of Hamburg, A.D. 865, was near dying, "he urged on his brethren the recital of the Catholic Faith composed by the blessed Athanasius," who had been gathered to his fathers five centuries before the creed bearing his name was thought of or saw the light. If it had been composed by the "blessed Athanasius," who died A.D. 350, it certainly would have been well considered in the

Council of Constantinople,	A.D.	381.
"	Ephesus	" 431.
"	Chalcedon	" 451.
"	Nicœa	" 787.

But there is no mention of its having been the subject of thought even in the above or any of the smaller councils.

The angry controversies which took place towards the end of the eighth century, between the bishops of Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain, as to the belief of the whole Church in the doctrine of the Trinity called forth from some of the bishops very able and lengthy expositions of the faith. There is one by Paulinus, the most influential bishop in Europe, found amongst the records of the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, which explains with great earnestness the trinitarian doctrine, and which says Dr. Lumby, fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, would have been quite unnecessary had

the Quicumque been then in existence. It would have answered his purpose exactly. Its whole tenor shows clearly that he had never heard of it, and there is not to be found the slightest notice of Athanasius in the whole proceedings of the Council in which were the representatives of Italy, Spain, Britain, Germany and Gaul.

This exposition by Paulinus together with the famous letter of Charlemagne—for kings and emperors in those days were also great theologians—addressed to the bishops of Spain to the like effect it is conjectured formed the basis of the Quicumque in A.D. 870. In that year it is found for the first time in the Prayer Book of Charles the Bald, Emperor of the West. Dr. Lumby thinks the question of its composer will probably ever remain doubtful, though there can be little question that “we owe it to one of the active ecclesiastics of the early part of the ninth century, and that the strong expressions of its warning clauses are to be traced to the fierce contests, which, at that period, agitated the whole ecclesiastical world.”

At one time it was thought that its first advocate was the mighty Charlemagne, but it has been proved that it was not known in his day, A.D. 800. It is more probable, therefore, that it was vigorously laid hold of by Charles the Bald, about A.D. 870, and ordered to be read or sung every day in the Church of France. From the ninth to the sixteenth century it

NOTE.—Among the points established by Dr. Lumby in his excellent work are the following: That the Quicumque was not known down to A.D. 813, to those who were most likely to have heard of it had it been in existence. That it is found nearly as we use it, A.D. 870. On every ground, both of internal and external evidence, it seems to be a sound conclusion that somewhere between A.D. 813-850, the Creed was brought nearly into the form in which we now use it: that before the earlier of these dates it was not known.

was sung every day in the Church of England. But the Reformation called a halt. Priests and people began to think its history "nowise satisfactory," and their enthusiasm in its favor waned. It was ordered to be said only six times in the year. Our reformers would surely have suppressed it altogether, but, as is well known, the Prayer Book was a compromise and it had to be retained. But what a falling off was there! Instead of being sung or said 365 days in the year, its few admirers were to be content with six! This great fact alone at that day and ever since has condemned it.

It is not necessary to enter at large on the theological aspect of the question. The reasons given by the Ritual Commission whose members held every shade of opinion on the subject are exhaustive and exceedingly interesting. They are quite decisive as to the propriety of discontinuing the recital of this creed as part of our Church Service, and to these we shall refer further on. But as its advocates refer especially to a text of scripture which they say supports it, it may be well in furtherance of our argument to refer to it.

Dean Stanley says, "The text which is most commonly adduced in support of the damnatory clauses is Mark xvi : 16 : 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.' But this is an exception which proves the rule. For, first, the belief here spoken of is not the belief in a series of antithetical propositions respecting the abstract nature of the Deity ; it is not even (as is sometimes supposed by a confusion between this and the parallel place in St. Matthew), a belief in the three-fold name of God, but simply a belief in 'the gospel,' (go, preach the gospel), in its larger and widest accep-

tation, which would include every shade of Christian, orthodox or heretical. Secondly, the word 'damned,' when taken (as in this argument it always is taken) in the well-known sense in which it is used in the coarse colloquialism of modern English, is not a proper representation of the old English word, which once meant no more than 'condemned,'* and thus falls altogether short of the unqualified and extreme severity of the Athanasian denunciations. And, thirdly, if even with these limitations it be acknowledged that the passage has a harsh sound, unlike the usual utterances of Him who came not to condemn but to save, the discoveries of later times have shown, almost beyond doubt, that it is not a part of St. Mark's gospel, but an addition by another hand, of which the weakness in the external evidence coincides with the internal evidence, in proving its later origin. When, therefore, this passage is cited by theologians as the statement of our Lord Himself, 'our Lord's own anathema' in defence of the Athanasian curses, they in fact surrender their cause, for they rest their position on a text which is first inapplicable; secondly, mistranslated; thirdly, in all probability, not genuine."

We rejoice that we can now point to the opinions of the eminent men, ecclesiastical and lay, who sat on the Ritual Commission—men holding as we have said every shade of religious belief and ritual, but all uniting in expressing their desire that this creed should cease to be enforced in public worship. Eight out of the twenty-seven Commissioners, would leave the Ru-

* Since this was written the word has been so translated in the revised New Testament.

bric as it is, but on condition of adding to it the following note: "That the condemnations in this confession of faith are to be no otherwise understood than as a solemn warning of the peril of those who wilfully reject the Catholic Faith." Frequent reference it will be seen is made to this note in the following reasons of the Commissioners:

The explanatory note was, it is much to be regretted and to the surprise of all, adopted at a very small meeting of the Commissioners. Had all been present it would have been rejected by probably the large majority of nineteen out of twenty-seven. That such an important matter should have been decided by a small minority of the whole Commission is inexplicable.

THE REPORT OF THE RITUAL COMMISSION ON THE ATHANASIAN CREED:

SO FAR AS GIVING THE REASONS OF THE FOLLOWING COMMISSIONERS
IN DETAIL.

31st AUGUST, 1870.

1. THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY:—"Respecting the Athanasian Creed, while I rejoice that the Commissioners have thought it right to append a Rubric explanatory of the sense in which 'the condemnations in this Confession of Faith' are to be understood, I cannot feel entirely satisfied with this course.

"The adoption by the Commissioners of this explanation seems to me to admit two things,—

"1st. That it was within the power of the Commission to deal with the use of the Athanasian Creed:

"2nd. That the use of the Creed in public worship was liable, from the wording of these clauses, to objection.

"I should, therefore, have deemed it a wiser course had the

Commission decided that the Creed in question, valuable and most important as are its direct doctrinal statements, should not retain its place in the Public Service of the Church." (Report, p. viii.)

2. EARL STANHOPE :—" In the course of our deliberations the propriety of retaining the Athanasian Creed in the Public Services was frequently discussed, the objection being felt more especially as regards its so-called damnatory clauses.

" It seemed to very many among us that these clauses are both a blemish in our beautiful Liturgy and a danger to our national Church.

" However they may be explained to the satisfaction of learned men conversant with the terms of scholastic divinity in the Greek and Latin languages, it is certain that they are a stumbling-block to common congregations ; forming a service which is wholly misunderstood by some persons, and in which it is observed that others decline to join.

" Various proposals were made in our body to meet the general and growing objections which these clauses in the Athanasian Creed and, consequently, on them the entire Creed, have raised.

" It was moved that in the preceding Rubric the word ' shall ' should be changed to ' may.'

" It was moved to omit the preceding Rubric by which the use of that Creed is prescribed. It was moved to limit the use of that Creed, and that it be permissive only, to our Public Services in Collegiate and cathedral churches.

" It was moved to enjoin it for only one Sunday in the year.

" To several of us it would have appeared a still more preferable plan, which, however, was not formally brought forward, to declare in a new Rubric that although the Church retained the Creed as a Confession of our Christian faith, the Church did not enjoin its use in any of its Public Services.

" It was found, however, upon divisions, several of which took place at divers times in the course of our proceedings, that no one specific proposal could commend itself to the approval of a majority among us. We have, therefore, left untouched and without any suggestion for discontinuance in the appointed Services a Creed, which, nevertheless, so far as regards its popular effect upon others, I imagine that scarce any Churchman contemplates with entire satisfaction. Nor am I at all satisfied with the note which our Report proposes to subjoin. Under these circumstances, which I most deeply regret, I altogether dissent from the very anomalous state in which, to my judgment, this question has been left." (Report p. viii : 9.)

3. LORD PORTMAN :—" I concur in the opinions above expressed." (Report, p. ix.)

4. THE EARL OF HARROWBY :—“ I assent to the statement of facts in regard to the Athanasian Creed put forward by Lord Stanhope, and agree generally with the opinions he has expressed.

“ I only disagree so far, as that I do not dissent from the conclusions come to by the Commission.

