

THE SCOTTISH BOOK OF
COMMON PRAYER—
ANOTHER ASPECT.

THE SCOTTISH BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER —ANOTHER ASPECT.

BY

WILLIAM GILLIES, Jr., M.A., LL.B. (Glas.)

Hon. Secretary of 1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association.

Forming Mainly an Answer to
"The Scottish Prayer Book, its Value and History,"
By The Very Rev. W. Perry, D.D.,
Dean of the Diocese of Edinburgh.

PUBLISHED BY

W. & R. HOLMES, 3/11 Dunlop Street,
Glasgow, C.1.

1930.

By the Same Author.

PROPOSALS FOR A GREAT SURRENDER,
with Foreword by the Right Rev. Bishop Knox, D.D.
(English Prayer Book Revision).

SCOTTISH PRAYER BOOK REVISION
CONTRETEMPS.

First impression, November, 1928.
Second impression, January, 1929.

PRINTED BY
STOBO & SONS, 13 EGLINTON STREET,
GLASGOW, C.5.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
Preface	vii.
I. Introduction	1
II. State Prayers	7
III. Lord's Supper	13
IV. General observations on the revision, with special reference to the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552	29
V. Confession	35
VI. Kalendar, Lessons and Psalms, Morning and Evening Prayer and Compline ...	39
VII. Litany, Prayers and Thanksgivings ...	46
VIII. Baptism and Confirmation	51
IX. Catechism and Occasional Services ...	58
X. Communion and Ordinal	65
XI. Conclusion	70
APPENDICES:	
The Sacrifice of the Mass	81
Substance of leaflet of 1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association	94

The references to the Scottish Book of Common
Prayer are according to the
1/- edition.

PREFACE.

THE Episcopal Church in Scotland having now been committed, at least for a time, to a new service book entitled, "The Scottish Book of Common Prayer," it may be of some interest to readers to judge from these pages whether my opinion is well grounded that the new prayer book, in defiance of the Protestant standards of the Church, aims at and effects, to a considerable extent, the substitution of medieval accretions for the simplicity of primitive truth, the basis being largely the first English prayer book of 1549 which was of Roman colour and proved to be so little worthy of acceptance that it was not reprinted after the year in which it was issued. The Church has, in my judgment, reached a critical stage. Her contribution to a wider union of those who accept the reformed faith might be great indeed on the basis of her accredited spiritual foundations. The new service book, however, turns her from such a lofty vista to the prospect of being identified with outworn beliefs as a mere sect, and a dwindling one at that, being "tossed to and fro . . . with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men." (Ephesians iv. 14).

CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer, being now available to the public, it is open to readers to realise more clearly the extent to which it falls short of the scriptural standards as defined in the thirty-nine articles of religion, forming the doctrinal basis of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, which, it may at once be stated, will not be heard to lay any rightful claim to the title "the Scottish Church." (See Table of Feasts and also the Ordinal). It cannot be too often recorded that every minister of this Church is required by a statute enacted in 1792, and still in force, to sign a declaration of assent to these articles which fall to be understood according to their literal and grammatical interpretation, and such subscription affords clear proof of acknowledgment to all the world that the signatory accepts Holy Scripture as containing all things necessary to salvation, and that he will eschew every aspect that has no express warrant in the Bible. There can be no finer foundation for a Church than holy writ recognised to be paramount as the inspired Word of God, and as such at the disposal of every would-be reader.

Dr. Perry has certainly given ample demonstration of his wide knowledge of liturgical art, and one readily realises from his clear exposition and historical survey the extent to which ancient forms of worship have

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

been drawn upon to provide contents for the new Prayer Book. The author, however, in the introduction, writes this with respect to an estimate of the value of the new Service Book: "No opinion is worth anything unless it be formed in full view of the truth." It is, therefore, remarkable, that in the whole study not a single reference to the thirty-nine articles occurs, nor yet to the second book of homilies, declared by the thirty-fifth article to contain a "godly and wholesome doctrine"; no mention is made of the Act of 1792 enjoining subscription to the articles and recital of the State prayers in a particular manner, nor of the Walker Trust Act, 1877, shewing that the endowment created by the Misses Barbara Walker and Mary Walker, and yielding some £6,500 yearly for general church purposes, was earmarked in the codicil executed by these ladies on 21st April, 1858, in the following terms:—"Considering that certain divisions or differences of opinion at present exist in the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and it being our express wish and intention that the whole estate, funds and effects provided by us for said church shall be applied solely to the support of **pure Protestant doctrines**, therefore we do hereby declare that in the event of differences on doctrine or church government unhappily proceeding such length as to cause a separation of or disruption among its congregations, then we declare that the said trust funds shall belong to that division or section of the Episcopal Church in

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Scotland which may adhere most closely to our views and wishes as herein expressed" [here follow arbitration clauses]. Section three of this private Act deals with the incorporation of trustees and provides:—"The Bishop for the time being of the Episcopal Church in Scotland for the Diocese of Edinburgh, the Dean for the time being of the said Church in Scotland for the Diocese of Edinburgh, the Lord Provost of the city of Edinburgh for the time being, the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates for the time being, the senior or sole Deputy-Keeper for the time being of Her Majesty's Signet for Scotland, and the Treasurer for the time being of the Bank of Scotland, and any other person or persons who may be legally assumed as trustee or trustees under any existing power contained in the trust deeds, shall be, and they are hereby declared to be, united and incorporated into one body politic and corporate by the name of 'The Walker Trustees,' as trustees for the purposes specified in the recited trust deeds and in this Act."

The foregoing perspective shews that the Scottish Episcopal Church, as definitely Protestant, is not free to adopt a service book that would conflict with the faith of the reformed church, and so cannot be regarded as a free agent in the matter of liturgical revision.

Objections to the new service book on the ground of its being at variance here or there with the Protestant standards of the Church cannot be dismissed

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

as mere "prejudices." The failure of the Dean to set forth these standards detracts considerably from the worth of his book, as his presentation of the case for the new Prayer Book is thus seen to be coloured. The average churchman will not be slow to sense the significance of the relegation of the thirty-nine articles to the background of the Code of Canons, in place of their being incorporated in the Prayer Book itself. The ostrich with its head in the sand still has imitators.

As I pointed out in my address on 20th November last in Glasgow under the auspices of the 1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association, the word "Protestant" is not only negative as in opposition to the errors of Rome which result in a failure, through the whole sacramental system of that Church, to do justice to the all-sufficiency of Christ, but also positive as testifying for the scriptural principles proclaimed at the Reformation and embodied in the articles. It is interesting to read "The Evolution of Religion," by Dr. Edward Caird, which book forms the Gifford Lectures given by that author at St. Andrew's University. It is there shown how in the development of the code of ethics a materialism and polytheism, with magic and superstitious rites, gave place to the consciousness of a divine unity, and in turn there took place an advance from this pantheism to the idea of a spiritual principle implied in monotheism. Christianity, which is more than a mere

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

coalition of objective and subjective religion, cast aside the mechanical observance of external rules, and henceforth there was a higher estimate of the moral, as contrasted with the ceremonial, elements of the law. As Bishop Barnes said in his Lordship's second series of Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen University last year, "it was not until after the dawn of written history that there was evidence, especially in ethical monotheism, of a type of religion which sheltered and created moral ideas. 50,000 years ago religious and ethical ideals were a jumble of fancies and superstitions and ritual acts, many of them childish," *e.g.*, the ceremonial act of crossing oneself to keep the devil away, and a Dervish setting of the Communion Service with bowings, elevations, lights, incense, gongs and other trappings of sensuous appeal, the distraction being aggravated by the presence of servers or acolytes. The Baal worship recorded in the first book of Kings, chapter xviii., readily comes to mind in this connection.

Dr. Perry refers on page 8 to subjectivism and individualism as being the bane of Protestantism, to which faith, for all that appears, he might be in the relation of a third party. The danger to the Episcopal Church in Scotland—and it is a real one—lies in the shaping of the doctrine of the Church in the direction of the very materialism or objectivism with crude ceremonialism from which a merciful deliverance came through New Testament teaching. Take,

for example, the somewhat prevalent practice, especially on the part of some clergy, of bowing to the Holy Table, or altar, as they term it, whenever opportunity offers. "Altar" was deliberately expunged from the Prayer Book of 1552, and does not occur in the rubrics of the present English Prayer Book. This cannot be said of the Scottish book, but one is thankful to be able to record that even here "holy table" predominates. Obviously "altar" as implying sacrifice tends towards the corrupt doctrine of a re-presentation of the sacrifice made by Christ once for all for the sins of the whole world, and the bowing affords ocular demonstration that the person so acting accepts the Roman belief in a localised Presence of Christ. An attempt is made from time to time to justify the action by an alleged analogy to the practice of bowing to the Throne when the King is not seated there. As the venerable Archdeacon Thorpe has pointed out, however, the King does sit on it frequently, whereas Christ is in Heaven, and He never is on the Table or altar. There is really no parallel between the Table in church and the Throne. The practice savours of sacerdotalism, and is indefensible, falling within the condemnation of bowing down to a graven image, and shewing that the "actor" does not appreciate the relative importance of the means of grace. If by individualism the Dean means private judgment, holy writ is clear on this: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

CHAPTER II.

STATE PRAYERS.

The plan will now be to deal with the State prayers, and, secondly, with the chapter on the Lord's Supper, and thereafter to offer a commentary upon the whole of the Dean's book in the order of its pages, so far as the statements have not previously been canvassed and seem to call for comment.

In the matter of the State prayers one should note that, while the Episcopal Church in Scotland is not obliged to submit the contents of a projected service book for Parliamentary approval, the provisions of the said Act of 1792, whereby the penal laws which had been imposed upon Scottish Episcopalians were removed, require to be kept in view.

One of the conditions laid down is contained in Section 5 of the said Act, providing, in short, that every pastor or minister officiating in any Episcopal chapel or meeting house shall, as often as he shall officiate, at some time during the exercise of divine service "pray for the King's Most Excellent Majesty by name, for His Majesty's heirs or successors, and for all the Royal Family in the same form of words as His Majesty, his heirs or successors and the Royal Family are or shall be directed by lawful authority to be prayed for in the prayers for the Royal Family contained in the Liturgy of the Church of England."

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

The penalties for failure in this respect are specified in the next Section of the Act, being Section 6, and in Sections 7, 10 and 13.

The law of the Church of England as regards prayers for the King and the Royal Family is understood to be in the following position:—Services fall into two classes (a) public prayers, and (b) prayers of a private character. In the latter class are included marriage service, burial service, churching of women, confirmation, visitation of the sick, prayers for those at sea. In these services no State prayers are enjoined. In all the services which are not of this character, prayers for the King, at least, occur for recitation. In the orders for morning and evening prayer, there are set out prayers for the King and the Royal Family, and the recitation of these is imperative except as modified by the provisions of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872, which provides under the second section thereof for a permissive shortened form of morning and evening prayer in conformity with the schedule annexed to that Act for use on any day except Sunday, Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday and Ascension Day in lieu of the order for morning prayer or for evening prayer as prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. Even in such shortened service, however, the recitation of the "versicles" immediately prior to the collect for the day is imperative both morning and evening.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

In the issue of 12th April, 1929, of the "Scottish Chronicle," the Dean of Peterborough is reported to have said that "there is no authority in the Prayer Book whatsoever to bring Morning Prayer to an end with the Benedictus." The new Scottish Prayer Book, however, contains on page xlvi. the following rubric:—

"When Mattins precedeth Holy Communion as a Service for the same congregation, either immediately or with the Litany only intervening, it may begin with O Lord, open Thou our lips, etc. It shall then suffice that one of the appointed psalms be used; and Mattins may end with the Benedictus Dominus or Jubilate, or The Lord be with you, etc., Let us pray, and one or both of the Collects for Peace and The Grace may be added." The Grace reference is ambiguous.

