

death into a more perfect zeal for righteousness. This increased penitence and renunciation will be painful, but not such pain as is inconsistent with peace. But this is a question of opinion as to which we may well plead for individual liberty. To impose a doctrine of P. upon all men as a necessary article of Faith is an act of unjustifiable tyranny.<sup>1</sup>

Literature. See references above; also Mason, *Purgatory; Commentaries on the Arts.; Tracts for the Times* 79; R. M. Benson, *The Penitence and Joy of the Faithful Departed*; J. H. Newman, *Dream of Gerontius*.—R2<sup>o</sup>.  
S. C. GAYFORD.

**PURIFICATION OF BVM.**—See FESTIVAL, § 13; SAINTS' DAYS (RATIONALE OF SERVICES FOR), § 7.

**PURIFICATOR.**—A small square of linen often used to wipe the Paten and Chalice after the ABLUTIONS.—R3.  
J. W. TYRER.

**PURITANS.**—This name was first bestowed at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign on a number of extreme Reformers who objected to the imposition of the "cap and surplice" and to certain ceremonies, such as the sign of the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage and kneeling at the reception of the communion. They were chiefly composed of clergymen who had been in exile at Geneva during Mary's reign, and who on their return objected to what they considered as the "compromise" adopted by the Act of Uniformity of 1559, and desired to mould the discipline and ceremonies of the Ch. according to the Calvinistic model they had used abroad.

There is little doubt that the majority of the early Elizabethan clergy strongly sympathised with the Puritan scruples. The bps. expressly declared that they had used every effort with the Queen "to effect what our brethren require and what we ourselves wish" (*Zürich Letters* 177 and 169), and in 1562 a petition in the lower house of Convocation for the removal of Puritan grievances was only rejected by a majority of one vote in spite of the influence of the Court against it. The main body of the Reformers, however, were willing to yield to the dictation of the State in non-essential matters of ceremonies; but the Puritans, who accepted the Holy Scriptures as a perfect standard of discipline as well as doctrine, refused to conform to requirements which possessed no express scriptural sanction and which they regarded as superstitious and "idolatrous." They had, however, no quarrel with the doctrinal standard of the Ch., and, although they refused to conform to its discipline, they had no desire to separate from its communion. But, as Elizabeth was determined to enforce a uniformity of discipline, the persistent refusal of the Puritans to wear the habits soon led to the deprivation of many of them from their cures. The persecution they

endured for their nonconformity at the hands of the bishops led many of them after 1570 to deny, not merely the lawfulness of the vestments, but also of the episcopal government of the Ch.; and Cartwright, in his *Admonition to Parliament*, advocated a Presbyterian system of Ch. polity in accordance with the rules laid down in the *Holy Discipline*, a book drawn up by himself and Travers, two celebrated Puritan divines. Attempts were soon made by the Puritan clergy to enforce this system in many parts of the country.

About the year 1580 some of the more extreme Puritans, under the influence of the teaching of a divine named Robert Browne, went a step further and advocated complete separation from the Ch., denying the validity of its Orders and Sacraments, and affirming each congregation to be a distinct church. These Brownists and all who refused to conform were, however, so vigorously and relentlessly persecuted that towards the close of Elizabeth's reign Puritanism greatly declined, and the Puritans who appeared at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 were far more moderate in their demands. A rigid conformity was, however, demanded and, owing to the severely repressive ecclesiastical policy pursued by Charles I and Archbishop Laud, the Puritan ranks were increased by a large number of conforming clergymen of Calvinistic opinions, who were being driven from the Ch. by suspensions, fines, deprivations and imprisonments. During the Civil Wars the Puritan party became sufficiently powerful, with the aid of the Scots, to overthrow episcopacy and establish a Presbyterian system of worship. After the Restoration they presented their old grievances at the Savoy Conference, but on their refusal to conform to the requirements of the Act of Uniformity (1662) they were ejected from their benefices and thenceforward became merged in the general body of DISSENTERS. [Cp. Figgis on *Puritanism* in *DECH.*]—A1.  
C. SYDNEY CARTER.

**PYX.**—A small box of precious metal, in which the Blessed Sacrament was reserved in the church and carried to the sick. In mediæval England the P. was suspended above the altar.—R3.