“ In spite of the objections which I entertain to the language of certain clauses of the so called Athanasian Creed, and to its use in public congregations, I have felt it my duty to concur with the majority of the Commissioners in retaining it as it now stands in the Prayer Book, on the ground that it seemed to me to be beyond the purpose of our Commission to remove a Confession of Faith from the position of authority, in which our Church has hitherto placed it.” (Report, p. ix.)

5. THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER :—“ I am not satisfied with the explanatory note appended to the Athanasian Creed.” (See Report, p. x.)

6. THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S :—“ I protest against the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed, as not only an evil, on account of the effect it produced on many of the most intelligent and attached members of our Church, but a wrong in itself. It may be impossible to ascertain the extent of the evil, or the proportion of those who are offended by the Creed, to those who acquiesce in it, or even find themselves edified by it.

“ But this appears to me of comparatively little moment. The important question is, whether those who are offended by the Creed, have just and reasonable ground of objection to it. I think they have.

“ It appears to me that, in adopting such a document, the Church both overstept the bounds of its rightful authority, and exercised the usurped authority in an uncharitable and mischievous way.

“ Nothing, as it seems to me, could have warranted such a step, but a special revelation, placing the Creed on a level with Holy Writ. It may be possible for Theologians to show, by technical arguments, that it is a legitimate development of doctrine implicitly contained in Scripture. But this, however fully admitted, would not justify the Church in exacting assent to their conclusions under the penalty of eternal perdition.

“ This was in fact creating a new offence against the Divine Law, and introducing new terms of Salvation, on merely human authority. Looking to the period when this innovation was first imposed on Christians, we may find much excuse for its authors.

“ But viewed in the light of the fundamental principles of a Reformed Church, it appears to me, as forming part of our public services, utterly indefensible.

"I strongly disapprove of the Explanatory Note which has been appended to the Athanasian Creed. I believe not only that it must fail to serve the purpose for which it was adopted, but that it will aggravate the evil it was designed to remedy. If the 'condemnations' have hitherto been generally misunderstood—which I do not believe to be the case—it is too late for any Commission, even if it could speak with authority, to correct the error of public opinion on this head; and if this was possible, it could not be effected by an explanation which is vitiated by the ambiguity of the term 'wilfully' on which the whole meaning depends. The unsuccessful attempt will, I believe, be generally regarded as the admission of an evil, which ought to have been treated in a different manner, or left untouched." (Report, p. xi.)

7. LORD EHURY "desires to concur in the above protest." (Report, p. xi.)

8. MR. JOHN ABEL SMITH, M.P., "desires to concur in the above protest." (Report, p. xi.)

9. THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE :—"With regard to the Athanasian Creed.—It may be doubted whether the consideration of this subject was within the limits of your Majesty's Commission; but the Commissioners having determined so to disregard it, I regret that it was found impossible to arrive at a more satisfactory solution of the difficulty which many persons feel, than the addition of a note, which, I venture to think, is incomplete as an explanation, and insufficient to meet the scruples of those who object to the public recitation of this Confession of our Christian Faith." (Report, p. xiii.)

The same Prelate proposed that the use of the Creed should be prohibited in parish churches, but permitted, though not enforced, in cathedral and collegiate churches. (See Report, p. xvii.)

10. THE RIGHT HON. SPENCER H. WALPOLE :—"The note appended to this Creed or Confession of Faith furnishes to my mind the strongest proof that, however valuable such a document may be as an historical exposition of the Church's views, the enforced use of it as a symbol of faith in Public Worship is most inadvisable. It seems to be very objectionable that a congregation should be required to affirm and profess the articles of their Creed in language which obviously and in its natural sense means one thing, when the interpretation put upon it says that it means another." (Report, p. xiii.)

11. THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOSEPH NAPIER.—"With reference to the annotation proposed to be made in explanation of the penal clauses of the Creed commonly known as the Athanasian Creed, I

humbly submit that we were not authorized by your Majesty to suggest any alterations in this or any other part of the services set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, and least of all by the imposition of a meaning of which the words are not susceptible." (Report, p. xiii.)

12. SIR TRAVERS TWISS, THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE.—"I humbly submit to your Majesty, that evidence has been given before your Majesty's Commissioners, that this Confession of Faith is in practice disused by many of the Clergy, partly from personal repugnance of their congregations. Petitions have also been addressed to the president of your Majesty's Commission from Clergy, praying for relief, as regards the use of this Confession of Faith.

"Under these circumstances, if the occasional use of this Confession of Faith is still to be sanctioned, it seems to me that it would be in accordance with the spirit of your Majesty's instructions, that the Rubric, by which its use is made imperative on certain Festivals, should be modified. I consider it to be beyond the province of your Majesty's Commissioners to interpret the language of this Confession of Faith, and to put a construction, as proposed, by authority upon the so-called damnatory clauses, which is at variance with their plain and grammatical sense." (Report, p. xiv.)

13. MR. CHARLES BUXTON, M.P.—"I desire humbly to express to your Majesty my deep regret that the Royal Commission has not recommended such changes in the Rubric, before the so-called Athanasian Creed, as could have put an end to its use as part of the services of the Church of England; because—

"1. It seems to me that there is great presumption in the attempt made by that Creed to give a precise definition of the nature of the Supreme Being;

"2. The assertions it makes as to the nature of the Supreme Being are nowhere to be found stated in such terms in Holy Writ: but they are the deductions drawn from Scripture by the theologians of the period in which it was written. Now, I cannot think that a Christian Creed ought to consist of inferences (however logical) drawn from Scripture, but only (like the Apostles' Creed) of the very statement of Scripture itself, given in its own words;

"3. Its declaration, that those who do not accept its statement of the Christian Faith, without doubt, will perish everlastingly, is generally acknowledged to be false, and nothing can be less fitting than to invite the people to make a solemn asseveration of that which is not even wished that they should believe;

4. "It commits the Church of England to the doctrine, long since exploded, that error is a crime, punishable with horrible torments.

"I object to the Note that it is proposed to append to the

Athanasian Creed, because, in my opinion, it affirms that which is clearly contrary to the fact. The Athanasian Creed was written at a time when all men firmly believed that erroneous doctrine would be punished with everlasting perdition ; and it was undoubtedly intended as a denunciation of such perdition against all those who did not hold that statement of doctrine which it sets forth. Accordingly, it precedes the statement by the words, 'which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly ; and the Catholic Faith is this,'—it concludes the statement by saying, 'This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.' The meaning of this declaration at the beginning and ending of its statement of the Catholic Faith does not surely admit of any doubt whatever. Were there any such doubt, it would be altogether extinguished by the additional words thrown into the middle of the Creed. 'He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly.' . . . I consider, therefore, that it is only by perverting the obvious meaning of the above words, that we can aver, in the language of the Note, that they are to be no otherwise understood than as a solemn warning of the peril of those who wilfully reject the Catholic Faith." (Report, p. xvi.)

14. THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER :—“I desire to express my conviction that it was the duty of those who served on your Majesty's Commission to recommend the relaxation of the use of the Athanasian Creed in the service of the Church of England. This might have been effected either by the substitution of 'may' for 'shall' in the Rubric, or by the omission of the Rubric altogether, according to the two proposals of Lord Stanhope ; or by the forbidding its use in parish churches, whilst permitting, but not enforcing it, in cathedral and collegiate churches, according to the proposal of the Bishop of Carlisle : or by leaving it to be used alternately with the Apostles' Creed, according to the conditional proposal of Mr. Perry ; or by 'calling attention to the question of placing it with the Articles of Religion, at the end of the Book of Common Prayer,' according to the proposal of the Bishop of Winchester. Any one of these recommendations would have relieved the consciences of those who are burdened by its use, without depriving those who are attached to it of the advantage which may, in their judgment, be derived from the retention of the Creed in the formularies of the Church.

“I deeply regret that a change, proposed with such evident endeavors to conciliate the scruples of those opposed to it, should have been rejected ; and I beg to offer the following reasons for that regret :

" 1. Because the Creed was received and enforced in the Church of England when it was believed to be the Creed of St. Athanasius, whereas it is now known to be the work of an unknown author, not earlier than the fifth century, perhaps as late as the eighth

" 2. Because its exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity is couched in language extremely difficult to be understood by a general congregation, in parts absolutely certain to be understood in a sense different from what was intended by the original words ; as, for example, ' person,' ' substance,' and ' incomprehensible.'

" 3. Because it is never recited in a mixed congregation in any other Church than our own.

" 4. Because the parts of the Creed which are at once most emphatic, most clear, and most generally intelligible, are the condemning clauses which give most offence, and which in their literal and obvious sense, are rejected by the Explanatory Note which is now proposed to be appended to them.