The original intention of the revisers was to remove from the orders for morning and evening prayer the State prayers in the English prayer book form. This is evident from the proposed direction in the print of June, 1928, not, however, confirmed, in these terms:—

"Omit the old State prayers and print the Scottish form only, and omit the rubric before the latter. Place the old prayers for the King and the Royal Family among the prayers and thanksgivings and add rubric here; or the prayers for the King and the Royal Family included among

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

the prayers and thanksgivings may be said (give the page reference). Note that a prayer for the King by name shall be said at Morning Prayer or at Holy Communion, and also at Evening Prayer, at least on every Sunday."

The 1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association brought strong pressure to bear in opposition to this arrangement, founding upon the statutory requirements in this respect, and at the last moment, as the Dean states, better counsels prevailed, and happily the State prayers retain their places in both orders. He condescends to write that "there is no harm in this." Yet, even so, the recital of the English State prayers each time a minister is conducting either order is not made obligatory, and I cannot believe that any direction permitting of less than this is in line with the statutory requirements. Dr. Perry has omitted to give the reason for this hasty rectification, but he draws attention to the overlook of the revisers to bring the matter following a rubric to be found after the Grace at Evening Prayer into line with the altered position. The rubric itself seems to be quite in order.

There are serious objections to the treatment of the State prayers in other respects. The Litany is frequently a service complete in itself. According to the English form the prayers for the King and the Royal Family constitute four separate supplications. In the Scottish book two alternative Litanies are provided

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

for general use, under the first of which three of these four suffrages are dispensed with, thus cutting out the prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family, and under the second none of the four appears, the State reference being confined to "Let us pray for all Christian princes and governors, especially our Sovereign Lord, King George."

Under a rubric after the prayer for the Royal Family in the orders for Morning and Evening Prayer the saying of the Litany is made an occasion for dispensing with the recital of the State prayers as they occur in these orders, and by the same rubric an "omnibus" prayer outside of the English prayer book can be substituted for the proper State prayers and the prayer for Parliament. It will thus be seen how inadequate and unsatisfactory the position has become.

One of the mutilations in the English Communion is the omission of the prayers for His Majesty the King at the outset of the order. Doubtless these prayers have been transferred to the section, "Prayers and Thanksgivings," but the rubric at the commencement of these does not compensate. These prayers for the King here will, I consider, under this arrangement be largely overlooked in the Communion Service.

As acknowledged by the Dean, further inroads into the State prayers occur in the following rubrics:—

"When Baptism is administered at Morning or Evening Prayer, then all the prayers after the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

third collect may be omitted," *i.e.*, the State prayers need not be recited.

"When Confirmation is administered at Morning or Evening Prayer, then all the prayers after the third collect may be omitted."

Readers can now understand what the revisers, in spite of the above statutory requirements, intended to do, but abandoned, what they have in fact done, and what they have failed to do.

CHAPTER III.

LORD'S SUPPER.

In relation to the Lord's Supper, the first point that forcibly strikes a reader of the Scottish Prayer Book bears upon the direction on the opening page, "How to follow the services in this book," in these terms:—"If the English Liturgy is used, turn to page 188," and the statement in the table of contents thus:—"The Order of the ministration of the Holy Communion, Scottish and English, page 170." On referring, however, to page 188 one discovers that the Order is not according to the English Prayer Book, but a form of service radically different in respect not only of important omissions, but also of additions which no loyal Protestant could countenance for a single moment. Thus, considerable liberty has been taken with the rubrics of the 1662 Order, even to the extent of omitting the one prohibiting solitary communion, and also leaving out the "black" rubric, the terms of which are here set forth to shew the doctrinal enormity of lightly dispensing with such:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

In the absence of this rubric a corporal presence in the consecrated elements can be advanced. Dr. Dyson Hague, in "Protestantism of the Prayer Book," writes of this "black" rubric thus:—"And above all, most decided Protestant mark, there was inserted in 1552 that rubric at the end of the Communion service which, as it has ever been a humiliation and thorn in the flesh to all Romanisers and pseudo-Romanists in our church, has been to all loyal churchmen a cause for continuous thankfulness, as the sturdy bulwark against all Romanism and popery, open or concealed."

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

By an ingenuous blending of rubrics on page 171 of the new Prayer Book there are deftly introduced (1) the optional use of the wafer. The real English rubric, not to be found in the Scottish book, provides that for the taking away of all occasion of dissension and superstition (this, of course, refers to the Mass doctrine) the bread shall be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten; (2) the practice of reservation, opening the door to false doctrine in various ways, *e.g.*, adoration of an imaginary localised Presence; Canon Streeter spoke thus with reference to Reservation at the Farnham Conference, as quoted with approval by Bishop Knox:—"All ceremonial developments which are ultimately an attempt to represent, not so much what Christ meant, but what theologians have supposed to be the metaphysic of the rite, are a loss of reality and power"; and (3) a mangle-mangle of the Lord's Supper in the provision that at every celebration "reasonable opportunity to communicate shall be given to the people who wish to do so," whereby persons participating in the Supper according to the Divine ordinance are placed in a special position, the implication being that in general those present will be non-communicants, a portent of the Mass. The new rubric recommending frequent communion should be read with this in view that the "breaking of the bread" in Acts ii., 42, refers to a weekly social meal. (cf. verse 46 of that chapter and Acts xx., 7 and 11.)

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Moreover, liberty has been taken to place asterisks in the course of several of the ten commandments, and a new rubric permits of the commandments, when they are recited at all, being rehearsed in the short form by stopping at the asterisks. Further rubrics authorise the substitution, except on one Sunday in each month, of what is called the summary of the law, or even of the bald: "Lord, have mercy upon us; Christ, have mercy upon us; Lord, have mercy upon us." The Dean (page 91) cannot be said to be impressive in his attempt to justify the mutilation of the commandments. It is not for puny mortals to edit the words of God. Dr. Perry does not suggest that the segregating apart of what he calls "Jewish details," makes the revised commandments conform to any of the three versions referred to by him. The commandments thus doctored are commandments of men (St. Matthew xv., 9), however much reliance may be placed on the plea of "a more scientific appreciation of the Old Testament." The collects for our King have been removed from their proper place, as already noted.

The Reformation established the dependence of the sacraments for efficacy upon the Word of God. Hence in the English Communion Order the second rubric after the creed runs thus:—"then shall follow the sermon, or one of the homilies . . ." So, also, the Gospel is read, before the Sacrament of Baptism is administered, the clergy being "Ministers of God's

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Word and sacraments." The English rubric enjoining a sermon is reduced to words making this permissive, the reference to homilies being excised. The rubric in the Scottish Liturgy is even weaker: "if there be a sermon, it followeth here." New rubrics provide for the priest "offering" the elements, and using at his discretion the first section alone of each form of words at the administration, the second sections having been added in 1552 as a safeguard against false doctrine. One often hears saving of time mentioned in this connection, but one should be slow to accept an ostensible reason as the real motive.

Whatever this new Order may be, it is certainly not the English Liturgy as used in the Church of England to-day. The Dean would have us believe that the amendments of the English Order are very slight, and he even makes the statement (page 98) that "the Communion service of 1662 remains as it was, except as regards the treatment of the commandments"! The caveat offered in "Scottish Prayer Book Revision Contretemps" is now repeated. The counterfeit Order should in accordance with canonical safeguards be emphatically rejected by churches using the English Liturgy. It must be refused in cases where the English Order is legally prescribed. It is unthinkable that the imitation misdescribed be allowed to supplant the Order of 1662, and prayer books containing the correct service will therefore still be needed in church, as often as the English and

scriptural form is in use. The plan in the Scottish Prayer Book whereby the so-called English and the Scottish Communion services have been largely inter-related is unworthy owing to such far-reaching deviations from the 1662 Order. The Bishop of Edinburgh in a Synod charge has designated the Communion Order, as conceived by the Scottish revisers, "the English Order of 1929"! It need hardly be stated that the Church of England has had nothing whatever to do with the Order. A congregation where the 1662 Order is exclusively in force under the constitution or titles is secure; under the canons this is recognized, and these do not permit in other cases of the substitution of one Order for another which has been in sole use, nor the discontinuance of an Order at the accustomed times, nor the introduction of an Order new to a particular congregation, unless with the consent of a considerable number of the members of the church concerned. There is, however, unfortunately, what I may call a backdoor method, canonically sanctioned, whereby a Communion Order strange to a church may be foisted upon the congregation, if, in general, twenty-five communicant members express in writing a desire to have additional administrations of Holy Communion provided according to an Order not in use in that church. While such arrangement is not to interfere with the times ordinarily set apart for Holy Communion in the particular church, unless with the general assent of the communicants of the

congregation, it is not difficult to visualise the danger of such a concession.

The three prefaces at the beginning of the English book do not appear in the Scots book. In one of these it is declared that "Christ's Gospel is not a ceremonial law, but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the spirit." Another preface desiderates "one use." In the Scottish Episcopal Church, however, the uses for the Communion service are now these:— (1) The present English Liturgy, the 1662 Prayer Book comprehending this being one of the authorized service books of the Church, though the Dean in the early part of his book applies the phrase "was in use" to the English Prayer Book; (2) the Scottish Liturgy; (3) the Scottish Liturgy according to a text older than the year 1912; (4) the Scottish Communion Office of 1764; and (5) the spurious "English Liturgy" as printed in the Scottish Prayer Book. And there is contemplated still another option, making a possible sixth "use," to wit, what is provided under the fourth section of Canon XXIII. as found on introductory page vii. of the Scottish Prayer Book, *i.e.*, the English alternative Order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion (1928), if and when the Episcopal Synod is satisfied that it has been authorized in the Church of England. Dr. Perry asks whether "authorized" and "legalized" mean the same thing. In the "Contretemps" I pointed out that,

short of Parliamentary approval, this alternative Order cannot be recognized for any purpose of public devotion, and a Bishop's "paper" in such circumstances adopting the pseudo-Order would add further point to the popular contempt of the efforts in England to keep it, as it were, in life by artificial respiration. Under the same section of the last-mentioned Canon it is provided that the so-called 1928 alternative Order, if ever it should be sanctioned for use in the Episcopal Church in Scotland, might with the requisite consents displace the English Order of 1662, but, let this be carefully noted, in no circumstances could the "production" form a substitute for the Scottish Liturgy, truly an ingenious device for bringing the scriptural English Order of 1662 in course of time, as it were, to the lethal chamber, an Order which took precedence over the Scottish Liturgy under the Canons of 1863, testifying to the wisdom and loyalty to Holy Writ of the revisers of that time. With such a plethora of versions it is hard to understand the heading on page 171: "General rubrics applicable to both the authorised offices of Holy Communion." The same applies to what follows "Appendix" on page 202 of the Scottish Prayer Book. The Dean holds the controversy which raged round the ultimately rejected alternative 1928 Communion Order to have been unnecessary. Yet his admission that the consecration prayer therein resembled that in the Scottish Liturgy constitutes condemnation enough in the eyes of Pro-

testants. It is not proposed to attempt to cover the ground so ably explored by Bishop Knox and Archdeacon Thorpe, to mention but two evangelical leaders, in the way of setting forth the unscriptural character of the alternative consecration prayer that was contemplated. The Dean, referring to the Scottish Liturgy, writes:—"In the Eucharistic service the scriptural foundations are unmistakable." Such cannot apply to the consecration prayer containing, with special reference to the Oblation and Invocation, features of this prayer in the first Prayer Book of 1549, declared by Bishop Gardiner of that period to be consistent with the doctrine of the Roman Mass. The Bishop had deduced the localised Presence of Christ from the prayer of humble access in its position as in the Scottish Liturgy after the consecration. In the 1552 Prayer Book this prayer was therefore placed before the prayer of consecration, separating the latter from the preface, this arrangement not finding favour with the Dean, whose strong support of ancient liturgies falls to be weighed in the light of the warning of Dr. Harold Smith, writing on "Early Liturgies," that "these, as a rule, reflect the decided development of Eucharistic doctrines and language which arose in the middle of the fourth century, and which many of us will regard as a departure from primitive simplicity and truth."