E. HERMITAGE DAY.

**QUADRAGESIMA.**—See FESTIVAL, § 13; LENT, § 1, 4; ADVENT, § 1.

**QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.**—The name of a fund provided for by an Act of 1703 (2 and 3 Anne, c. 20), the administrators of which were formed into a corporation early in the following year, under the title of "The Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne, for the Augmentation of the Maintenance of the Poor Clergy." Previous to the Reformation, the exactions of Rome from the clergy had included the FIRST FRUITS and TENTHS levied on all clerical incomes and paid over to the Pope for the time being. On abolishing the papal authority in this kingdom, Parliament under Henry VIII diverted both these sources of revenue to the Crown, by which they were retained till restored to the Ch. by the forementioned Act of Parliament. The governing body, headed by the two Abps., with a

<sup>1</sup> On the rejection of the belief in P., based upon the denial of an intermediate state, in the Homilies, ii. 7, 3, and the authority of the Book of Homilies, see *CQR* 10 14 ff.

tolerably full clerical representation, embraces a strong lay element also—a Committee beyond suspicion for the impartial distribution of the fund entrusted to them. The charges are still made *pro rata* according to the value of the respective benefices as declared under Henry VIII, which differs considerably in many cases from the modern estimate; and more than half the benefices in England and Wales are altogether exempt, either by statute, or as having been created since the charges were imposed. There is, however, a very respectable income, averaging about £15,000 a year, from the amenable contributors, to which the interest on capital held by the Governors is added. Their grants are rarely made to livings of, or exceeding, £200 in net annual value. Otherwise they are usually directed to—(a) the augmentation of poor livings by the gift of a capital sum, say £200; (b) the foundation of new benefices by a gift supplementary to that of the private benefactor; in which case due care is taken to guard against abuses of patronage; (c) the building, or improving, of parsonage-houses; and (in special cases) the erection, or reparation, of chancels. The trustees are further empowered to lend money upon mortgage (sometimes of the benefice itself) in furtherance of objects which commend themselves to their judgment. The application of the fund has been regulated by a long series of statutory provisions, e.g., those of 1714, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1846, and 1865; and applicants for grants will be informed of the conditions on which they can be obtained at the offices of the Bounty, 3 Dean's Yard, Westminster. [The question has often been raised whether the administration of QAB. should not be amalgamated with the Eccles. Commissioners.] (For legal questions see Cripps, *Laws of the Church and Clergy*, and PROPERTY.)—A6. G. WORLEY.

**QUESTMEN.**—An old synonym for churchwardens, who were so called from their duty of inquiring after and presenting for censure parishioners guilty of heresy or other ecclesiastical offences (cp. canons *passim* and art. CHURCHWARDEN, § 1)—A3. P. V. SMITH.

**QUICUNQUE VULT.**—This "Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius," belongs to the third of the three chief classes of Creeds—*Baptismal Creeds, Conciliar Creeds, and Private or Individual Theological Professions*. Its early history is still obscure, and has been the battle-ground of much controversy. But it is generally agreed that it was originally written in Latin, probably in the 5th cent. All the Greek versions are plainly translations from Latin, and it is not until the 8th cent. that the name of St. Athanasius is found connected with it. This tradition of authorship however is probably older than the 8th cent., because the author of a commentary (so called the *Oratorian*), writing probably at the beginning of the 9th cent., says that he has seen it entitled "The Faith of St. Athanasius" even in old MSS.

The earliest definite quotations of the Creed are found in the writings of Cæsarius, who was Bishop of Arles 503-543 A.D. These quotations are not confined to the Pseudo-Augustinian *Sermon* 244, which is commonly ascribed to Cæsarius, and

in which the preacher cites clauses 1, (2), 7, 15, 16, 33, 42. Dom G. Morin, O.S.B., has shown that Cæsarius used the Creed continually as a sort of elementary catechism, and that it reproduces both his qualities and his literary defects.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Cæsarius often put some words of a distinguished writer at the head of his compositions, so that in this way he may have been responsible for the fact that the name of St. Athanasius was subsequently attached to the Creed.

The use which Cæsarius made of the QV. may, however, be explained by the suggestion that it had been taught him in his youth, so that his style had been moulded by it. Eloquent as he was, the greatest preacher of his time, and the theologian to whom the credit belongs of ending the Pelagian controversy on Free-will when he presided over the Second Council of Orange in 529 A.D., he was not an original thinker, and we must look to some other writer of the school of Lerins to which he belonged.