" 5. Because the use of anathemas in the public services of all Churches has been generally discontinued.

" 6. Because these condemning clauses assert in the strongest terms a doctrine now rejected by the whole civilized world, viz., the certain future perdition of all who deviate from the particular statements in the Creed.

" 7. Because they directly exclude from salvation all members of the Eastern Churches ; to whom, nevertheless, the clergy and the bishops of the Church of England, at various times, and especially of late, have made overtures of friendly and Christian intercourse, entirely inconsistent with the declaration that they ' shall without doubt perish everlastingly.'

" 8. Because the passage commonly quoted from the Authorized Version of Mark xvi. 16, in their defence is irrelevant ; (a) as being much more general in its terms ; (b) as being of very doubtful genuineness ; (c) as being in the original Greek much less severe than in the English translation.

" 9. Because the use of this Creed, and of those clauses especially, has been condemned by some of the most illustrious divines of the Church of England, such as Chillingworth, Baxter, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Secker, Dr. Hey, Dr. Arnold, Dr. Burton, Bishop Lonsdale.

" 10. Because the use of the Creed arouses scruples in candidates for ordination, which can only be overcome by strained explanations.

" 11. Because it has been rejected by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which is in full communion with the Church of England, and whose clergy are authorized by statute to minister in our churches, being yet under no obligation to use this Creed.

"12. Because it is a stumbling block in the way of almost all Nonconformists.

"13. Because the public use of the Creed as a confession of Christian Faith, being, as it is, the composition of an unknown author, and not confirmed by any general authority, is a manifest violation of the well-known decrees of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

"14. Because the recitation of the Creed had, in many English Churches, become obsolete, till it was revived some thirty years ago.

"15. Because many excellent laymen, including King George III. have, for the last hundred years at least, declined to take part in its recitation.

"16. Because, so far from recommending the doctrine of the Trinity to unwilling minds, it is the chief obstacle in the way of the acceptance of that doctrine.

"For these reasons I consider that the relaxation of the use of the Creed, whilst giving relief to many, ought to offend none. It has, no doubt, a historical value as an exposition of the teaching and manners of the Church between the fifth and the ninth centuries. It has also a theological value, as rectifying certain erroneous statements; and as excluding from the essentials of the Catholic Faith the larger part of modern controversy. But these advantages are quite insufficient to outweigh the objections which are recorded above, and which, even in the minds of those disposed to retain the use of the Creed, have found expression in an Explanatory Note, tantamount to a condemnation of it.

"With regard to the Explanatory Note, whilst acknowledging the benefit derived from the indirect but unquestionable discouragement which it inflicts on the use of the Creed, I would humbly state the reasons why it appears to me to aggravate the mischief which it is intended to relieve.

"1. Because it attempts a decision on a complex, dogmatical and historical question on which the Commission is not called to offer an opinion and which it has not attempted in other instances, equally demanding and more capable of such explanations, such as the Baptismal Service, the Ordination Service, and the Visitation of the Sick.

"2. Because this dogmatical decision was carried by a small majority in a Commission of reduced numbers; whereas, in order to have any weight, it ought to have received the general concurrence of those most qualified to pronounce it.

"3. Because the words in the Creed, which it professes to explain, are perfectly clear in themselves, whilst it leaves unexplained other words, such as 'person,' 'substance,' 'incomprehen-

sible,' which are popularly understood in a sense different from their original meaning, and which as so understood mislead the mass of the congregation and even preachers, into some of the very opinions so terribly denounced by the condemning clauses.

"4. Because the statement which it implies is historically false, viz., that 'the condemnations in this Confession of Faith' do not apply to the persons to whom they are evidently intended to apply.

"5. Because the main statement which it contains is either extremely questionable, or a mere truism, or else so ambiguous as to be only misleading.

"6. Because, after well considering a similar explanation given in 1689, Archbishop Tillotson thus expressed himself: 'The account given of Athanasius' Creed appears to me nowise satisfactory. I wish we were well rid of it.'

"7. Because, in most instances, it will give no ease to those who are offended by the use of the Creed in public services.

"8. Because, whilst virtually condemning the use of the Creed, it still leaves the Rubric enjoining that use.

"9. Because it will have the effect of increasing the existing burden, by seeming to state that in the view of the Commission, it is a sufficient remedy.

"10. Because it is one of several proposed explanatory notes, which appear in the Minutes, and which are manifestly inconsistent with this and with each other.

"11. Because (in the language used by our chairman, in putting it to the vote), it is 'illogical and unsatisfactory.'" (Report, pp. xvii, xviii.)

15. THE DEAN OF LINCOLN (Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge):—"I am unable to recommend that the Rubric which prescribes the use of the Creed should be retained :

"Because an Exposition of Faith, containing a series of subtle definitions on the most abstruse points of doctrine, may be fitly placed among the Articles of Religion, but is ill-adapted to be 'sung or said' in the public worship of the Church.

"Because the condemning clauses which precede and follow those definitions, when understood in their obvious sense, cause extreme distress of mind to many men of unquestionable piety, who unfeignedly believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith.

"Because, however desirable it may be to present an authoritative interpretation of the Creed, the Commission has no authority to interpret doctrinal statements; and the Note, which it is proposed to add, seems rather to attest the fact than to diminish the force of grave and serious objections.

"Because the Church has omitted the anathematizing clauses at the end of the Nicene Creed, as it stood originally; and the principle thus applied to a Creed which was sanctioned by a General Council might, with at least equal propriety, be applied to a Creed which was composed at a later age, and by an unknown author.

"Because the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which has not only rejected the use of the Athanasian Creed in its public services, but even omitted all reference to the Creed itself in the eighth of the Articles of Religion, is not the less cordially acknowledged to be in full communion with the Church of England." (Report, p. xix.)

16. THE REV. CANON PAYNE SMITH (Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford):—"I object to the note appended to the Creed commonly but erroneously, called the Creed of St. Athanasius, for the following reasons:

"1. Because the Commission possessed neither the right nor the authority to put an interpretation upon any of the formularies of the Church.

"2. Because the note explains the anathemas of the Creed in a manner contrary to their plain grammatical sense, and thereby introduces into the Prayer Book the principle of the non-natural interpretation of the creeds and formularies of the Church; a principle fatal to the maintenance of any standard of doctrine whatever.

"3. Because the note gives no ease or relief to the consciences of those who are offended by the recitation of this Creed at public worship.

"I venture, further, humbly to express my opinion that this Creed ought not to be publicly recited in the Church, for the following reasons:

"(1.) Because the recitation of a Creed so intolerant is contrary to the right spirit of public worship, as being destructive of that calm and reverent frame of mind in which men ought to approach God. The anathema appended to the Nicene Creed, is by the general consent of the Church, never recited at public worship.

"(2.) Because the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed are not warranted by Holy Writ, exclude apparently the whole Eastern Church from the possibility of salvation, and require men to believe, under pain of perishing everlastingly, not merely the plain statements of Holy Scripture, but deductions gathered from it by human reasoning.

"(3.) Because the recitation of this Creed is a violation of Church principles, and condemned in the severest terms by the highest ecclesiastical authority. For the Church of England professes to receive the four first General Councils as next in authority to

Holy Scripture, and accordingly the bishops of the whole Anglican communion at the recent Lambeth Conference affirmed that they received the faith as defined by these Councils. But the Council of Constantinople in its seventh Canon, and that of Chalcedon in the Definition of the Faith appended to its Acts, expressly forbid 'the composing, exhibiting, producing, or teaching of any other Creed.' For this they give a sufficient reason, namely, that the Nicene Creed as finally settled at Constantinople 'teaches completely the perfect doctrine concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and fully explains the Incarnation of the Lord. To guard more carefully against the imposition of new creeds, they command that every bishop or clergyman so offending should be deposed, and every layman anathematized. It was only after long and patient deliberation that these Councils themselves made additions to the simpler creed of the Primitive Church; and not merely is their sentence justly deserved, but the principles which guided them violated, when we are required to recite at public worship a highly complex and elaborate Creed, the statements of which have never been discussed at any Council or Synod of the Church, and which, in so many particulars, goes beyond the Definition of the Faith as settled in the four first General Councils.

"As embodying, nevertheless, that particular explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, gathered from Holy Scripture chiefly by the logical mind of St. Augustine, I think that this Creed ought by all means to be retained among the authoritative documents of the Church of England, mainly because the general assent given to it by the whole Eastern Church; but only until such time as both its several clauses, and also the question of its general imposition in the face of the contrary decision of the Undivided Church, shall have been considered, if not by a General Council, at all events by a Synod representing all Christians in communion with the English Church." (Report, p. xx.)