With relief one turns from such a prayer of consecration which has no warrant in Holy Writ,

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

to the consecration prayer in the English Prayer Book, which is treasured for its very faithfulness to our Lord's command. The fallacy underlying the view that the form in the Scottish Liturgy is superior lies in the inability, through what may be called ecclesiastical atavism, or the unwillingness, of supporters of the latter to realise that the presbyter has been appointed to *administer* the Sacrament, and that no words should be included in the prayer that would be capable of interpretation in favour of sacerdotal pretensions, such being totally inadmissible. Keeping this key to the solution steadily in view, one realises that thanksgiving as regards the consecration prayer falls to be limited to the recording of the fact that our Lord gave thanks. It is somewhat significant that it should have been left to the Scottish revisers of the present day to "discover" for the Episcopal Church in Scotland that a direct "eucharistic or thanksgiving element" ought to be included in the prayer which was under review.

A preposterous allegation has been widely made to the effect that the 1662 prayer teaches through emphasis on the words of institution a mechanical theory of consecration, and thus loses in spiritual power. Bishop Knox had no difficulty in exposing this baseless assertion. His Lordship deals with it thus:—
"Our present prayer was written by men who believed that consecration effected no change in the elements, except a change of use. They did not intend any mechanical change, because they did not intend any

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

change at all. The happening of something by the recitation of a formula was forced on to the existing prayer by those who deliberately used it for a purpose for which it was not intended."

If there had been the shadow of a foundation for the extraordinary charge, and if the deposited book had passed, an astonished world would have witnessed the continued use by staunch Protestants of the 1662 prayer in which the Bishop of Winchester finds "the Western, that is, the Roman tradition, in the acutest form!" This Bishop, however, was pleased also to regard the rejected book as a "milestone."

Extracts, applicable to the Scottish Liturgy, from "the unscriptural character of the alternative consecration prayer" by Bishop Knox, and "Memorial and Invocation" by Archdeacon Thorpe, are given here in that order. It will be seen that the former excerpt relates to the invocation or epiclesis, and the latter to the memorial or anamnesis.

(a) "Now we have to remember that the institution of the Eucharist was followed immediately by our Lord's discourse on the Holy Spirit. The disciples had been newly taught to eat the bread and drink the wine in remembrance of Christ. He was about to be parted from them and to be replaced by the Holy Spirit as His earthly Vicegerent, Who was to be more to them than even the bodily presence of their Lord. What teaching would have been more appropriate, what sort of comfort more welcome than the doctrine that the

Holy Spirit would make the bread and wine of the Sacrament to be the Body and Blood of their Master? To omit this word of comfort at such a moment, if it could have been given, was most heartless. Surely there was no ordinary reason for such a silence as this. Again, when St. Paul was expounding the Eucharist to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi., xii.), and about to pass on from it to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, what force would it not have added to point out that the bread and wine were made the Body and Blood of Christ by the same Spirit by Whom the Corinthians were baptised into one body? But once more we have silence where instruction was to have been expected. Such silence is most significant. The argument from silence is not of great value when there is reasonable ground for silence. But silence, when the need for speech was imperative, where a great doctrine was at stake, is not to be lightly ruled out of consideration.

We have therefore, firstly, in the whole Bible a very jealous restriction of worship to God as distinct from, and external to, the material world, and secondly, an omission in the New Testament, we might even say a refusal, to associate the elements in the Eucharist with any action of the Holy Spirit." (b) "Some years ago certain clergy set out to prove that the consecrated elements should be "offered" to the Father as a sacrifice in continuation of, or repetition of, the sacrifice of the Cross. This before, and

independent of, their being partaken of by the communicants. The argument they made most frequent use of was St. Paul's words (1 Cor. xi., 26): "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." They contended that the Greek word for "shew" (*katagellete*) means "offer before the Father." . . . But a better knowledge of Greek led other clergy to reply that the word "shew" means "proclaim," and that before men, not God, as the Greek prefix indicates. Yet the argument, while completely exploded, has left its mark and influence on religious thought. For it is a well-known fact that when men have persuaded themselves of a religious opinion by the most unsound arguments—an opinion which they desire to believe—they will cling to that opinion and persist in proclaiming it. Church history furnishes the student with abundant examples of this theological dogmatism persisting in defiance of unanswerable arguments to the contrary.

And so this unscholarly interpretation of St. Paul's words, the chief if not the only passage relied on, although driven underground, is still influential with men, who cling to it for reasons which have no regard to Holy Scripture or sound learning. The seat of their religious opinions is not their minds, but their wills and wishes."

Two sermons on the sacrifice of the Mass, preached by the late Rev. Charles G. Monro, when Incumbent

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

of St. Silas' English Episcopal Church, Glasgow, form an appendix to the present study.

Further notes may be added regarding the Scottish Liturgy. From the consecration prayer have been deleted the words "And humbly praying that it may be unto us according to His Word." The word "become" in relation to the elements still remains. The double fraction shews to what lengths compilers of liturgies are prepared to go in exaggerating the simple procedure narrated in the Gospels as having taken place in the Upper Room. Turning to the rubrics at the delivery of the elements, as these appear in the Scottish Liturgy, it falls to be observed that there is nothing in Scripture to correspond with "the Sacrament of the Body of Christ." It cannot be advanced that "the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ" is complementary, for these words do not occur. The underlying notion would seem to be that the delivery of the Bread is the important operation, keeping in view the Roman restriction to one kind. Communicants should insist upon the chalice being delivered into their hands.

Furthermore, the second sections of the words of administration which, as has been recorded above, were added in 1552, find no place in the Scottish Communion Order. It is worthy of note that in the Scottish Liturgy the last of the sentences at the time of "the offertory" and reading as follows: "To do good and to communicate forget not; for with such

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

sacrifices God is well pleased" (Hebrews xiii., 16), might quite conceivably mislead a reader into imagining that the word "communicate" here referred to the Lord's Supper, and that this Sacrament had a primary sacrificial character. In actual fact the meaning of the word in this sequence is to be beneficent or charitable, without any connection with the administration. To say the least, an error in doctrine might easily be created by this sentence placed in this context, and opportunity might well have been taken to expunge the sentence. The restoration in the Scottish Liturgy immediately prior to the consecration prayer of the Benedictus qui venit, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," a feature of the 1549 prayer book, but dropped in 1552, supports the cherished fancy of a Presence localised through an affected change in the elements. Bishop Dowden, however, in "Define your terms," repudiated the suggestion of an adorable Presence in and under the forms of bread and wine.

Again, the insertion of "O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world . . ." preparatory to the taking of the elements, is simply a method of restoring part of the Gloria in excelsis to its position in the 1549 book, and aids the perverted idea of the Lord's Supper being a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. We must beware in the words of one of the homilies "lest of the memory be made a sacrifice."

It is interesting to note the parallel between what

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

is called in the new Prayer Book a thanksgiving for the institution of Holy Communion and the Roman festival of Corpus Christi, in which transubstantiation is affirmed. Further, in this chapter it falls to be pointed out that the revisers have failed to insert the direction in the English Prayer Book to omit "Holy Father" from "It is very meet, right . . ." on Trinity Sunday.

There is a small-minded direction whereby the Comfortable Words may be omitted at week-day administrations.

CHAPTER IV.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE REVISION,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PRAYER
BOOKS OF 1549 AND 1552.**

Consideration may now be given to the Dean's book in the order of his treatment of the subject. In the introduction he characterises the new Prayer Book as an advance on the old. I can only agree if "advance" be applied to a state of spiritual decay. Readers can judge as to whether the new matter in general constitutes enrichments and improvements, and as to whether opposition can fairly be attributed to mere prejudice.

Certainly no Anglican will question the value of set forms in public worship. It falls, however, to be added to the reference to St. Paul with respect to external worship that he abhorred idolatry (Romans i., 22-23). A true lover of the English Prayer Book does not weary of any part of it. Scripture is breathed out in every page, and the recital of the contents is ever opening up new vistas of the great unseen towards which we are all hastening. The Dean's view that the second English Prayer Book of 1552 was reactionary simply falls to be refuted on examination. The first book of 1549 formed a stepping stone from

Romanism to the second book enshrining scriptural truth as the result of many important changes, and the succeeding revisions did not materially alter the Protestant foundation of the 1552 book. The Reformers had, perforce, to proceed by stages. Thus, "Mass" was still retained as part of the title of Holy Communion in the 1549 book, and was excised in 1552. It is pathetic to find the Dean trying to stigmatise as mischief the changes carried through in 1552 and essential for pureness of doctrine. He writes, of course, from the ancient Liturgy standpoint, which leads him to prefer the semi-Roman book of 1549 as opposed to the four succeeding Protestant service books.

The statement that a Christian from Alexandria or Constantinople would find in the Scottish Prayer Book much with which he is familiar in the worship of his own Church affords an admission of the setting kept in view by the Scottish revisers. The "Scottish Chronicle" of 10th January, 1930, contains the text of a message of greeting and congratulation sent by the Primus on behalf of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland to the new Archbishop of Constantinople and Oecumenical Patriarch, and of the acknowledgment. What concerns members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, however, is whether the Orthodox Church of the East can positively be regarded as Protestant. If not, why has this line been adopted in compiling the new Prayer Book? How

also can it be suggested that all that people loved in the old book will be found in the new, unless by "people" the Dean means himself and those sharing his views? Verily, no service in the 1662 book "has escaped the hand of the Scottish revisers." Dr. Perry asks: "How can a prayer book compiled in 1662 satisfy the spiritual needs of people living in the twentieth century? Yet, Holy Writ has not changed. The remedy prescribed in the new book can be summed up as modernising by means of a restoration of medieval features in generous quantity. Reasons given for revision follow the lines of the special preface in the deposited book thrown out by the House of Commons, the only forum practically immune from the bias of clerical interpretation, and those reasons do not convince except in the matter of the insertion of prayers appropriate to needs and aspirations of the present day. The Bible constitutes the only sure foundation after as before the great war, and a revision that makes an inroad into bedrock principles formulated on this basis, however much liturgiology may be pled in aid, is unworthy of acceptance, and the ground of charity, not advanced here, but so often abused in this connection, must be ruled out.

The harmony in the Provincial Synod, to which allusion is made, need surprise no one, this being a purely clerical body, and the members with but few exceptions holding opinions in line with the Anglo-Catholic school of thought, in which atmosphere

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

students of the Church are nursed. It is noteworthy that the Reformation does not excite admiration in a Diocesan Synod. The lay representation in the Consultative Church Council counted for little in the net result. As for the general body of the laity, the Scottish revisers did not regard such as a factor in the whole movement, and this renders the task of reconciling lay folk to the new book an onerous one. It cannot be said that the book was passed without doctrinal controversy. Certainly opposition was inevitably conducted under the serious handicap of the clerical fortress being impregnable in many matters. Yet a feeling that all was not well gave rise to a body known at the outset as the Present Prayer Book Standards Defence Association, which on the passing of the new Scottish Book adopted the existing title of 1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association. The substance of a leaflet issued by the Association forms an appendix. This body urged with some effect, as will have been understood, the terms of the Statute of 1792, and its influence in criticism of changes in the Bible which were accepted by the revisers for liturgical purposes will be noticed later. Again, the fact of the Episcopal Church in Scotland being a comparatively small body militated against the expression of a great volume of adverse opinion. It cannot be doubted, however, that a Church with a Protestant flag can ill afford, the motive being put no higher, to alienate Scottish Episcopalians who

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

are Protestants, and who will continue to regard themselves as such, in spite of the blandishments of the new Prayer Book.

On page 34 of his book the Dean commends the introduction of Eucharistic prayers at the blessing of the water in Baptism, and before the laying-on of hands in the Ordinal. As regards baptism he does not, however, notice the danger inherent in an insertion of this kind, as tending to weaken the fundamental doctrine that sacramental efficacy is referable to the power of God's holy Word. Baptism is one of the two sacraments of the Gospel ordained by Christ as "generally necessary to salvation." In their proper perspective in relation to prayer, holy writ and the Christian ministry, these sacraments are means of grace because of their dependence upon the Gospel in its all-pervading power. There is the further danger of affecting to favour a superstitious interpretation countenancing the Romish doctrine of mechanical or *ex opere operato* regeneration, whereby it is believed that grace is invariably conferred by this sacrament, as in the case of other rites recognised by that Church. So with the Ordinal, the position of a clergyman as "a minister of God's Word and Sacraments" should have restrained those who in the outcome have succeeded in strengthening here the unprotestant policy, and therefore unscriptural policy, of making every function of the Church depend as much as possible upon the Eucharist. The underlying error in this consists in

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

magnifying the outward sign to the detriment of spiritual reality.