The famous monastery of Lerins was founded by Honoratus in the early years of the 5th cent. and sent forth into Gaul a succession of great bishops and teachers. It is from such a centre of culture and religious zeal that we should expect the author to proceed. Some writers have claimed Vincentius, one of the early monks, author of the famous *Commonitorium*, or warning against heresies, as the possible author. Again, we find that Honoratus, the founder, was described in the memorial sermons preached after his death by Hilary of Arles and Faustus of Riez, as renowned for his zeal for the true faith and his careful instructions. Hilary calls him "a daily witness in most sincere sermons of our confession of Father, and Son and Holy Ghost, nor has anyone easily discussed so openly, so clearly, concerning the Trinity of Divinity since thou didst distinguish the Persons and associate them in eternity and majesty of glory."<sup>2</sup>

Such quotations, of course, do not prove authorship, nor is it so important to find an author as to decide the approximate date at which the Creed was written. Dr. Waterland's argument that it was written in what he calls Apollinarian times has not always received sufficient attention. He means times when the Apollinarian error of denying that the Lord had a human soul was a pressing danger. There can be no doubt that this was the fact at the beginning of the 5th cent., when Priscillian, a Spanish bishop, who fell into heresy and founded a sect which bore his name, taught with great vehemence and under pain of damnation both this error and the error of Sabellius, confusing the persons of the Trinity; so that from beginning to end the QV. is a strong reply to his errors, which were greatly feared in France. Moreover, we find that the Council of Toledo in 633 A.D. quoted certain clauses from both parts of the QV., together with sentences from a contemporary formulary known as the *Creed of Damasus*, which is also apparently directed against Priscillianism.

<sup>1</sup> *Le Symbol: d'Athanase et son premier témoin St. Césaire d'Arles*, Rev. Bénédicte, Oct., 1901.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly Faustus writes: "Let us first follow the things which he taught. Let us first hold fast the right faith, let us believe Father and Son and Holy Ghost one God. For where there is Unity there cannot be inequality."

In the 8th cent. we begin to find MSS., one of which, the famous Ambrosian MS. at Milan (Cod. O. 212 *sup.*), has even been ascribed to the 7th cent., and the Creed emerges from its obscurity.

## 2. Classes of MSS.

The MSS. fall into two main classes: (i) Collections of creeds; (ii) Psalters. The Ambrosian MS., referred to as the earliest, also contains the *Faith of Bacchiarius*, which is the defence of an obscure monk against the charge of some such heresy as Priscillianism, and belongs to the 5th cent., like the QV.; and again "the *Faith of Jerome*." Another very interesting MS. which has only recently been discovered is a collection of creeds which was made by Bishop Leidrat and combined with a series of quotations from Cassiodorus, Jerome, Isidore and Augustine, intended as an Introduction to the Psalter. Leidrat presented this MS. with an autograph inscription to the Altar of St. Stephen in Lyons. He resigned his see in 814 A.D., so that the date of the MS. can be ascertained with confidence.

Incidentally this MS. proves how unsafe were the foundations of the Two-Portion Theory, formerly popular in England and put forward by Professors Swainson and Lumby. They found some quotations of the first portion of the Creed in a profession of faith presented to Ethelhard, Abp. of Cant., by Denebert, Bp.-elect of Worcester, in 798,<sup>1</sup> and (with the exception of clause 37) the whole of the second portion of the Creed quoted freely in a sermon known as the *Trèves Fragment*,<sup>2</sup> beginning abruptly in the middle of clause 29. They assumed that Denebert only knew the first portion, and the author of the *Trèves Fragment* only the second, and that the two portions were first brought together in the 9th cent. (c. 860 A.D., Swainson; after 813 A.D., Lumby). The theory involved assigning later dates to all the MSS. supposed on palæographical grounds to belong to the 8th cent. But the progress of palæographical studies during the last twenty years has proved this to be absurd, and we may now reckon that some five or six at least of the MSS. may be dated before 800 A.D. Moreover, the evidence both of MSS. and Commentaries combines to prove that the Creed existed from the earliest days precisely in the form in which we use it. The paraphrase of clauses 35, 42, in the *Trèves Fragment* show the licence taken by the preacher, not the original text of the form which he was quoting.

Space will not permit us to quote from other MSS., for which reference must be made to the

## 4. Leidrat's MS.

list of books given at the end of this art. But Leidrat's MS. is the connecting link between the two classes of MSS., since the same collection of creeds and extracts relating to the Pss. is also found in the famous Golden Psalter at Vienna (Cod. 1861), which was written by command of a King Charles I for a Pope Hadrian. There can be little doubt that this was prepared by Charles the Great for Pope Hadrian I, after whose death, in 795 A.D., the MS. seems to have been given to Queen Hildegard. Leidrat may have been consulted by the King as to the preparation of the Introduction to the Psalter. From this time

on we find the QV. appearing more and more frequently in an appendix to the Psalter together with the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ordinary Canticles.

The earliest use of the QV. was, as we have seen, in sermons, and in canons on the Faith, such as the canon of Toledo, in which clauses were quoted without reference to the formulæ as a whole. About the year 670 A.D. Leodgar, Bishop of Autun, directed his clergy to learn the *Faith of St. Ath.* by heart. Some hundred years later the author of the *Oratorian Commentary*, possibly Theodulf of Orleans, informs us that he has been instructed by a Synod to prepare an exposition of this work on the faith "which is up and down recited in our churches and continually made the subject of meditation by our priests."