17. THE REV. HENRY VENN (Secretary of the Church Missionary Society) "is unable to concur" in the retention of the existing Rubric and the explanatory note affixed to it. (Report, p. viii.)

18. THE REV. W. G. HUMPHRY (Vicar of St. Martin's):—"I disapprove of the note which has been appended to the Athanasian Creed in the schedule, for the following reasons:

"1. It is not within the province of the Commission to put an interpretation on one of the formularies of the Church.

"2. The note appears to me to put an interpretation on the condemning clauses of the Creed, which is at variance with their plain and obvious meaning. For, according to the note, the condemnations of the Creed are intended only for those persons who 'wil-

fully reject the Catholic Faith'; whereas, the Creed declares that except every one do *keep* the Catholic Faith *whole and undefiled*, he cannot be saved; and again, 'This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man *believe faithfully*, he cannot be saved.' The terms of condemnation, as expressed in the Creed, are manifestly far more comprehensive than the note represents them to be.

"3. It appears to me that the chief effect of the note, if placed in the Prayer Book, will be to offend by an unsound explanation the consciences of many who at present acquiesce in the recitation of the Creed.

"With regard to the recitation of the Creed in public worship, I concur generally in the opinions expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of St. David's, the Dean of Westminster, and Professor Payne Smith." (Report, p. xxi.)

19. THE REV. T. W. PERRY proposed that permission should be given to use the Apostles' Creed instead of the Creed of Saint Athanasius.

Of the twenty-seven Commissioners, nineteen expressed their opinion with various shades of difference, that the use of the Creed should no longer be made obligatory, and the small minority of eight were only willing that it should be continued if accompanied with the note of explanation, which we have seen was strongly condemned by the large majority of the Commissioners; so that for all practical purposes there is complete unanimity as to the expediency of omitting from the service this celebrated Creed; and as Dean Stanley observes, "This unanimity is the more impressive from the variety of elements which have been brought to bear on the subject. There is here no difference between bishops and presbyters. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the humblest parochial incumbent in the Commission appear on the same side of relaxation. Nor is it a question of political opinion. The Conservative legislators and lawyers, Earl Stanhope, Mr. Walpole and Sir Joseph Napier agree on this point

with Lord Portman, Lord Ebury, Sir Travis Twiss, Mr. Buxton and Mr. John Abel Smith. Nor is it a concord only of one ecclesiastical party. Not to speak of others, it is interesting to observe, that, however wide their differences on ceremony and doctrine, we find in this cause of charity, justice and common sense. Mr. Venn, the venerable champion of the Evangelical school, on the same side with Mr. Perry, the indefatigable champion of the Ritualists."

III.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM'S SPEECH.

"Since the sitting of the Ritual Commission, 1870, say Dr. Lumby, another attempt was made to quiet the feelings of men on the subject of the damnatory clauses in the Creed. In the convocation of the Province of Canterbury, held 1st July, 1879, it was proposed and agreed to append to the Athanasian Creed a declaration, as follows :

"For the removal of doubts and to prevent disquietude in the use of the Creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, it is here solemnly declared :

"1. That the confession of our Christian faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, doth not make any addition to the faith as contained in Holy Scripture, but warneth against errors which, from time to time, have arisen in the Church of Christ.

"2. That as Holy Scripture, in divers places, doth promise life to them that believe, and declare the condemnation* of them that believe not, so doth the Church in this confession declare the necessity for all who would be in a state of salvation, of holding fast the Catholic Faith, and the great peril of rejecting the same. Wherefore the warnings in this confession of faith are to be understood no otherwise than the like warnings of Holy Scripture; for we must receive God's threatenings even as His promises, in such wise as they are generally set forth in Holy Writ. Moreover, the Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the judge of all."

* The revisers altered the word damned to condemned.

The same declaration was afterwards submitted to the Convocation of the northern Province of York, but it was not accepted by that body. It was then moved in opposition, "That as the Creed of St. Athanasius has been received by the Catholic Church for so many centuries as the standard of faith, no explanatory additional rubrical note is required, and no action of Convocation ought to diminish the frequency of the use of the Creed." The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot) proposed an amendment, and his speech thereupon may be taken as an index of the feeling of most moderate members of the Church of England at the present time.

He proposed, as an amendment, the substitution of the word "may" for "shall" in the Rubric. His chief object was to give the alternative on certain days of using the Apostles' Creed, or, in other words, the placing of the Athanasian Creed in the same position as the Canticles. It appeared, he said, they knew not how, that the Creed had never received the sanction of a General Council; hence it stood in a position different from that of other creeds. It occupied a position in the Anglican Church which it had never occupied in any branch of the Church Catholic. In the service of the Roman Church it never appeared, but in an occasional office repeated by the clergy. He had before him a tract written by a Roman priest in which he explained its use, and which showed that its position was wholly different from what it was in the English Church. In the Greek Church it was not authorized at all; it appeared in some editions of the *Horologium*, but was omitted in others, and that *Horologium* had the sanction of certain Bishops of the Greek Church. By certain branches of the Anglican Church, the Creed had been rejected; whilst the American and the Irish Churches had rejected it altogether. He believed the American Church was, if anything, more orthodox in its adherence to the Nicene Creed than we were ourselves, and he was not sure that it was not due to the removal of this stumbling-block. He would very gladly accept the present position of the Athanasian Creed if the prominence given to the document was a real gain to the Church, but he was sorry he could not think it was so. The position of the Creed should not be retained as a barrier to young men taking holy orders. Whatever interpretation was put on the damnatory clauses, they were no part of the document itself, and Dr. Arnold, like the present Bishop of Salisbury and others, agreed with him. The great grievance was the necessity of using the Creed on the great festivals of the Church, in place of the Apostles' Creed. Clergymen had put their own interpretation on the damnatory clauses, but somehow or other they had not succeeded in getting their congregations to take the same view of the case. Whether congregations were right or wrong, it was a very sad fact, which

should lead them all to consider carefully whether their allegiance to the Church of Christ did not require them to remove the stumbling-block. At the solemn festivals of the Church, that harmony which it was very desirable should pervade those services, was interrupted by denunciations, and the reverence they desired to conciliate for the great doctrines of the faith was impeded by an attachment to those clauses which they could not get the congregation to understand in the sense in which they were put. Amongst the changes possible was the appending of a note. He hoped they would not take that, which he believed would be the most fatal solution of the difficulty. By a note they either meant that it was a counteraction of the Creed, in which case they discredited it; or, that it was an explanation; and they would see that it was a most dangerous precedent to attempt to explain important doctrinal points in the Rubrics. Besides, a note would only result in dissatisfaction to those persons who at present took the document without scruple, and they would thus be placing a stumbling-block in the way of those who now had no difficulty. Another mode of relief which might be suggested was the excision of the damnatory clauses. That would be a very good solution in itself; but it was *ultra vires*, and in dealing with the Rubrics they had no power to adopt that course. He ventured to say that those clauses were no part of the confession of faith itself. The third possible alteration was the rendering of the Creed optional. He would not press for the absolute removal of the document from the public services of the Church, though that arrangement would be made in accordance with the uses of other churches. He would have preferred that it should be so removed; and, in many cases, theological education had gone so far that to press for the total removal of the recitation of the Creed in mixed congregations might be wise. Not many years ago nearly three thousand of the clergy sent a memorial to the two archbishops seeking relief in that matter. If Convocation thought the subject was set at rest, they were very much mistaken. They were on a volcano, whether they would recognize it or not. There was a sense in which there was sincerity in using all the words of the Creed; still they were a stumbling-block to many. He felt that his allegiance to his Master, Christ, to that Nicene doctrine which he thoroughly and completely held, and to that Church of England which he ventured to think was the noblest church in Christendom, required him to do what he could to remove that which was a stumbling-block in the way of many of their brethren.

IV.

UNIFORMITY AMENDMENT ACT, 1872.

The other important measure which we think we owe to the influence of the bishops at their first Conference, is the Act of Uniformity, 1872.

We have had for two centuries three services in one on Sunday morning. The Episcopate saw the injury this was doing the Church. It did not tend to edifying. The three services had many parts in common, and the saying them together led to "vain repetitions"—the saying of the Lord's prayer four or five times—the reading of ten or twelve chapters from the Bible and the saying of two solemn diverse confessions of faith within a few minutes of each other. The Episcopate therefore procured the passing of the above Act, which enabled the clergy without any doubt to divide the services. But unfortunately, and unwisely, the division is left to their discretion, and it was very soon found they could not exercise it.