The note here of the adoption from the new American Prayer Book of the definition of "hell" in the Apostles' Creed as the "place of departed spirits" may be regarded with the explanation that the Popular Encyclopedia, published by Blackie & Son in the year 1881, records that this definition was then in use in the American Church.

The Dean enumerates on pages 38 and 39 adopted "changes drawn from the liturgical language of the past," and regarded as "suitable and edifying for congregations at the present day." These will be examined as they severally occur in the later portion of the book. Here again, however, one fails to discover the faintest hint of the Scottish revisers having kept the Protestant standards of the Church in view in deliberating upon the appositeness or otherwise of this or that feature of ancient service books.

CHAPTER V.

CONFESSION.

One change by way of addition relates to what Dr. Perry dismisses in less than a line in these words: "the form for private confession of sin." This form occurs on page 212 of the new Scottish Prayer Book immediately after the first of the two Exhortations before the Holy Communion, and effectively distorts the true meaning of the concluding part of that Exhortation which no evangelical churchman would seek to oppose. The Exhortation recommends a person in abnormal circumstances, that is, unable to quiet his conscience by the appointed means set forth therein (means to which no Free Churchman could offer objection), to go to a learned minister of God's Word and open his grief that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution. A Christian minister has no power by scripture to absolve in the Roman sense. His function in such circumstances is "to declare and pronounce" to God's people "being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins," these words occurring in the Absolution recited at Morning and Evening Prayer according to the English Prayer Book, and forming a prayer of outstanding scriptural purity. It appeared for the first time in the second Prayer Book of 1552,

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

and the words "or remission of sins" were added in 1604 to shew that the clergy in the prayer of absolution were stating the terms of God's forgiveness. This prayer, it may here be noted, is allowed by the Dean to be well expressed, but is denounced by him as: "an unsatisfactory composition. It merely states obvious truths about God's mercy and ends with an exhortation to pray for forgiveness; in fact, it contains hardly anything except information." Herein, however, lies its merit, as revealed by the reformers in the careful structure of the prayer. Not a trace of sacerdotal pretension can be found in the prayer which is regarded on this account as unpalatable by the Scottish revisers, who have sought to limit its use by providing an alternative form of absolution drawn from ancient sources and doctrinally inferior to the English form as affecting to put a priest in the position of a mediator between God and man. Nevertheless, the Dean, on the stated ground of avoidance of repetition, advocates the frequent use of this alternative, which appears also in the service called Compline. In the new Prayer Book the English form to which we have so long been accustomed ceases to be classified as a prayer. The Council of Trent declared: "Whosoever shall affirm that the priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, but only a ministry to pronounce and declare that the sins of the person confessing are forgiven, let him be anathema." Further, this Council, presumably recognizing the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

impossibility, made no attempt to invoke holy scripture in support of the confessional, pinning their faith to the allegation that a priest has power to forgive sins, and that accordingly there must be poured into his ear full details of sins committed. Such a standpoint has always seemed to me to contain a contradiction in terms, for, assuming such a priestly qualification—a bare assumption refuted by the inspired Word, in that the priest would thereby be brought to a level with the Godhead—surely the omniscience inseparable from such an exalted position would, to this extent at least, obviate the necessity for the order of the grille. The logical conclusion shews the ridiculous result of a pretension of the kind indicated. According to the Roman regime, which the Scottish revisers have not repudiated in this matter, the penitent goes to the bar as a sheep that has gone astray in morals, and traverses the pathway of contrition and confession, ere the "*absolvo te*," for what it may be worth, is pronounced, subject to what is called "satisfaction," whereby the penitent is required to execute works of penance as outlined by the confessor, with the additional prospect of retribution in purgatory, the merits of the death of Christ being thus far overshadowed.

How, then, does the new form for private confession of sin distort the meaning of the Exhortation, as above alleged? Perusal of the form introduced in 1549 and struck out from the English book in 1552, not to

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

reappear, will satisfy readers that it can be founded upon to set up and justify teaching of auricular confession in normal circumstances, the very evil from which the reformers strove successfully to rid Anglicanism. The pulpit supplanted the confessional, which history shows to have been a dreadful snare alike to those confessing and to those hearing. Sex is reckoned to form the subject of 90 per cent. of confessions. The reformers spoiled the spoiler of his prey, and Scottish Episcopalians should stifle the attempt to revive the practice in their midst, if they would not see a repetition of the corruption inseparable from it. No one ought by such means to put himself or herself into the power of any other human being, be secrecy ever so faithfully observed. According to holy writ, confession of our faults one to another is right and proper. With this let the matter end. There is one Mediator between God and man, the Man, Christ Jesus, and there is offered to us free and direct access to the Throne of Grace.

CHAPTER VI.

**KALENDAR, LESSONS AND PSALMS, MORNING
AND EVENING PRAYER AND COMPLINE.**

In dealing with the new kalendar the Dean invites consideration of what are suitable contents for such in a "national" Church. This line of enquiry is surely wide of the mark in the case of a kalendar for use in the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The main point that strikes a Protestant relates to the fact that no saint of a later date than 1380 is included, so that the champions of the Reformation settlement have been ignored, at least by name, and this in a Church professing to teach reformed doctrine. Invocation of saints is ruled out under the twenty-second article of religion. Yet this kalendar will induce such, thereby detracting from the worship of our Heavenly Father. Loaded as the kalendar is, provision has been made for commemoration of local saints with permission of the Bishop of the diocese. One may ask whether "canonising" has received countenance through this option having been conferred. The festivals in honour of the Virgin Mary have been increased. The general entry for November 8—Saints, Martyrs and Doctors—permits of endless extension of commemorations—"The Common of Saints."

To test to some extent the table of lessons as

printed, I have followed through the provision made for reading a number of chapters of cardinal worth in the New Testament, to wit, the two chapters which may be called the danger signals, Romans i. and Galatians i., 1st Timothy ii., Hebrews ix. and x., and Jude. All of these chapters except Hebrews x. are appointed to be read on a Sunday once in the three-year course, subject to any interruption through synchronising of Feasts and Holy-days. Hebrews x. does not occur for Sunday reading. None of these portions of scripture is therefore in the Dean's category of "good lessons" which are assigned to Morning Prayer one year, and to Evening Prayer the next. Certainly it must be kept in view that all of the chapters specified occur in the week-day courses, and that the liturgical epistles embrace part of them. It seems strange, however, that even on St. Jude's day the portion of the General Epistle of Jude appointed liturgically may be supplanted by an alternative lesson. For in Jude occurs the behest that we earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints, being primitive scriptural truth.

The revised treatment of the psalms sacrifices much for the sake of appropriateness. This thin excuse for jettisoning one of the glories of Anglicanism, the reading or singing of the psalms in proper sequence as appointed in the English Prayer Book, occurs in one church magazine or another when the pitiful change takes place. The people feel that there is

something wrong, but they cannot without an analysis which few would undertake put their finger on the misfortune that has befallen them. Well may Dr. Perry admit that a serious breach has been made in the ancient custom of reciting the whole psalter within a given period. The method of "selection" of psalms for Sundays results in the 119th psalm being wholly cut out of Morning Prayer. Even the curtailed arrangement may be still further abbreviated through the rubric providing that when Mattins precedes Holy Communion as a service for the same congregation, it shall suffice that one of the appointed psalms be used. The farcical announcement from the stall may frequently be heard to this intent: "The psalm for the service this morning is . . ., to be found under the nth evening"! The "imprecatory" psalms have dropped out of the Sunday scheme, and verses elsewhere have been starred for optional omission in an attempt to pander to sickly sentiment. The Dean shews the spirit in which these psalms should be rehearsed.

Turning to Morning and Evening Prayer, we recognise the importance of these orders from Dr. Perry's statement regarding the prominence of the scriptures therein. In his words, "the psalms and scripture lessons are the central part of the service." The exhortation, "dearly beloved brethren," forms an admirable prelude to public worship according to these orders, but, as it appeared for the first time in the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

prayer book of 1552, it has not found favour with the revisers, who have placed it with the scriptural sentences in an introduction which may be little used, and provided two brief and feeble alternatives, doubtless again under the trite and threadbare pretext of "saving time." The confession and absolution, though not placed in the introduction, may also be dispensed with in quite normal circumstances through the rubric already referred to in dealing with the treatment of the psalms, whereby Morning Prayer may begin with "O Lord, open Thou our lips" in the case of Mattins preceding Holy Communion as a service for the same congregation. This permissible curtailment of the use of the general confession should be kept in view in its relation to the auricular confession rubric, the option of the general confession in church there mentioned being to this extent a phantom. Whether lawful or not from the aspect of the State prayers, part of the rubric abbreviating Morning Prayer provides for bringing this service to an end immediately after the Benedictus. The idea of the revisers would seem to have been to avoid the dissatisfaction inseparable from abandonment of Morning Prayer at 11 o'clock, but they cannot expect to escape from the criticism that this order can now be reduced to a mere skeleton of the English form. Possibly the revisers may have thought that a service which need last no longer than fifteen minutes might be adopted in churches where at present the 11 a.m.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

service begins with what is called sung or solemn eucharist, preceded by "gabbled" Mattins as a separate service. This remains to be seen. The serious danger of the whole re-arrangement, however, lies in the case of churches where Morning Prayer is now in proper perspective. Here an attempt is already being made to induce people to accept tabloid Mattins, and to stay in church throughout the supervening Communion service, no reasonable opportunity to be given for the retreat of those not desirous of participating. By such unworthy expedient, buttressed up with the ingenuous assurance that the combined service in its entirety will not exceed the conventional hour and a half, the stage is set for the establishment in this Protestant church, in the teeth of the xxxix. articles, of the supremacy of the Mass. The Lord's Supper predicates taking; the Mass is a looking matter: "Peep, see, look, gaze, stoop down before." The change is a travesty of the Lord's Supper, and turns the administration of this sacrament, divinely appointed, into a "performance" or peep show. The whole idea finds support in the title of the Scottish liturgy, which runs: "for the celebration of the holy eucharist and administration of holy communion." The Roman definition of holy eucharist is "the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ under the outward appearance of bread and wine." The eucharist is thus recognized to be something distinct from the action of communicants gathered in faith round a Table after

self-examination to partake in remembrance of the benefits conferred through Christ's Passion upon worthy receivers. People are invited to communicate in the early morning and to attend the eucharist at the usual hour for morning service. They have the remedy in their own hands. Such a service as has been figured need not be attended. Alternatively, non-communicants should withdraw at the accustomed time.

Conferring an optional omission of the concluding four verses of the Venite does not consist with these being attributed to the Holy Ghost (Hebrews iii., 7). The verses, as pointed out in the "contretemps," relate to God's wrath and His judgment on the Israelites for their sins.

One of the good features of the new Prayer Book is the retention of the hundredth psalm as an alternative to the Benedictus. The use of the Jubilate affords a welcome and uplifting change when properly rendered.

The "let us pray" added after "and take not thy Holy Spirit from us" may be allowed to have all the antiquity assigned to it, but it is none the less a totally unnecessary and therefore irritating direction, the worshippers being already engaged in prayer. Further, the adverb "devoutly" before "kneeling" in the rubric before the second collect for peace savours of cant. There is no variety of pose in kneeling.

In the service of Compline, which is in the Roman

form, there is included a collect for use in colleges and private houses and beginning thus: "Visit, we beseech Thee, O Lord, this habitation and drive far from it all the snares of the enemy." The Ven. Archdeacon Thorpe has characterised this as a return to the demonology of the Middle Ages. It contradicts our Lord's own words (St. Matthew xv., 19, etc.), and is a denial of the Christian doctrine, which makes every place sacred to the believer and no building more secure than another. He concludes that the whole idea of special places specially protected from the powers of evil is medieval, superstitious, ignorant, unreasonable and unchristian.

CHAPTER VII.

LITANY, PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS.

Nothing vexes one more than the changes with reference to the Litany, a jewel of the English Prayer Book. The Dean might have characterised these as far-reaching rather than "important," for the effect of them is sadly to depreciate the scriptural power of the prayer. The mischief arises in the provision of "two shorter Litanies," either of which may supplant the first form in the Scottish Prayer Book, even itself shortened as regards the English form, wherever the Litany is appointed to be used. The first of the shorter litanies is simply an abbreviation of the English form through the omission of many clauses. The Dean seeks to justify the plan by suggesting that much of the full litany may be regarded as redundant or unnecessary in these days. He adds: "We need not pray every week for deliverance from . . . all sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion." This clause, however, continues: "from all false doctrine, heresy and schism; from hardness of heart and contempt of Thy Word and Commandments." The excision of such a clause shews that the revisers have failed to appreciate what is in need of emphasis to a greater degree to-day perhaps than at any other time, faced as we are with Anglo-Catholicism and Modernist teaching, to refer to but two schools of thought in our midst.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

The second shorter litany is a makeshift, hopelessly inadequate in comparison with the English litany, and one is very glad to note the Dean's comment that "it will not bear frequent repetition." It should be relegated to the scrap heap, as unworthy of inclusion in the service book. The concluding prayer contains this petition: "Let the whole world feel and see that things which were cast down are being raised up." This may aptly be applied to medieval accretions.

The prayers and thanksgivings next referred to by the Dean may be grouped with the intercessions forming an optional ending for Evening Prayer, and the Appendix on page 202 of the Scottish Book of Common Prayer. Among the prayers of the first-mentioned group is one for religious communities. Now, the overthrow of monasticism was one of the rich blessings of the Reformation, when people learned to realise that the Christian life should so shine forth that men may see good works and glorify God. Withdrawal into nooks and crannies may suit ascetics for their own sakes, but such ought not to be treated as exemplary. Yet the bidding here reads: "Let us pray that God may bless those serving in Religious Communities, and that many may be called to this life and service." In the prayer following, this aspiration finds articulation. The evils of the monastic system became rampant prior to the Reformation, the conditions that were in operation giving free scope for a falling-away from grace. To-day, attempts are being made, with

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

special appeal to feminine mentality, to resuscitate the system, despite the warnings of history. Retreat houses, convents in embryo, are springing up in Scotland and England, conductors of retreats being drawn in goodly proportion from the most "advanced" type of clergy, who rejoice in the Roman appellation, "Father." Worthy clerics of this kind are considered eminently qualified to lead the Episcopal Church in Scotland from time to time in what are called "Missions for the deepening of spiritual life." It has occurred to me that it would save a great deal of time to leader and hearers, if the conductor chosen for a mission of this nature were simply at the outset to despatch a postcard with this message: "Your priests claim authority to sacrifice, to celebrate Mass, and to absolve. Use these offices, potential penitents." This hint may be taken by successors of "Father Vernon," now in the sphere to which his religious persuasions logically impelled him. From perversions of faith of the foregoing description we may fervently pray, "Good Lord, deliver us."

Another matter of far-reaching moment that finds a place in all three sections of the prayers as well as in the burial service is "Prayers for the dead," comprehending the teaching of an intermediate state, albeit Article xxii. declares that the Romish doctrine of purgatory (whereby is signified the doctrine of purgatory, Rome assenting to it, not, as is sometimes ingeniously alleged, a special Romish variation of the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

doctrine) "is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." One collect, occurring in two places, runs: "We praise and magnify Thy holy Name . . . for the Blessed Virgin Mary, etc., and for all other Thy righteous servants . . .; and we beseech Thee that, encouraged by their example, strengthened by their fellowship and aided by their prayers, we may attain unto everlasting life." The terms of the collect are tantamount to acceptance of Romish doctrine of saint and angel worship in two cognate aspects:—(1) that saints are aware somehow of our wants and can hear our prayers, and (2) that saints are able by their intercession to help us on earth. Both of these fall entirely outwith "pure Protestant doctrine," and the words admitting such must be rejected. So, also, collects in the portions thereof figuring an intermediate state fall to be repudiated, *e.g.*, the duplicated collect: "O Eternal Lord God, who holdest all souls in life: we beseech Thee to shed forth upon all the faithful departed the bright beams of Thy light and heavenly comfort; and grant that they, and we with them, may at length attain to the joys of Thine eternal Kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." Salvation is offered by Christ to the living who will accept and take it, and the prayers of a righteous man, while of much avail in their own sphere, have no place in relation to the dead. Unsound doctrine permeates prayers in

the three groups, where these prayers bear upon the subjects now under review. In particular, one is forced to call in question the proper preface for All Saints' Day.

Part of the creed of Pope Pius IV. reads: "I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated; that they offer prayers to God for us and their relics are to be venerated."

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION.

At the opening of his chapter on the ministration of Baptism the Dean plunges us into consideration of the relation of Confirmation to this sacrament of the Gospel by his assertion that Baptism is regarded in the Scottish Episcopal Church "as incomplete without the conscious act by which the gift of the Spirit is received in Confirmation. The union between Baptism and Confirmation has always been maintained." Attention is drawn by him to the definition of Confirmation in the catechism of the new Scottish Prayer Book giving expression to this view as follows:—"Confirmation is an apostolic and sacramental rite by which the Holy Spirit is given to complete our baptism." The Episcopal Church in Scotland is thus committed to doctrine regarding Confirmation quite contrary to the sound Anglican teaching on the subject since the Reformation, as embodied in the 1662 Prayer Book. The doctrine accepted by the Scottish revisers in the light of the foregoing logically would take this shape, being a quotation from the preface of "The Doctrine of Confirmation," written by the Rev. A. T. Wirgman, B.D., D.C.L., then Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, and published in 1897:—

1. "Confirmation is a part of the sacrament of Holy Baptism, just as much as the adminis-

tration of the consecrated chalice is a part of the Holy Eucharist."

2. "The Divine indwelling of the Spirit is given by means of Confirmation alone, and a person who has been baptised, but not confirmed, is in an abnormal situation, and has not yet received the gift of the Holy Ghost."

The author of this book comments upon this statement, emphasising (first) that by such teaching there results an overshadowing of the two sacraments of the Gospel "by a sacramental Ordinance that was not ordained by Our Lord Himself 'as generally necessary to salvation' in the same direct way that He ordained Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist"; (secondly) that the 'strange doctrine' in the Church of England rests for support upon "the constructive and formative powers of a few nineteenth century writers on theology"; and (thirdly) that a serious inroad is made upon the Anglican doctrine embodied in "seeing now that this child is regenerate." As regards the first observation, the exaltation of the status of Confirmation and the other four minor rites making up with Baptism and the Lord's Supper the seven sacraments of the Roman Church clearly appears as having been an object of the present revision. This will be established later. On the third aspect, regeneration, it seems to be desirable to state shortly the Anglican standpoint. For the groundwork one naturally turns to the articles of religion. No. xxv.

reads: "The sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." There is an addition that to such only as worthily receive the sacraments of the Gospel have they a wholesome effect or operation. Article xxvii. :— "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God." The word "rightly" dismisses effectively the Roman claim that Baptism confers grace without requiring personal effort on the part of the baptised. On the other hand, avoidance of such magical view (which, be it said, might be encouraged by the eucharistic interpolations) by no means involves acceptance of union between Baptism and Confirmation on the lines advocated by the Dean, Holy Scripture testifying to these being distinct. Dr. Wirgman writes:—"Whilst we dare not draw too closely the analogy between our Lord's Baptism and our own,

there is still a connection to be traced, helpful to our present enquiry. . . ." "We note the humility of our Lord in suffering St. John the Baptist to baptise Him with Baptism of repentance before 'Holy Spirit' descended upon Him," prayer having intervened, as St. Luke records. Now, in Greek, *pneuma*, employed here without the article, cannot bear the translation, "Objective Personal Indwelling of the Holy Spirit," such being inseparable from our Lord's sacred Humanity, but signifies the conferring of special gifts of the Holy Spirit for a special office and ministration, being His Priesthood "for ever after the order of Melchisedek," His ordination as well as His confirmation. The correct meaning of the two Greek words is abundantly vouched for in passages from holy writ. So we, by preliminary repentance and faith—the regeneration which is the condition of baptism and not its effect—whether acknowledged by ourselves in the case of adult baptism, or by sponsors for us in infancy, as the catechism shews, receive as a divine gift at baptism the Personal Indwelling of the Holy Spirit by virtue of the baptismal union with the second Adam, and at confirmation, which in its true meaning stands for the channel of special gifts of the Holy Spirit for a special office and work, we are consecrated by the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost for the work of our royal priesthood. Such, it is submitted, forms the limit of the sacramental grace imparted at confirmation.

Baptism and the laying-on of hands are thus distinct, even when one immediately succeeds the other. In matter, form and character they are entirely different (Bishop Forbes on the xxxix. articles). Dr. Perry cannot find his view that Baptism is incomplete without Confirmation upon the terms of the opening Exhortation in the Order of Confirmation in the new Prayer Book, for in the story of the confirmation in Samaria, as narrated in Acts viii. and incorporated in the Exhortation, "Holy Spirit" is used in the sense of special gifts over and above the gift of the Indwelling Spirit in baptism. So also in Acts xix. we find the same interpretation through the omission of the article in the Greek. It is interesting to observe that the Scottish revisers have taken this view, for, whereas in the 1549 Prayer Book the prayer "Almighty and everlasting God" contains this:—"Send down from heaven, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon them Thy Holy Ghost," the revisers have continued the 1662 form, "Strengthen them, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost."

There is a further aspect to be considered in connection with the Exhortation mentioned. Peter and John, being of the Apostles, endowed with powers that cannot be shewn to have been transmissible, might well have conferred special grace at Samaria without setting up at the present time, as it were by an assumed analogy, corresponding potentiality on the part of those administering the order of Confirmation.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Reverting to the Baptismal Service, one finds Dr. Perry applauding the recasting of the opening exposition, but he fails to state that the corresponding portion of the 1662 order finds ample justification in the ninth article of religion dealing with original sin. Fortunately, the "prone to sin" now adopted can be reconciled with "inclined to sin" in that article. The Old Testament references to baptism, as strengthening the statement that scripture, as it were, breathes from every page of the English Prayer Book, might well have been retained by the Scottish revisers. The Dean deplors the mutilation of the exhortation explanatory of the Gospel portion appointed, but makes no reference to the fact that even the abridged version has been made optional in place of the obligatory exhortation in the 1662 order.

The "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin" falls to be read with article nine, . . . "and this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate," and also with the portion of a prayer after baptism that the baptised "may finally with the rest of Thy Holy Church be an inheritor of Thine everlasting Kingdom." The prayer of thanksgiving in the English form strengthens this aspect, which is less emphatic in the curtailed version in the Scottish book. In keeping with the revisers' underlying attitude to holy writ, the Dean applauds the removal of the requirement to Godparents, as appearing in the English form of exhortation, that the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

child be called upon to hear sermons. Surely there is weakness in reducing the standard on the plea that it has not been observed. The Church exists to lead people in the way of truth, not to bring her standards down to a popular level. The Scottish form of exhortation is also defective in its qualified reference to the Ten Commandments "as set forth in the Church Catechism." Commandments of men are found there. The first rubric after this exhortation has been dealt with in relation to the State prayers. One notes in conclusion that the English rubric, "To take away all scruple concerning the use of the sign of the Cross in baptism . . ." does not appear in the Scottish order.

CHAPTER IX.

CATECHISM AND OCCASIONAL SERVICES.