These services were, long before, and remained divided services long after, the Reformation. But a lethargy came over the Church. It had existed with increasing force for centuries, and now culminated in the clergy, with a few brilliant exceptions, becoming indolent, indifferent and degraded in the extreme. They were fonder of hunting the deer and the fox than hunting after souls. They said "These separate services take up all our time, can we not say them altogether?" and in this they were encouraged by the folly of Arch-

bishop Laud, a man of large learning but small sense, who, at their request, allowed them to join two of the services, and then, having this permission, they by degrees, joined the three, and thus a bad custom was introduced and has remained to this day a stumbling block to all intelligent worshippers in the Church, and a byword to all other denominations of Christians. We marvel that great and good and learned men amongst us in every congregation, should, Sunday after Sunday, and year after year for a lifetime, perpetuate, honor and revere, and cling to with such tenacity, a vicious custom, introduced by an indolent and degraded clergy—by men whose conduct they ought rather to condemn and deplore, and seek the first opportunity to avoid.

Perhaps the greatest objection intelligent laymen have to the present system is the saying of the two diverse creeds, we might say three creeds, for Luther held the *Te Deum* to be a fourth creed, in almost the same breath. They do not care for the subtleties of belief these enjoin, which are of no practical value whatever. Surely our assembling together is not to have the mind exercised in logical debate as to the object and meaning of creeds; whether there is one or a "double procession," or whether the opinion of this council or that were right or wrong on some misty symbols of faith—non-essentials in themselves and unintelligible to the multitude, who in truth know but little and do not care to know the existence of these unnecessary and almost puerile difficulties, as far as the congregation is concerned, which have in the past and do still so distract clerical antiquaries; difficulties

which intrude themselves upon us by the recital of diverse creeds within a few minutes of each other are, we humbly submit, a great hindrance to true devotion. Our people of the present day yearn after the simple faith as taught by the good old Apostles' Creed which is in almost the very words of Scripture, and which embraces the leading facts of a revealed Christianity. By it their minds are led to contemplate the precious truths it teaches, upon which their souls and spirits feed and by which their inner life is nourished and supplied. Erasmus wrote, that "Never was the Christian faith purer or more undefiled than when the world (*i.e.* the clergy) was content with a single creed, and that the shortest creed we have." And again, the eminent and pious Bishop Jeremy Taylor, about 1660, "Regarding the Apostles' Creed as embodying the essence of Christian truth, he declares every subsidiary dogma to be superfluous or indifferent, and not to be required as a necessity of faith."

Paley contends that a public liturgy should contain as few controverted propositions as possible. All churches have no doubt the right to frame creeds and to impose subscriptions. "But why," he asks, "should every position which a Church maintains, be woven with so much industry into her forms of public worship? Some are offended and some are excluded.* This is an evil of itself at least to them, and what advantage or satisfaction can be derived to the rest from the separation of their brethren, it is difficult to imagine, unless it were a duty to publish our system of polemic divinity

* Notably by the Athanasian Creed.

under the name of making confession of our faith every time we worship God." . . . " We ought not to shut out any from our communion by mixing with divine worship doctrines, which, whether true or false, are unconnected in their nature with devotion."

The only comment we have been able to find on the passing of the Act of Uniformity is in the words of Her Majesty on the closing of the Parliament, 10th August, 1872. " The measure for the amendment of the Act of Uniformity, based as it is upon careful enquiry and on a large amount of ascertained consent, has without offence or shock introduced useful modifications into an ancient system of Divine worship to which a large portion of my people are warmly attached."

The division of the services is optional with the clergy. They may divide. Had it been imperative it might perhaps have given " offence or shock," to weak brethren, but it would only have been a very passing sensation. The best of people fume and threaten for a moment when some change or innovation displeases them, but they soon recover their better sense.

But let us see how the good intentions of the Queen, the bishops and the legislature have been realized. On the passing of the Act all the bishops referred their clergy to it, and offered their best advice—it was all they could do—to those who might be desirous of carrying its provisions into effect; advice given now nearly twenty years ago, and we now ask, How many clergymen have availed themselves of such advice? We doubt if many have. There is no church

as far as we can learn, where one or a shortened service avoiding all repetitions of prayers and the saying of diverse creeds is said on Sunday morning at the usual hour. The services in several churches have been reduced from three to two, a very great improvement and much appreciated by the congregations. But these are exceptional cases and by no means cure the evil. To do this the plan proposed in Synod by that much loved and respected man, the late Rev. Edwin Baldwin, should be adopted, "That the morning service should be so divided or shortened as that the same prayer be not repeated twice, and only one solemn confession of faith be made at any one service." The Act of Uniformity fully provides for this. But it is essential in carrying it out that congregations be consulted.

Professor Hopkins, of the great University of that name in Baltimore, in an able paper in the *Contemporary Review* a few years ago, drawing a contrast between the American and English Episcopal Churches urges that the laity of the latter should be invested with "one undivided third part," in their management, but he would not, we presume, carry out his desire through what he is pleased to call our "hideous vestry system," nevertheless, we shall take leave to make use of that system in part, in our suggestions for the guidance of the laity, further on.

Now the theory of our Church organization, both in England and in Canada, has long been that every thing is done with the full consent and approval of this "one-third part," that is, the congregation. The bishops and others insist on this consent being ascer-

tained. The late Dean of Westminster, in his interesting essay on vestments, says, "That on no account should these garbs whether legal or illegal, be introduced into churches or parishes where they give offence to the parish or the congregation." Mr. Gladstone, alluding to the riot in Exeter occasioned by a clergyman preaching in his surplice! and using the prayer for the Church militant! says, "To me it appeared at the time, that their introduction, however legal, was, if not effected with the full and intelligent concurrence of the flocks, decidedly unwise," and in speaking of any change that may be desired in the services of the Church, says, "It should be enquired, will it increase or will it limit, the active participation of the flock in the service? Is it agreeable to the desire of this particular congregation?" and our late beloved Bishop Bethune always urged that congregations be consulted in every important change. Now what do all these references to the importance of knowing the will of a congregation mean, when there is no machinery existing by which that will can be ascertained? It means simply this, that the will of a congregation can only be accepted and acted on when, and as it is interpreted by the clergyman who by no chance ever really and completely consults it. It is a one-man power feebly exercised. He desires, for instance, an important change and asks the opinion of his churchwarden, and perhaps one or two members of the congregation. But it does not necessarily follow that he will be guided by such opinion. If he has strong convictions against it he hardly will be. The proposed change, however, reaches the ears of a prominent member who

opposes it, and, with more zeal than discretion, intimates that if it is attempted to be carried out, he and others would leave the Church. The clergyman shrinks, even if his friends do not, from offending so influential a member, and the subject matter not being an essential, not an article of faith, thinks it prudent to abandon it. Why should he make an enemy of perhaps his best friend? And so one or two members in a large congregation, without any special claim to intelligence, can prevent all progress and improvement.

In a city church, the committee on church music, suggested to the rector that the responses in the communion service, should be chanted. Leave was most willingly given, and on the following Sunday this little change was made and gave very general satisfaction; but an old lady, another Jennie Geddes, of Edinburgh Church fame, in the time of Charles I, vowed that it was rank popery, and if continued she would leave the church. The rector ordered the chant to be discontinued. This trifling incident shows the principle which pervades and guides the government of every congregation; a fear of offending the few at the expense of the many. But let us suppose the change proposed was that so clearly stated by the late Canon Baldwin, "that the morning service shall be so divided or shortened, as that the same prayer be not repeated twice and only one solemn confession of faith be made at any one service," as allowed by the Act of Uniformity. If attempted to be carried out by the minister alone, it would cause "offence or shock" and some even would threaten to leave. But if he could say to the obstructing parties, "I and others think such change desirable and as we

should be governed by the opinions and wishes of our people I propose to ascertain clearly what they are. If the proposed change is approved of by a two-thirds majority, it will of course be made, if not things will remain as they are." This should be satisfactory to all. In a constitutional government a majority must rule. The attaining of any proposed object, is no doubt more circuitous and attended with more labor and expense, but it is infinitely better than a direct despotism feebly exercised.

The Act of Uniformity is permissive only. The services may be divided, but the power to divide is practically nowhere. The bishop cannot direct a division, he can only advise. The clergy cannot divide effectually, for on the least show of opposition they remain content with the accustomed usage. The laity have no voice in the matter. Can we wonder when our people see this want of authority that there is such a lethargy, so much indifference in our congregations? such sullen and dumb endurance manifested at the unsatisfactory morning service? They all wish it altered, but "it can't be done, and it's no use talking about it." And so the Church is fast losing her hold on them. They go to other places of worship or to none at all. This is not a desirable position for the Church to occupy in the latter part of this enlightened nineteenth century. Now, if asked for a remedy, we at once reply, introduce into her government, fully and effectually, the lay element, as afterwards mentioned. Make her really and truly the Church of her people, beloved by them. Sidney Smith said, "Unless you liberalize, unless you popularize the Church of Eng-

land, it will go to pieces, it will die of dignity." The prophecy is in the way of being fulfilled and nothing but a radical application can prevent its entire accomplishment. The Bishop of Manchester, recently at a meeting held in Manchester of the National Church Reform Union, amongst other things, said, "I should wish the parishoners to possess, whether by the institution of a Church Board, Parochial Council, or otherwise, more power than they now have to regulate those matters pertaining to the external administration of religion in their parish in which they certainly have the primary interest."

We hope that it will not be supposed that we imagine the clergy generally would approve of more liberty being given to the laity than they now have. There is involved in such a concession some important considerations which, however, would not be within the scope of our remarks now to consider. Yet we hope that many of the clergy would gladly and gracefully trust their congregations in some of the important questions which affect the temporal well-being of the Church.

We have already suggested that any important change should be referred to the congregation for its opinion upon it, and it may be asked in what way should this be done? Mr. Gladstone, in one of his essays, mentions with approval, how a question of ritual or ceremonial might be settled by a congregation. It was in the instance of a Welsh congregation. The incumbent was shocked at the free and easy manner of the singers. Some came marching into the church when the service had well begun, or had even

reached the Psalms, and went out oftentimes when the singing was ended, just before the sermon ; and, moreover, their conduct was marked by great levity during the service. They were volunteers ; if censured, they would not come at all. The incumbent thought the remedy was one of order. It lay in a surpliced choir of men and boys who must attend in good time under the superintendence of a choir master or the organist. But the plan was opposed by several of his flock who threatened to leave the church if it was carried out. He wisely determined to be governed by the majority of his flock, whatever that might be. On a Sunday morning he stated the case in a few words, and desired for his guidance to have their opinion, and said that a card on which was printed the question proposed had been placed in each pew. The pewholder would take it home, consider the matter, write on it "yes" or "no," and return it to the churchwardens. The question was decided by a clear majority and order and satisfaction ever afterwards reigned in that congregation. We think if the basis of voting were enlarged, and not only pewholders but every member had the privilege, greater interest would be manifested by the young as well as the old, on Church matters, and the position of the Church greatly strengthened thereby. Various ways of taking the vote might be suggested. The discussion of any important question may properly be had in the vestry, but the vote should be in the church on a day appointed, much in the same way as a vote is taken on the election of a bishop, when, as in a late case, the most perfect order and the greatest solemnity prevailed from first to last. It is an important duty and should be done well.

A plan of this kind, besides being perfectly legitimate and proper, would make our churches in the week day of some little use, at least for perhaps a few times in the year, and relieve them, in a slight degree, from that lonely, that melancholy aspect they have to passers by, being shut up from one Sunday to another.

We would respectfully urge upon all our congregations, and the young men of them especially, to take more interest in their church's welfare. Let them fix their attention and do their utmost to remove the blemishes in the Prayer Book—some may be removed at once, others may require Synodical action or a formal revision, and let them cherish, as the Bishop of Manchester says, "they certainly have the primary interest" the attainment of the "one undivided third part" in the government of their Church. Each congregation might agree on some such points as these :

1. Pewholders and members, men and women, who may sign the roll kept by the Vestry Clerk or Churchwardens, to constitute the laity.

2. The usual elections to take place at Easter.

3. The Churchwardens and Delegates to the Synod, Delegates, if any, to the Provincial Synod, and two Sidesmen to form "a Parochial Council."

4. Any important change in the form of service or ceremonial, or in the general temporal government of the church, desired by the Incumbent, or any six members of the laity, to be stated in writing and presented by the Vestry Clerk to the Council for deliberation. If it pass the Council unanimously, and be approved of by the Incumbent and the Bishop, it shall be carried into effect by the Churchwardens.

5. If the Council be not unanimous, or being unanimous the Incumbent does not give his assent, the Council shall refer the question to the full church, to be voted on by a voting paper delivered to scrutineers in the church on a day named by the Vestry Clerk.

6. The scrutineers having reported the result to the Council.

If the question be carried by a two-thirds majority, and it be approved of by the Incumbent and the Bishop, it will be carried into effect by the Churchwardens; but if such approval be not given the matter drops for that year, but may be renewed after the next Easter.

The sad scenes so often witnessed at our vestry meetings would, by some such plan, be entirely prevented, and the best interests of a parish would be better looked after and promoted when all, old and young, had the opportunity of giving an intelligent vote in its management.

V.

SECOND CONFERENCE, 1878.

We have seen that the first Lambeth Conference was not a success in the estimation of many earnest Church people, though we think it must take credit for originating the two important measures we have noticed. It was, however, hoped that when the second Conference was announced, real work would begin and would show itself. After ten years of thought and consideration on the questions discussed at their first meeting, and especially that now they have had before them the report of the Ritual Commission, and seen the working, or rather the failure, of the Uniformity Act, it was natural to conclude that if they had not the power finally to determine, they would at least advise, as with authority, the relaxation of the use, in some way, of the Athanasian Creed and the amendment of the Act of Uniformity. From the well-known desire

of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and many of the Bishops, that the former should cease to be part of the morning service, and the notorious failure of the latter to effectually divide the services, it was deemed quite certain that some decisive action would be taken, in both of these important matters, by the combined wisdom of this great assembly. But as, at the first Conference, "the door was shut"—and so, in a very maze of ignorance and doubt we can only surmise that His Grace found himself not supported by so large a majority as he expected, and did not like to throw the least gloom over the august assembly by dividing it, and thus exposing to view, though it were only amongst themselves, the ulcers and sores of the Church, to find cures for which, we should have thought, was, or ought to have been, if not the main, at least one of the objects of the meeting. When the time came, it was thought best to pare down one's own particular views, and to concede everything so as to preserve the appearance of union, even though it might be suspected, by the outside world, to be hollow and delusive.

Every good resolve, every good intention and purpose for the Church's welfare, would appear to have been sacrificed to making matters pleasant and agreeable to His Grace's invited guests. They received, we were told, as all wished they should receive, and as their life-long labors in the service of religion well merited, unbounded hospitality. They spent much of their time with "the kindest of Christian friends in their delightful homes." But still, in all seriousness, we must ask, What great good did they achieve? Did they in this, the time of the Church's

extremity, advise the removal of one single grievance, of one stumbling-block especially which has been in the way of the Church's progress for generations? We are obliged to say, No. These one hundred venerable Bishops, whom we all revere and love, were invited to come from the utmost ends of the earth, to discuss some important matters amongst themselves, and then to write a letter which, in its essence, is almost a transcript of the letter written ten years before, exhorting the faithful to union and submission to Church authority!

Our Church rulers here lost a golden opportunity. For nearly ten years they have had under consideration the two important questions we have noticed. They must have remarked the almost unanimous opinion of the members of the Ritual Commission, that the Athanasian Creed should cease to be read in the churches—an opinion which we are warranted in saying is entertained by the vast majority of the clergy and laity—and they must have seen the failure of the Uniformity Act. Had they given the advice which these two questions demand, had they made a beginning of reform, they would have silenced the just complaints of the best friends of the Church. They would have placed her in a position unassailable by her bitterest opponents. But it would seem that they were and are irresolute. They are afraid to act in anything like a commanding, or ordering, or even advising spirit, lest they should offend a small minority in the Church. "Their hands," said Bishop McGee, at Northampton, 20th Oct., 1875, "are paralyzed. They have divested themselves of power and authority.

They are fast losing all control over the clergy of their respective dioceses, who conduct the services of the Church as they like, and not as the bishops and as the people wish ; making her a scorn and a by-word to her enemies."

There is no hope of any effectual reform or amendment, unless the lay element in the Church asserts itself and is brought to bear on its general management, in some such way as we have mentioned. We can no longer, we are sorry to say, trust the Conferences of our Bishops. They have now returned, Sept. 12th, 1878, many of them to their very distant dioceses, and, at the end of another decade, we shall see them again wending their way from earth's remotest bounds to the Palace of Lambeth, when nearly the same programme will be gone through, and with almost the same result—a letter to the faithful. In the meantime, that the Church is in rapid progress of disintegration, is clear to every thoughtful mind.

VI.

REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

11TH NOVEMBER, 1880.

Soon after the adjournment of the second Conference the Revised New Testament appeared, and we make one or two remarks upon it.