There can be nothing but praise for the Dean's advocacy of greater prominence being given to the Catechism, but one must join issue with him on the relative merits of the 1662 and 1929 forms. So far from being "greatly improved" by the revisers, the Catechism suffers in several important matters through changes or additions. It is not easy to appreciate a gain in clearness by supplanting "rehearse" by "repeat," which often means, "say over again." When, however, one finds the same reason advanced for the suppression of "remembrance" by "memorial," in relation to the Lord's Supper, amazement is bound to be evinced, for children might surely have been spared the corrupt doctrine involved in this substitution, as elsewhere demonstrated. The "editing" of the Ten Commandments is also unfortunate. In view of what has already been written on the subject of Confirmation, it could not be expected that reception of the three questions on Confirmation would be at all cordial. These are far from being happily expressed. It might be imagined from them that the Temple prepared by Baptism is empty and void of the presence of the Holy Ghost until confirmation, which, however, as has been shewn, does not complete Baptism, being complete in itself, as one of

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

the two sacraments of the Gospel ordained by Christ. No revelation of the idea of "special gifts" can be traced in the second and third answers. A note of thanksgiving should be sounded for such restraint as the revisers thought fit to exercise in dealing with the English Catechism. The last observation in this connection relates to the Dean's reference to the opening question of the "Shorter Catechism." "What is the chief end of man?" The answer "To glorify God and enjoy Him for ever" is within the compass of the intelligence of most children in Sunday School, and the superlative excellence of the question and answer has been recognized the world over.

In the revised Marriage Service the principle that underlies much of the work of recasting is prominent in three respects, first, in the removal of certain Old Testament references; secondly, in the restoration of the ancient ceremony of blessing the ring to provide the "sign" of a sacrament, the absence hitherto of such differentiating this service according to the twenty-fifth article of religion from a sacrament of the Gospel. It must always be remembered, however, that this blessing of the ring is not a "visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" as the article runs; and (thirdly) in the attempt by the substitution of "desirable" for "convenient" in the closing rubric of the English form, and by the addition headed "Communion" in the Scottish form, to restore the nuptial mass, another instance of the notion that the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Lord's Supper should as far as possible be interwoven with church services.

Scope for superstition and doctrine having no warrant in holy scripture is afforded by the very nature of the services for the sick and the burial service, and, while in the 1552 Prayer Book ample safeguards were adopted, the prayer book under examination has, through the inclination of the revisers towards pre-Reformation standards, to some extent failed to reproduce these salutary features, and even accentuated in places the Romish colour which the safeguards were designed to blot out. Thus, in the order for the visitation of the sick, under the heading "repentance," auricular confession is facilitated by the introduction of a special form to this intent, and such is all the more noteworthy in conjunction with the Dean's explanation at the outset of Chapter X., which is tantamount to a claim that the visitation service should by no means be limited to those who are seriously ill. On the other hand, the invalid is conditionally to be moved to make a special confession of his sins, *i.e.*, "if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter," and the absolution that supervenes is pronounced, only if the sick person humbly and heartily desire it. Furthermore, a minister has canonical authority to use his discretion as to how far the order of the service for the sick is to be followed. Dr. Perry notes that "I absolve thee" is a comparatively late insertion.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

The next section in the service is entitled "anointing and laying on of hands." The restoration of optional anointing, even though it be distinct from the Roman sacrament of extreme unction, must be viewed with a certain amount of misgiving. Scriptural justification will not hinder degeneration into vain superstition, and the innovation requires to be taken with the assertion of the claim to set forth the seven Catholic rites to be referred to in conclusion. In the anointing recorded in the General Epistle of James the oil was not consecrated. Yet already in the Scottish Episcopal Church requests have been made for such consecration. Again, in the former, the anointing was done by the elders; in the latter it can be performed only by a priest. As for the laying-on of hands, it would not be surprising if in the next revision of the Scottish Prayer Book ailing folk be counselled to touch the hem of a clerical garment!

The first commendatory prayer gives a good instance of Roman style in its repetition of Divine attributes, "Spare us, Lord, most holy, O God, most mighty; O holy and merciful Saviour." It seems a pity that the English prayer for one at the point of departure should have been curtailed to exclude the portion for those surviving, founded upon the noble scriptural petition, "So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

As regards the order for the communion of the sick, I do not here enlarge upon reservation, this subject

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

forming a chapter of the "Contretemps." Reference must, however, be made to the relaxation of the English prohibition of solitary communion which ban exists apart from the specialty of contagious disease. This veto demonstrates that Anglican teaching is definitely opposed to an aspect of communion whereby it might seem to be a mere magical performance with minister and invalid alone interested, as distinct from communion of a company of faithful people uniting to remember the Lord's death till He come. Moreover, the English rubric debarring communion in the absence of other communicants shews clearly a repudiation of the Roman viaticum theory. With satisfaction one observes that the English rubric declaring the efficacy of spiritual communion in certain circumstances, wider than the Dean states, has been preserved, even though "lack of company" has, in keeping with the above-mentioned relaxation, been struck out. On the other hand, the intinction rubric serves to support the viaticum notion.

A plea may here be entered against the practice of using the verb "communicate" transitively. It always conjures up in my mind the idea of a telephone operator switching a person through. The use also takes for granted the efficacy of this sacrament, which is allowable with regard to the presbyter administering (Article xxvi.), but wrong in the assumption of the worthiness of a fellow participant (Article xxix.). The phrase "made their communions," so often occurring

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

in church magazines and reports, should also be avoided on the ground last mentioned, and also as failing to impart the idea of receiving. Thus, in "make your confession to Almighty God" the ruling thought is to exorcise sin.

In his section relative to the Burial Service Dr. Perry has a further tilt at German influence. It can be said, however, without fear of contradiction that such influence, exercised in the shaping of the English Prayer Book on Protestant lines, has been thoroughly sound, as founded upon a scriptural basis, the only foundation that counts. The suggestion that in 1552 the burial service was spoiled is ill conceived, for the order in the Prayer Book of that year can be shewn effectually to have banished every element that might have given free play to superstition. The features of the new Scottish form, as outlined by the Dean, shew it to be as reactionary as it could well nigh be. The commending to God of the soul of the departed, both in collect and at the committal, oversteps the mark, prayers for the dead being of no avail, as lacking scriptural warrant. Such prayers imply a belief in the Romish doctrine of purgatory, conflicting with Article xxii. and with the declaration in the English collect, happily retained by the Scottish revisers, that the spirits of the faithful "are in joy and felicity." The concluding collect in the English order contains a petition that those who survive may be raised from the death of sin and found acceptable at the last, pointing

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

to the intimate connection of the English service with the living. This collect appears in the Scottish order with another collect, shewing a mistaken reliance upon prayers of the departed for the living.

The latter portion of the Scottish order provides a parallel to the Romish requiem mass; the closing rubric contains the expression "Memorials of the departed."

CHAPTER X.

COMMINATION AND ORDINAL.

"A Penitential Service," being the title adopted in substitution for the English "Commination," is defective in failing to predicate what the explanatory alternative title in the 1662 Prayer Book shews the service to be, viz.:—"Denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners," "mina" being the Latin word for "threat." The revisers have watered the service down to suit those who may find the "imprecatory" psalms too stern. A Christian will not, however, reach maturity on a milk and water diet with an element of charity thrown in at the wrong time. The Christian warfare against the world, the flesh and the devil must be waged unceasingly, for there can never be a discharge. Satan must be beaten down under foot. In the Scottish form one does not find the Old Testament denunciations, of which the first, salutary even in these days, runs: "Cursed be the man that maketh any carved or molten image, to worship it." Further, there is now quoted the Rev. Dr. Dyson Hague's appreciation of the Exhortation which the revisers for quite inadequate reasons have seen their way to omit:—"As to the exhortation we question whether in the whole compass of the Prayer Book there is to be found an address more fervent, more scriptural, more touching in its pathos, more

searching in its appeal, and one that is more calculated to arouse the impenitent and lead unconverted souls to Christ. From first to last it breathes the spirit of the yearning Christ, and is wholly interpenetrated with the purity of evangelical fervour. Herein is nothing of priestly absolution, sacramental efficacy or reception into the fold of the Church. There may be, and are, lost, unconverted, and unregenerate souls, and in pleading, simple tones it exhorts the hearer to turn to God ere it be too late, to come for pardon and newness of life, not to the priest, nor to the sacrament, but to Christ, the alone Mediator and Advocate."

The ordinal, which is wrongly entitled "according to the order of the Scottish Church," has to some extent been spoiled by the liberty conferred whereby the magnificent English Litany may be abbreviated, or excised entirely by the recital of an apology for the litany. It is to be noticed that in no case would the full English Litany be sung or said. This is surprising when we remember the eulogistic terms in which the Bishop of Moray referred to the English Litany.

Here again the passion of the revisers for over-estimating the Holy Communion as a means of grace has led to the introduction before the laying-on of hands of eucharistic matter in the form of a thanksgiving prayer beginning with the "sursum corda." Not only is this an overlapping, for "Lift up your hearts" occurs later in its proper place, but the cardinal difference between a minister of God's Word and a Mass

priest, so strikingly brought out in the English ordinal, is by such a device blurred. A further regrettable change is the modification of the question to a Deacon-designate in the English order: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" The Scottish form contains these extra words: "as given of God to convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the revelation of Himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?"—a serious qualification of the absolute test, and not to be justified by the Dean's offered explanation of an intention to express a more accurate view of the Bible. In the "Contretemps" I dealt with the significance of the withdrawal of the requirement in the English order, reading as follows:—"And the Bishop shall after that go on in the service of the Communion, which all they that receive Orders shall take together and remain in the same place, where hands were laid upon them, until such time as they have received the Communion," a requirement made deliberately in the English order to give added point to the radical difference between the Anglican minister and the Roman priest. No interference with such a vital direction should have been tolerated on a plea of convenience. The observance at the Lent ordination in Inverness of the ancient custom of Concelebration, mentioned in the "Scottish Chronicle" of 21st March, strikes a blow at the keystone of the Protestant fabric of the Church. The structure is trembling.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Well may one despair! The warning in the "Contretemps" passed unheeded.

The Dean notes that "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" as a formula dates only from the middle ages. In this connection it is well to remember that the theory of doctrine with regard to absolution in the Church of England, and of necessity also in the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, is totally different from the system of the Church of Rome, and cannot be reconciled with the latter. "Christian Minister" and "mass priest" are distinctive.

The "Scottish Chronicle," the weekly organ of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, has reached its semi-jubilee as a publication, and one may be permitted to join in the congratulations which have been offered. When regard is had to the comparatively few Clergy who use the searchlight of discussion provided through this medium, the achievement must be accounted the more praiseworthy. I sometimes wonder whether Scottish Episcopalian ministers in general value the freedom of the press. Can it be fairly advanced that the magazine is kept in the forefront of church life when the Primus has included in the eulogy on the present occasion a regret that even among some keen churchpeople its very existence has not become known? I think not, and the reason from a doctrinal point of view is found in this, that Anglo-Catholic predilections do not consist with Protestant standards, and this cardinal difference cannot be burked in the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

arena of the press, which demands the frankness and direct dealing expected and, let us be thankful, found in normal commercial relations. Contradictions in terms create the conditions for self-immolation.

There is perhaps nothing more pitiable than the closed mind, and such is not as uncommon as might be supposed, with its incentive to unhappy divisions. An *ex parte* statement that will not stand examination in print is of little worth, if indeed it does not confound. The only sure pathway to spiritual stability lies in the adoption of these words of St. Paul: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The twentieth article of religion contains this, "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of scripture, that it be repugnant to another."

CHAPTER XI.

CONCLUSION.

In the last chapter of the Dean's book there occurs this statement:—"The general tone of the new Prayer Book is the same as that of the old; there is no change in doctrine." This estimate, while on a par with the pronouncement of Archbishop Davidson in relation to the rejected Deposited Book, cannot be received with equal surprise, when regard is had to the previous use of the Scottish Liturgy and the practice of reservation in the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Nevertheless, it will not be difficult for readers of these pages to arrive at the conclusion that Dr. Perry's dictum falls very wide of the mark. Armed with the new Prayer Book, with its admittedly wider catholicity, a priest of the Scottish Episcopal Church has at least canonical authority for teaching that which would in all essentials be in line with Romish doctrine, or to use the Dean's words, "a richer expression of Catholic worship." The setting for the virtual supplanting of Morning Prayer by the unscriptural "Anglo-Catholic sung Eucharist" has been well and truly laid. The "leader" of the "Scottish Chronicle" of 22nd November last, the date of the publication of the new Prayer Book, leaves us in no doubt as to the intention of the promoters. These extracts shew that the mask is off:—"Had our forefathers been wiser, they would

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

have looked to the Orthodox Churches for a pattern of what the Church should contain. There they would have found catholicism maintained, not indeed faultlessly, but free from Roman accretions, and they would have learned that the true Church must present the catholic creeds, the catholic ministry, and the seven catholic rites (whether we name them sacraments or no). . . . In our Prayer Book there now stand forth, open and for all to see, the seven catholic rites: Baptism, confirmation, holy communion, penance, orders, matrimony, unction. . . . We have reached a turning point . . . and have asserted our character. . . . Are we not able now to address confidently the Churches of the East with a view to reunion?" A later "leader" encourages the Church to claim to be the Catholic Church in Scotland.