The Church's internal contentions during the last sixty years have been fierce in the extreme, whether we regard the two great parties whose differences are

mainly those of ritual ; or that other party composed of men of liberal and advanced views in Church matters, whose high position and great intellectual abilities no one can question ; who have set themselves to examine and criticize, but always with the most friendly eye to the Church's welfare, the very foundations of our belief, and the authority on which rests all Christian dogma. They are men who deem it the best and most honest policy, not to hide abuses, as we have long done, to the great injury of our Church and of true religion, but to expose and if possible to banish them. These men have been and are still much abused ; but at length the Christian world is beginning tardily to do them justice. The translators and theologians of a former age, scrupled not to make the word of God what they thought it ought to be. "Upon the pretext of exposition of Scripture," says Bacon, "they did not stick (scruple) to add and alter, and to pronounce that they do not find, and by show of antiquity to introduce novelty." The well-informed critics of the present day are endeavoring to sweep away all those incrustations of useless form and error which have been fastened on our practice and faith during a dark age, when a few learned ecclesiastics, but whose learning and abilities, says Macaulay, were habitually devoted to the defence of tyranny and imposture, had the power and could do what they liked for the promulgation of their peculiar views ; and they are bringing us back to the fair and original form of a revealed Christianity.

The appearance of the Revised New Testament on 11th November, 1880, fully bears out this view. We propose, among many instances of revision, to refer

only to one, and we may at once say we do so with very great reluctance, because we fear it may give pain to many of our honored clergy, which we would not willingly do. But truth is dearer than friendship, and the fact we shall mention shows, in such a strong light, the necessity for an immediate revision of the Prayer Book, that in justice to our argument we cannot pass it over.

The revisors have omitted, as indeed they had no choice but to omit, the 7th verse in the 1st and 5th John. It has been known for ages that it formed no part of Scripture at all. It is what divines and others mildly call an interpolation. A learned Judge, on a trial several years ago, designated an interpolation in an authentic marriage register, intended to support and prove a legal marriage, to be in the nature of a forgery; and if such it be in a secular document, surely in the word of God it must be a forgery of the deepest dye, and yet we are going on and have been going on for generations, with our eyes open, not only reading this spurious verse in our public service, but issuing and circulating millions of Bibles with this astounding interpolation, we might use a harder word, on the face of each copy! The New Testament Company revising the Scriptures, "earnestly laboring over the text of the Word of Life," have expunged this passage without, we are sorry to say, any note or explanation.

What a confirmation is this "interpolation" of the old aphorism that truth will in the end prevail. Here is a deception, a pious fraud, practised centuries ago, and until the last century considered a part of Holy Scripture, but is at last detected and only now waits

for formal banishment ! “Cunning and deception, the meteors of the earth, after glittering for a time must pass away ; but wisdom and truth, the offspring of the sky, are immortal.”

VII.

THIRD CONFERENCE, 1888.

But another ten years have elapsed since the last Conference, and our Church rulers are again on the move. They have been summoned and are hastening over land and sea, to the Palace of Lambeth. They have now had twenty years of thought over what should be done with the Athanasian Creed, and nearly as long as to the Uniformity Act, and have no doubt arrived at some conclusion with respect to them. Twenty years of thought over any great question—and as to the Athanasian Creed, they have had the advantage of the opinions of many of the learned men of the last two centuries—one would think should be sufficient to come to some conclusion with regard to it. This third great Pan-Anglican Council opened at Lambeth 30th June, 1888. At its close, 28th July or soon after, its proceedings appeared in book form. The Encyclical Letter, with the reports of committees and the resolutions formed thereon, furnish, no doubt, most interesting and instructive reading, but we fear very few of our people ever saw the book, whereas, had the proceedings, as they occurred, been made public through

the press, the whole Church would have been able to form some intelligent opinion on all the matters treated of.

At the two former Conferences no public reference was made to the Athanasian Creed, although it must have been seriously debated, and, as we have already stated, great dissatisfaction thereat was manifested by a large portion of the clergy and laity; but now, amongst the resolutions formally adopted at the third Conference, we find the following :

“18. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take counsel with such persons as he may see fit to consult, with a view to ascertaining whether it is desirable to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed or of the Quicunque Vult.”

“Whether it is desirable.” One is almost inclined to suppose, from the quiet wording of the resolution, that the subject of it had only just been brought to their notice, instead of having been under consideration for twenty years at least.

The resolution was carried by 57 votes to 20. Now, the bishops attending this Conference numbered 145, so on this resolution 68 bishops must have declined to vote or were absent. Thus we have, if all had voted, a probable majority result of 88 bishops opposed to the resolution! We surmise, and it is almost certain, that they thought it not only a trifling with, but a clear evasion of, the whole question. What! When they had before them the accumulated evidence of some of the best and most learned and pious men of the last two centuries? Men of every shade of religious opinion, deprecating the Creed for various reasons, but all uniting in the desire that it

should either be removed altogether from the Prayer Book, or placed with the Articles of Religion, so that it should not form part of the public service. Amongst a cloud of witnesses standing straight before them, we may mention a few: Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Chillingworth, Richard Baxter, Bishop Burnet, Dean Prideaux, Francis Burton, Dr. Arnold, Bishop Lonsdale, Canon Swainston, Dean Alford, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Earl Stanhope, Lord Portman, the Earl of Harrowby, the Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of St. David's, Lord Ebury, Mr. John Able Smith, M.P., the Bishop of Carlisle, the Right Hon. Spencer Walpole, Sir Travis Twiss, the Queen's Advocate, Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, Mr. Charles Burton, M.P., the Dean of Westminster, the Bishop of Manchester, the Dean of Lincoln, (Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge), the Rev. Canon Payne Smith (Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford) the Rev. Henry Venn (Secretary of the Church Missionary Society and venerable champion of the Evangelical School), the Rev. W. G. Humphry, Vicar of St. Martins, the Rev. T. W. Perry, the indefatigable champion of the Ritualists, The Bishop of Durham. And in addition to these they have had before them nearly 3000 of the clergy who presented memorials to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, praying to be relieved from reciting this Anathasian Creed.

And let it not be forgotten that, in the early part of this century, a very large part of the clergy declined, with the full permission of their bishops, to recite the Creed.

And there is another consideration which should have some weight in examining evidence. The *Quincunx* is a word of an extensive meaning. It may mean the whole world, but we may take it as applied to Christendom only. Dieterici, in 1861, estimated Christendom to contain five hundred and five millions of souls. Possibly we might now say five hundred and twenty millions. Of these, five hundred millions of Christians either do not recognize the Creed at all, or do not recite it in public worship. The Church of England alone, numbering only about twenty millions, recites it in her public morning service. Of these twenty millions, a very large majority, as we contend, wish that the Creed should not retain its place in the public service, and a very small minority that no change should be made. If this estimate be anywhere near the truth, and we believe it is, what a very small space the Athanasian minority occupies—a mere speck on the huge map of Christendom! It should teach a lesson of humility and moderation.

Now, in face of this overwhelming testimony against the Creed, testimony which would satisfy any court of law or equity, or any mixed jury of bishops, clergymen and laymen, they would "a true verdict give, according to the evidence," in five minutes; the managers of the Conference ask for some little further evidence from parties they know nothing of. Perhaps they are minded to send to Germany for a Martin Bucer and a Peter Martyr. Is it not an evasion of the whole question? nay, we say it is a fair presumption, from the cumulative and circumstantial evidence we have brought forward, that it is an admission as clear

as anything can be, that the bishops as a body acknowledge their inability to deal with it. It is, in fact, a postponement of it to the Greek Calends, or at least till some revolution comes along to help them to a conclusion; a revolution, stern and rude, and rough and boisterous, that will not even have the civility to say, "By your leave, my Lord Bishops," but, "see now that this be done without any more ado, or--"

It is a noticeable fact that no revision of the Prayer Book has ever taken place (and there have been five or six), except in times of revolution or great disorder in either Church or State. So our Church governors have abundance of precedents for delay, the course they appear to be involuntarily taking. In times of excitement they seem to say it would be imprudent to make any change; in times of profound peace, there is no necessity for it. Paley said, if we are to wait for improvement till Church governors solicit, or ministers of State propose it, I will venture to pronounce that (without His interposition with whom nothing is impossible) we may remain as we are till the "renovation of all things."

We know how difficult it is in a very small representative corporation to carry any important measure. In a large Ecclesiastical body of 145 Bishops, where there are so many varied and contrary interests to consider, and where the principle seems to be not to do anything in the way of an important reform, unless there is unanimity, the thing is simply impossible. It has been said that the Church of Rome can never be reformed from within; may not this remark equally apply to the Church of England? An intimate friend

once said to Gambetta, "If you had been Pope what wonderful reforms you would have made in the Church, you would have revolutionized Roman Catholicism." "Oh, no," he replied, "that would be quite impossible, for the Pope can reform nothing. If I were Pope and attempted reforms I should die a very sudden death, and a wiser Pope would succeed me."

If our venerable Primate were to advise with all the authority of his office, even though backed by the report of a Royal Commission, that this Creed should not retain its place in the public service of the Church, he would not, we feel sure, meet the supposed fate of Gambetta; but, he would raise such a storm and panic among certain sections of the clergy, that might possibly rend the very Church in twain. Possibly, but not probably. The storm would soon subside, but it is this imaginary result which frightens and makes afraid. When the Americans banished the Creed from their Prayer Book, there were then, doubtless, some severe ecclesiastics; Carlyle would have said peppery ecclesiastics, like those we have amongst us at the present day, who cried out at the top of their voice to frighten sober-minded people: "Paganism will now be substituted for Christianity." The good Christian people of the United States have managed to do excellently well without the Creed for the last one hundred long years, and we believe they are not yet Pagans. Mr. Bryce, indeed, in his recent very able work, the "American Commonwealth," says, "Religion is respected and flourishes and exerts at least as much influence as in England; intolerance is all but unknown, the clergy are respected and respectable; works of benev-

olence are pursued with an energy not to be witnessed even among the leading nations of Europe. Christianity, though not the established, is practically recognized as the national religion."

On the whole, this third Conference seems to define the position of the Church of England, as regards the two important subjects we have noticed, to be a very singular and a very distressing one. There is, for all practical purposes, complete unanimity of opinion by bishops, clergy and laity. *First*—As to the expediency of dividing the Sunday morning service, so that no prayer shall be repeated twice, and only one solemn confession of faith be made, at any one service; and, *Second*—As to the omission, on the appointed days, from that service, of the Athanasian Creed; and yet there is no power existing, equal to the occasion, of dividing the one effectually, or of omitting the other.

This, then, being the unfortunate position of the Church of England, in England, Is the Church of England in Canada to be guided by it? We know the love of the Canadian Church for her glorious Mother Church can never, in weal or woe, suffer decadence. If one is obliged to differ with the other, it will give intense pain to both. But if the Mother Church, from her peculiar position, cannot effect needed and well recognized reforms, she would not, we are sure, stand in the way of a Colonial Church, which possibly can. We sympathize with the declaration of the Canadian Bishops in 1861, that "We desire the Church in this Province to continue, as it has been, an integral part of the United Church of England and

Ireland," and we fully concur in the opinion expressed by some clergymen of high standing in the Church, whom Bishop Strachan consulted, that "we can make no movement, but in accordance with her principles and practice, and consequently after she has led the way.' But whilst we admit this, it must be with some limitation. A subject owes allegiance to his sovereign, but only so long as the sovereign is able to protect him in his rights. If he cannot, moralists tell us, the allegiance is withdrawn. And so if, as we have attempted to show, the Mother Church is unable to set in motion some organization which shall accomplish the reforms needed in her own sphere, any implied promise made by a branch of that Church only to act when "she has led the way," is not binding.

But this is a question for our own Church rulers to decide; we only wish to show that something should be done, with the consent, if possible, of the Mother Church, to make our Prayer Book more in accordance with the wishes of churchmen generally—some few blemishes should be removed—that one especially, that "interpolation" we have referred to with so much regret, and which conscientious clergymen must read with pain, should not be obligatory. It should be passed over in the future; but does it not show the necessity for revision.

And whilst we are on this subject, and by way of parenthesis,—When Prayer Book revision is fairly gone into, many improvements will be suggested no doubt; but there is one, as it seems to us, which is well worthy of consideration, and is mentioned simply for churchmen to think over. It

has reference to the evening service--with very little difference, it is the same as the morning. Surely we might have a varied form for that service, and particularly when it is considered that the evening congregation is, for the most part, the same as the morning. We are sure the laity would cordially approve of a change in this respect. It would be a most useful and attractive variation from the morning service, and would increase the love and veneration of every one for the grand Liturgy of our Church; or if, in the meantime, the heaven-inspired Litany could be substituted for the evening service, and either sung or said, we should be much more likely to hear it rendered in a manner befitting its high origin and intention, than we ever do on Sunday morning, smothered as it is between two services, and hurried, nay, we must say, in many cases slurred over, apparently without thought or feeling, in order that the whole may be gone through in one hour. This change of service, we submit, might, even now, to a great extent, be attained, if the clergy would follow the provisions of the last Uniformity Act. The "Parochial Council" might, in such cases as this, be consulted.

But the question has been so well treated by one of the Church's brightest ornaments, Dr. Arnold, that we cannot resist the pleasure of transcribing his remarks, which, however, it should be noticed, have reference to a national or established Church; but much of what he says is applicable to all our churches.

"The friends of the established Church justly extol the substantial excellence and beauty of the Liturgy. It can, indeed, hardly be praised too highly,

as the solemn service of the Church, embodying one of the best representations of the feelings and language of a true Christian, in his confessions, his thanksgivings and his prayers. But as, while we reverence the Bible above all other books, we yet should never think of studying it to the exclusion of all others; so, and much more, may we say of the Liturgy, that even allowing it to be the best conceivable religious service in itself, still it ought not to be the only one. The Liturgy of the Church of England, with some few alterations, which I need not here specify, should be used once on every Sunday, and every great Christian holiday throughout the year, in every parish church. But I doubt whether there are not many, even amongst its most sincere admirers, who, in a second service on the same day, would be glad of some variety; still more, who would wish to vary the service according to the time and circumstances, when the church was opened on week days. Indeed I hardly know a more painful sight than the uninterrupted loneliness in which our churches are so often left from one Sunday to another. The very Communion table and pulpit are dismantled of their coverings and cushions, the windows are closed; the doors are fast locked, as if a Protestant Church, except on Sunday, were like the *Pelasgicum* at Athens, 'best when unfrequented.' Now, this has arisen partly, no doubt, from other causes; but the necessity of reading the Liturgy, and nothing but the Liturgy, both at morning and evening prayer, is an immovable obstacle to the opening of the churches generally, with any effect, except on a Sunday. It is doubtful whether our arrangement of our time and the universal pres-

sure of business would allow of the attendance of a large congregation at church on week days, under any circumstances ; but it is certain that, in order to overcome these disadvantages, something more attractive is needed, than the mere uniform reading of the same prayers, and going through the same forms day after day, both in the morning and the evening. Nor should I think it an evil, but a great good, that different services should be performed at different times of the day and week, within the walls of the same church. Not only do the various tastes and degrees of knowledge amongst men require varieties in the form of their religious services, but the very same men are not always in the mood for the same things ; there are times when we should feel most in unison with the deep solemnity of the Liturgy ; there are times also when we should better enjoy a freer and more social service, and for the sake of the greater familiarity should pardon some insipidity and some extravagance. And he who condemns this feeling does but lose his labor, and can but ill appreciate one great attribute of God's works—their endless variety. Our sight, our hearing and our taste are furnished with subjects of gratification, not of one kind only, but of millions ; the morning song of the lark is not the same with the evening song of the nightingale ; the scenery which we most enjoy in the full brightness of a summer day is not that which best harmonizes with the solemnity of an autumn evening."

But we must return to our subject and hasten to a close. Entertaining the deepest reverence for the Book of Common Prayer, and an anxious wish that its

office should be freed from its few blemishes, we venture to express a hope that each lay member of the Church may be induced, if not from a perusal of the foregoing remarks, at least from his own more thoughtful consideration of the subject, to consider more seriously than he has yet done, whether, on Sunday morning, the needless repetitions of prayers, and the saying of diverse creeds within a few minutes of each other, really tend to his own "edifying." If not, we would then further ask him to make the cause we advocate his own, and talk over and promulgate his views amongst his brethren, and see if some means cannot be devised by which the morning service may be restored to that simplicity, harmony and beauty of performance, bequeathed to us by the wisdom of its framers.

If the Laity are to be enfranchised they must take the initiative. They must put their own shoulders to the wheel. We ask their careful consideration of the several points we have ventured to bring before them, and especially that one which has reference to the proposed "Parochial Council." Let them keep this steadily in view. It is the embodiment of their "one-third part" in the government of the Church. They are now a rope of sand, this constitutes them a tower of strength, which, in consonance with the two clerical orders, will be used in promoting the best interests of the Church and of religion. We hope and believe that, on full consideration, many of the clergy will aid the laity in its establishment, and that they will look upon it as the best means of obtaining, amongst other improvements, a more rational service than is afforded by the unmean-

ing repetitions of prayers and the saying of diverse creeds.

And finally, we again ask the laity, in any event, to "do what they can" for the "Parochial Council," and to do it heartily, in the spirit of those noble words of the Bishop of Durham, uttered in reference to one of the important questions we have had under consideration. "He felt that his allegiance to his Master, Christ, to that Nicene doctrine which he thoroughly and completely held, and to that Church of England which, he ventured to think was the noblest Church in Christendom, required him to do what he could, to remove that which was a stumbling-block in the way of many of their brethren."

se
nt,
,"
ds
ne
d-
er,
ly
nd
in
re-
of