All this, forsooth, is associated with a Church that is under definitely Protestant colours, and that has hitherto been content to enjoy Protestant support. It will be well to quote part of the twenty-fifth article of religion in answer to the foregoing claim to magnify ministerial functions. It runs thus: "There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of

life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

When one comes to summarise what the new Prayer Book has effected, the exultation of the "Scottish Chronicle" contributors that their aims have been accomplished can be amply justified. The Dean in closing commends, what I can regard only as a mutilation, the changes in the Bible for liturgical purposes emanating from a revising committee of the Church, the way being thus paved for a "Douay" Bible for the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The subject was dealt with at some length in the "Contretemps." The effort was, I believe, turned down by the Diocese of Brechin to a man, if exception be made of one or two members of the Synod, who, owing to recent appointments, had been unable to consider the matter, but the Bishop of Moray, in spite of this, persisted in asking the Provincial Synod to allow the changes to be made. I still venture to think that the alterations in general are unworthy in scholarship. To take one example, the opening words of the Gospel for Monday in Whitsun week: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life" (St. John iii., 16) have been mercifully left untouched, but the concluding words of the Gospel for Trinity Sunday, forming part of the fifteenth verse of

this chapter, appear in this "revised" and weakened form: "that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life." Belief here is vague, and the emphatic "should" becomes "may."

The pure doctrine of the early Christian Church was overshadowed in the Dark Ages until the glorious Reformation, the nerve centre of modern progress in every sphere, restored to its rightful prominence the simple Gospel message of justification by faith in Christ's atonement. Under the new Prayer Book, however, evidence is patent of an "advanced" type of religious outlook. With the new book an inroad is made into every positive blessing of the Reformation. Not only is the Bible mutilated for liturgical purposes, but the confessional is advocated strongly, albeit, as has been stated, scripture gives no place to habitual confession to a fellow creature. Latin phrases are eagerly adopted. The Mass priest idea is paraded, particularly through what amounts to a licence, more flexible than is afforded by the suppressed Ornaments Rubric, in the wearing of vestments, and colour is given to the teaching of the Mass with a priest as mediator between God and man. Finally, convent life is warmly supported.

At the close of the address in the Christian Institute a resolution was carried in these terms:—

"That this meeting regards with dismay the introduction of a new Scottish Prayer Book containing many reactionary doctrinal features of the most

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

fundamental description, and thus challenging the Protestant faith of our land, and expresses the earnest hope that, as in the case of the first English Prayer Book of 1549, on which it is modelled, the authority of the new book may be short-lived."

There are surely strong grounds for the dismay. The xxxix. Articles of Religion form the charter of faith of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Notwithstanding this, the articles have been relegated into the background of an appendix to the Canons, not in any sense generally referred to on the part of clergy or laity, the idea being to bring the articles into oblivion. The first section of the new Canon No. 16 B entitled "of Deaconesses" reads: "The Order of Deaconesses is recognised by the Scottish Church," by which is meant the Scottish Episcopal Church. "Deacon" is derived from the Greek word "diakonia," signifying "ministry" (Ephesians iv., 12, and 2nd Timothy iv., 11). The church is committed to the threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, declared to have been in existence from the time of the Apostles. By the third section of the new canon it is declared that "the functions of a Deaconess shall be such as may from time to time be determined by the Episcopal Synod, provided that, if she conducts a service or gives an address in church, these shall be only such as are specially intended for women and children, and shall be other than and dis-

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

tinct from the canonical services," defined to be the services of morning and evening prayer, litany and holy communion, and the orders for baptism, confirmation, matrimony and burial. Section seven runs: "Subject to the provisions of this canon, any bishop, after ascertaining in such way as he sees fit that the proposal is not unacceptable to the congregation, may license deaconesses to serve where there is no rector or priest-in-charge, or in any part of his diocese which lies outside the limits assigned to cures of souls."

In the face of all these possible opportunities for teaching the faith of the Church, the revisers have seen fit to include the following as part of an appendix to the canons:—"It was decided that it is not desirable that assent to the xxxix. Articles of Religion should be required of Deaconesses and Lay Readers."

The functions assigned to Lay Readers include the conduct of morning and evening prayer where the help of a Diocesan supernumerary has been requested, and preaching at these services.

If the revisers had been animated with fervent zeal for the preservation of the true faith of their Church, they would surely have been careful not to relax the standards in the case of persons charged with the responsibilities of Deaconesses or Lay Readers, apart altogether from the legal aspect of the question.

And now the summing-up stage has been reached. When all has been said for the new Prayer Book, the plain fact confronts us that it is based on the assump-

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

tion that the so-called "modern thought" and "new knowledge" of these latter days can be co-ordinated with a service book that discounts the Reformation settlement and its attendant blessings.

This manifest contradiction carries with it the condemnation of the plan. Present-day problems are not thus to be solved. The Gospel message of salvation stands for all time, and by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving are we to lay our petitions before our Maker and Redeemer, with the nourishment of the precious promises of the Word of God, the sincere milk of the Word as opposed to the hokey-pokey of the sacramental system. The 1552 Prayer Book, as practically continued in 1662, is a jewel the price of which has not declined with the passing of the years. Rather has the test of time enhanced the credit of the composers, as the reasons for their great work have become more widely disseminated and appreciated. Here can be found externalism attuned to spiritual worship; here is enshrined a scriptural faith as opposed to a religion described as "modern," but containing nothing new. Even Rome is likely to see that her structure of sacerdotalism rests on shifting sand, as being man-made, and that logically the Protestant faith based on the inspired Word rests upon the only sure foundation.

The new Prayer Book is praised for the variety of treatment provided. When the old "pie" was opened, the people could not begin to sing, for they

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

were unable to find the places in their service books! Here the same difficulty will be encountered. The wide liberty of alteration conferred upon the bishops under Canon xxiv. 7 must, of course, be read as subject to the provisions of the Statute of 1792.

The crux of the whole matter lies in this question: How can the Episcopal Church in Scotland, using a prayer book differing so vitally in tone and in spirit from her avowed standards—any parallel of which contradiction would be laughed to scorn in the commercial sphere—expect to be taken seriously in offering to the world a message of salvation?

It is, of course, open to any persons who favour, say, intinction as a general rule, or the denial of the cup to the laity, to band themselves together in an effort to constitute what might be termed the "Scottish Catholic" Church. There would for such a Church be none of the xxxix. Articles of Religion "to do mischief," but Protestant support could not be invoked. As matters stand, the leaders of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would "catholicise" her in spite of the articles, which are of statutory obligation, and in spite of the terms of Protestant endowments, which are cheerfully requested for promoting this strange *modus operandi*, to-day doing untold harm to a Church that with fidelity to her standards might be a power. The Walker Trustees might well, if such is not already exacted, demand from charges asking for grants a declaration that the teaching given

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

there is for the furtherance of "pure Protestant doctrines." The clergy with Scoto-Catholic sympathies could thus be differentiated.

There is, however, really no room for a Scottish Catholic Church of the kind figured, as Roman Catholics in Scotland regard themselves as Scottish Catholics, and the suggestion now thrown out is never likely to materialise.

The Primus recently indicated that the services of the Consultative Church Council might not be called upon in the matter of liturgical revision for some time to come. It is not possible to see any future of real spiritual worth for the Episcopal Church in Scotland under the Prayer Book now launched. No self-respecting Protestant can make common cause with a Church developing on lines to which he must remain steadfastly opposed. The present position of the Church with this new service book is anomalous, and it is for the leaders to consider the means of extricating the Church from a spiritually perilous situation.

There is a call to-day for more candidates for holy orders. The mental gymnastics incidental to the standpoint of a Church using a Prayer Book at variance with the standards of the faith professed may be part of the human complex, but this agility can scarcely be expected to appeal to men of normal outlook. The English book has, it is learned, been canonically sanctioned with reluctance, special cir-

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

cumstances pertaining to certain congregations having rendered this imperative. Yet I am convinced that such influence as the Episcopal Church in Scotland may hope to radiate in future will be commensurate with the extent of her loyalty to the scriptural English Prayer Book now in use.

If the Episcopal Church in Scotland is to attract students in increasing numbers for spiritual service under her banner to the glory of God, her appeal must be based upon the scriptural foundations as adumbrated in "Popular Preaching," by Dr. Dinsdale T. Young. Preaching is, as the author points out, an ordinance of God and "the chief instrumentality for the salvation of the world." "Ultra-ritualism" is characterised by him as a menace. "It exalts what it describes as 'the altar,' and depreciates the pulpit. . . . The plea that the pulpit should be superseded by ceremonialism is refuted by Christian history. . . . Nor is any plea more sophistical than the plea that 'we go to church to worship, and not to hear preaching.' This creates an antithesis which should never be constituted by Christian people." Justification results from faith in the atonement, which it is the function of the preacher to proclaim, and such cannot be effected by priestly offices of men's devising, nurturing superstition and the very pagan ideas exploded through the Reformation achievement, an emancipation for which we should ever offer humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God. Dr. Young gives

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

further counsel that no regard be had to "shallow 'modern thinkers' who proclaim the need of a new Gospel. The old Gospel is ever new. . . . The Bible is contemporaneous with all time. If it is God's Word, as it assuredly is, it must address itself to all generations. And it does! It speaks as directly to the twentieth century as it did to the first century."

An appeal from any Theological College on such solid foundations, with fervent prayer, would in God's providence surely prove to be irresistible, as being on the very highest plane. "Evangelical truth, Apostolic order." *Floreas, talis ecclesia!*

APPENDIX I.

The substance of two sermons preached in the English Episcopal Church of St. Silas, Glasgow, on October 12th, 1924, by the late Rev. Charles G. Monro, B.A., M.B. (Cantab.).

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

The following paragraphs are extracts from a letter sent to me by an Evangelical Church Society of which I am a member:—

"At this great crisis in the history of our Church, we appeal very earnestly to our Brethren of the Clergy, and through them to their Congregations, to join with us in prayer to Almighty God, our Heavenly Father.

"At the Reformation our Church of England came under the light of the Word of God. Tested by that light, and cleansed by the grace of God, the Church returned to the simplicity of Apostolic faith and doctrine. But to-day there is imminent danger of teaching and ceremonial, which for more than three and a half centuries have found no legitimate place within the borders of our Church, being reinstated with official sanction. If changes now under consideration by the National Church Assembly, and already largely approved in the separate Houses of Clergy and Laity, are legally authorised, then in many

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

of our Churches the service of Holy Communion will closely resemble the Sacrifice of the Mass; the Adoration of Christ under the form of bread and wine will be encouraged through the Reservation of the Consecrated Elements; Prayers for the Departed will find a place in our Public Devotions; and other departures from the teaching of Holy Scripture and from Apostolic practice will with these receive official recognition."

I have therefore thought it well to take as my subject for two sermons "The Sacrifice of the Mass."

The word "Mass" has in itself no special meaning, being derived from the closing Latin words of the Roman Office, but it has come to signify a particular way of carrying out, celebrating, or administering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The point, however, lies in the word "Sacrifice," for the true name for the Sacrament as celebrated in the Roman Church is that which is used by themselves—viz., the Sacrifice of the Mass. Is there, then, any difference between our view of the Sacrament and that of the Roman Church, and, if so, what is it?

Let us begin by being just to the Roman Church, which does preach Christ crucified. I saw these very words over a church door in France this summer, and they were in French, too. It does teach that Christ did actually die on the Cross as an atonement for sin, which is more than some so-called Protestants are teaching to-day.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

But, to put it shortly, amongst other things it adds this, that the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross was not sufficient, and that His sacrifice can be, must be, repeated in order that sin may be forgiven; and the sacramental service instituted by our Lord is taken by Rome as being the means by which this repeated Sacrifice is to be applied for the forgiveness of sins. In order that the completion of Christ's sacrifice may be effected, the ordained priest pronounces the words of consecration over the bread and the wine (which then and thus become the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ), and then offers Him to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin.

The subject of this change in the bread and wine we shall deal with presently; just now we consider the fact that the priest in the "Mass" claims to be a mediator between God and man, claims to have the power to offer to God a sacrifice of propitiation and atonement.

Now, I trust, you and I take God's Word Written as the *best* guidance we can get on a subject like this. We, too, preach Christ crucified; we acknowledge with thankfulness that He died for us, the Just for the unjust, and that we are indeed saved by His death; but in this connection we turn to the Apostle's words, written, we believe, under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost, to his immediate successor in part of his work. These are in a letter chiefly dealing with the management of Church affairs and the regulating

of Church services (1 Tim. ii. 5-7). Now, if there had been the faintest idea in the Apostle's mind that the Christian minister, whether Apostle, Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, was in any way to be looked upon as a mediator, as one standing between God and man, to offer a sacrifice to God and pass on its beneficent effects to men, here certainly was the place to explain it. After laying stress on the Mediatorial Work of Christ, surely he should have gone on to say *something*, to give some hint of the mediatorial office of the Christian minister. *But there is not a word!* And not only that, but the fact of there being only One Mediator between God and man is solemnly set forth as on a par with the statement, "He gave Himself a ransom for all," and he closes with the solemn assertion that this was the essence of his God-given Apostleship. *Nowhere* in the Scriptures do we find the slightest hint of any mediatorial office on the part of the Christian minister, not even if he were an Apostle.

Secondly, the offering of a sacrifice implies a priest having proper authority to do so. Now, unfortunately, there is a double meaning in the English word "priest." You will find the word all through the Book of Common Prayer. Does that mean that ordained clergy of the Church of England have been authorised to offer sacrifice? The Roman priests are so authorised, and they are given certain robes or "vestments" which proclaim this, and whenever you see a clergy-

man, in England or elsewhere, wearing those peculiar white garments, you know that he thereby claims to be a priest duly authorised to offer a sacrifice. To my mind it is quite unnecessary to lay too much stress on the clothes that an officiating clergyman wears, but the "vestments" make a very distinctive claim—viz., that the wearer is a priest offering a sacrifice.

Now, let us turn to the Word, and we must go to the Greek to make quite sure. If you turn up your Concordance at the English word "priest," you will find it invariably used either in connection with the Aaronic priesthood, who were authorised by law to offer sacrifices, or of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah (see Heb. vii. 11-17, 24-28). So the first point we have established is that the Man Christ Jesus was appointed by God to be a Priest of a special Order, that of Melchisedek, thereby superseding the Aaronic priesthood. Verse 3 emphasises the characteristics of this priesthood as being specially uniqueness and permanence. Christ continues for ever the work which He began on Calvary, and so, thank God, He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by Him.

Now, look for the word "priest" as applied to the Christian minister, and you won't find it. The English word is originally the Greek word "presbuteros," an elder, shortened and altered. The Scripture does not leave us without definitions and rules as to Elders and Presbyters, but nowhere is there the

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

slightest hint of their authority to offer sacrifice. St. Peter, who says of himself that he is also a Presbyter, never claims the right of offering sacrifice, though he does very markedly refer to the sacrifice of Christ.

There are two words in the Greek connected with the English word "priest," one of which ("hiereus") is always used of a sacrificing priest, and never of the Christian minister, for whom an entirely different word ("presbuteros") is reserved, so it is quite obvious that God's Word restricts the authority for offering of sacrifice to the Aaronic priesthood, now done away, and to the Lord Jesus Christ, and gives no such authority whatever to the Christian minister.

Thirdly, the Greek word translated "once," in Heb. vii. 27, is extraordinarily emphatic, and is better put in the R.V., "once for all," therefore God's Word expressly denies the necessity for a recurring offering of the Sacrifice. In the Holy Communion we remember that He offered Himself once for all—*i.e.*, for all time—and by partaking of the consecrated elements we symbolise our spiritual union with Christ and the fact set forth in Coloss. ii. 10.

To sum up, then:—

1. There is *One Mediator* between God and man, and only one, the Man, Christ Jesus.
2. Christ is the High Priest of a new Order, in which He is seen to be *Unique* and *Eternal*.
3. His Sacrifice of Himself was offered once for all time.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Consequently:—

- 1a. We reject the offer of any man to intervene between us and our Mediator.
- 2a. We reject the claim of any man to be a sacrificing priest, as being blasphemous usurpation.
- 3a. We reject the idea of the necessity of the repeated offering of the Sacrifice of Christ, as being directly contrary to God's Word and derogatory to the completeness of Christ's Sacrifice.

This is all put very shortly but very clearly in the 31st Article of Religion in the Book of Common Prayer—

"The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

We now turn to another point which arises, and it, again, is dealt with in another of the 39 Articles.

All Christians are agreed that Our Lord instituted a Service on the night He was betrayed. This is confirmed by the Apostle Paul in chapter xi. of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and it is from this chapter, verse 20, that the phrase "Lord's Supper" is derived; just as the word "Communion" is taken from the 16th

verse of chapter x. The latter is the Greek word "koinonia," which means the act of partaking or sharing, so that the root idea of this aspect of what Our Lord instituted is fellowship or union with Himself, and so with one another, for "we are all one in Christ Jesus."

So both names, "Lord's Supper" and "Communion," are quite Scriptural. The word "Holy" is added to the latter to distinguish this particular fellowship from any other.

The Service therefore has two aspects:—

1. A Feast, of bread and wine, a supper, and therefore the piece of furniture on which the Feast is spread is a *Table*. It cannot be an altar, because, as we have already seen, there is no authority given by God for the offering of a sacrifice by the Christian minister.
2. But it is more, for it is a partaking of Christ, a union with Him, and thereby with our fellow-believers.

The word "Sacrament," which meant originally the Roman soldier's oath of loyalty, has come to have a theological meaning, and is now limited (and rightly) by the Church of England to the two Services instituted by Christ Himself, each of which has two parts, an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace. We have this dual character of the Service we are considering shown in the two Scriptural names for it: it is a Supper, something externally

visible and tangible; it is also a Communion, a spiritual partaking of Christ. How beautiful, how simple to accept, if not to explain, and yet what rivers of blood have been shed by those calling themselves Christians just about this very Feast of Love!

The root of the trouble can be shortly put in a question, What did Our Lord mean when He said, "This is my Body . . . this is my Blood"?

Now, firstly, at the time of institution Our Lord was in the body, His human body. Therefore, if the bread and wine were, at that time, becoming or to become His Body, He had two bodies, and His death happened actually in the Bread before it happened in His flesh-and-blood Body, which, as our old friend Euclid would say, is absurd!

Secondly, let us look in passing at the time and circumstances of the institution. It was evening, but according to Jewish reckoning a new day had begun. The fact that the Jewish day begins at our 6 p.m. and ends correspondingly is just one of those things which we are so apt to forget! So if you want to argue, you can argue that it should be held either in the evening or at the beginning of the day!

Again, the institution was "after supper," which certainly to my mind cuts away the foundation of the idea that fasting Communion is a *necessity*, as does also the Apostolic teaching in 1 Cor. xi. 21 and 34, where coming hungry to the Lord's Table was a source of error! I may also point out that the ordinary hour

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

for Evening Communion is not based on Scripture, since it is almost always *before* supper!

Again, if fasting Communion is right, because of a desire not to mix the Sacred Food with any other, then (I speak as a medical man) no other food must be eaten for at least two hours after, to allow of digestion of the consecrated Bread!

Let us get away from all carnal and materialistic ideas. Time, place, and even manner are infinitely less important than the spiritual feeding on Christ. Personally, I prefer the early morning, because I come to the Service fresh, whereas at any other time I am tired by the preceding services and sermon. The spiritual value, to you and me, of the Holy Communion can be summed up in a question, Do we go home from the Lord's Table with Christ so in our hearts that He shines out in our lives?

Let us return to Our Lord's words of institution. When He said "is" He did not mean "becomes," or He would have said so. The verb "to be" is sometimes left understood in Greek, but in this case the word "esti"—*i.e.*, "is"—is there, and it does not mean "becomes," or another word would have been used by the Son of God. Nor does St. Paul use any other word but "esti" in 1 Cor. xi., where we may specially note verse 23, in which the Apostle claims to have had the account straight from the Risen Lord, *after His Ascension.*

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer—Another Aspect.

Turn to Gal. iv. 22-26, and note the use of "is" and "are." See also Matt. xiii. 18, etc. This use is a common figure of speech called Metaphor. One of the commonest uses is when one takes, say, a knife, and laying it on the table, says, this is So-and-so Street, in order to describe the way to somewhere.

But how are we to know that in this case the Lord is using a figure of speech? From the Greek. "When a pronoun is used instead of one of the nouns (as it is here), and the two nouns are of different genders, the pronoun is always made to agree in gender with that noun to which the meaning is carried across, and not with the noun from which it is carried, and to which it properly belongs. This at once shows us that a figure is being employed; when a pronoun, which ought, according to the laws of language, to agree in gender with its own noun, is changed, and made to agree with the noun which by metaphor *represents* it. Here, for example, the pronoun 'this' ('*touto*') is neuter, and is thus made to agree with 'body' ('*soma*'), which is neuter, and not with 'bread' ('*artos*'), which is masculine. This is always the case in metaphors." ("Figures of Speech Used in the Bible," Bullinger.)

By using the figure of metaphor Our Lord tells us that He did not mean "become," and that He did mean "represent."

A bank note is a piece of paper subject to all the conditions which affect paper, but if I gave it to you

and said, "Here is a pound," would you refuse it because it was not a piece of gold? But its value consists not in itself, but in the fact that it represents a certain amount of gold stored up somewhere else. It is, therefore, not an ordinary piece of paper, and we all treat it with respect, because it has a great value, not on its own account, but because of what it represents.

So with the elements at Holy Communion. They do have a value. When consecrated they are not ordinary bread and wine. They do not *become* Christ, but they do *represent* Him. When bank notes have served their turn they are destroyed and fresh ones are issued, which equally represent the unseen gold. When the bread and wine have served their purpose they are consumed. In the Book of Common Prayer the Reformers carefully guarded against the possibility of any of the elements being reserved, because they knew the danger of their being worshipped.

In the Church of Rome the priest is actually described as being greater than God, because at his command God *must* come into the bread, which is blasphemy, and the consecrated elements are worshipped as God; which is idolatry. It is no use saying that people do not worship the bread, but God. That is just what the idolater says. An image is made, consecrated by a priest, becomes a god, and is worshipped; yet they say it is not the image that is worshipped but the god. But all bowing down to,

and worshipping of, the creature is prohibited by Jehovah.

Consequently, we find ourselves in agreement with the 28th Article of Religion, which says:—"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

The teaching involved in the Sacrifice of the Mass is therefore seen to be directly contrary to that of the Book of Common Prayer, and to suggest having "alternative" Prayer-Books containing incompatible doctrines, in the same Church of England, as a practical possibility is simply absurd.

God keep us from any such tragic absurdities!

CHARLES G. MONRO.

APPENDIX II.

1662 Prayer Book Standards Defence Association.

DO YOU KNOW:—

(1) That anyone connected with a Church using the new Scottish Prayer Book cannot be regarded as a Protestant?

(2) That Protestants should have nothing to do with such Churches?

(3) That the Confessional and the Mass should be kept at a distance?

(4) That the only safe course for Protestants is to hold fast to the authorised version of the Bible and the English Prayer Book, as countering Anglo-Catholicism on the one hand, and modernist teaching on the other?