The interest which Charles the Great took in Church music soon led to the use of the Creed as a canticle. Angilbert, Abbot of St. Riquier (c. 814 A.D.), records that it was sung by his school in

procession on Rogation Days with the Creeds and the Lord's Prayer. Before long it was regularly introduced into the Office of PRIME, apparently first in the Monastery of Fleury, of which Theodulf had been Abbot. At the end of the 10th cent. Abbo of Fleury speaks of it as sung antiphonally both in France and England. But the earlier use as a catechism, especially for the benefit of the clergy, did not pass away. Thus Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims in 852 A.D. made his clergy learn it by heart and explain it like a catechism; and Hayto, Bishop of Basle († 836 A.D.), directed his clergy to learn it by heart and recite it on Sundays at Prime.

During the Middle Ages the Ch. of Eng. continued this use, extending it through the

## 7. English Use.

Sarum Brev. to daily use, according to the common custom of the Western Ch. through the 12th and 13th cents. In the Roman Brev. the use seems to have been restricted to Sundays from the end of the 13th cent. In the First PB of Ed. VI it was directed that it should be "sung or said" after the *Benedictus* on the greater Feasts. The Ap. Creed followed it as part of the *Preces in prostratione*, all kneeling. In the Second PB it was directed that the Ap. Creed should be said standing, preceded by the QV. on certain festivals, the number of which was increased. In 1662 the rubric was altered to "At Morning Prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed."

In the Eastern Church it has been introduced into the Appendix of modern additions to the

## 8. Use in other Churches.

Hour Offices, but in a mutilated form, the words "and the Son" having been cut out of clause 23. With this correction of the doctrine of the Procession of the Son it is regarded as a good exposition of the faith, but no directions are given as to its use. In Russian Service-Books it appears at the beginning of the Psalter. In the R.C. Ch. the Sunday Office of Prime is often

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus., *Cleopatra*, E. r.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, Bibl. Nat., *Lat.* 3836.

crowded out by the multiplication of Saints' Days with their special offices, but it survives in Adv. and Lent and on Trin. Sunday.

Thus the Ch. of Eng. alone uses the Creed in the mother tongue in a popular service, and in the present-day controversy on the use this is the starting-point of discussion. It is admitted that there were popular translations in the Middle Ages, and also that Latin was understood by all educated persons, and that Prime as a part of the series of services called Mattins was a popular service. But the fact remains that by far the greater number of the congregations must have been unable to follow the QV., and would use their private devotions in preparation for the Mass following. So that our modern use does not at all correspond to the ancient.

Without trenching on the subject of the next section and without controversy, it may suffice to say that there are those who wish for some alteration of the use, without disloyalty to the positive teaching of the Creed, only feeling that on such days as Christmas Day and Easter Day it is impossible to explain what qualifications are needed to understand clause 2 in a Scriptural sense. They do not wish for the mutilation of the Creed by the excision of a clause or clauses.

Probably the most satisfactory means of attaining this end is through a proposal which was made in 1872 that the bishops should claim as a part of their *ius liturgicum* a legal power of dispensing, upon application from an incumbent, with the use of the QV. as enjoined in the PB on certain days. The condition might be added that it should be used either in a revived Office of Prime, or at the Evensong preceding the Festival, so that the clergy and other teachers who can supply the necessary qualifications to the warning clauses would still at such times meditate on—to use Hooker's words—this "most divine explication of the chiefest articles of our Christian belief."<sup>1</sup>

Some light is thrown on the teaching by the use of the new translation prepared by the Abp's. Committee, the variations of which from the PB version will be found after the original Lat. text printed below.

I. THE TRINITY.

<sup>1</sup>Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem: <sup>2</sup>quam nisi quis integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in aeternum peribit.

i. (a) *Divine Personality is Triune.* <sup>3</sup>Fides autem catholica haec est, ut unum deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate vueremur; <sup>4</sup>neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes. <sup>5</sup>Alia est enim persona patris, alia filii, alia spiritus sancti; <sup>6</sup>sed

<sup>1</sup> *Eccles. Pol.*, v. 42 12. This suggestion commended itself within limits to Canon Liddon, Dr. Pusey and Lord Salisbury, when they were championing the cause of the Creed.

patris et filii et spiritus sancti una est divinitas, aequalis gloria, coaeterna maiestas.

(b) *Attributes of the Godhead expressed in subsidiary antitheses.* <sup>7</sup>Qualis pater, talis filius, talis et spiritus sanctus: <sup>8</sup>increated pater, increatus filius, increatus spiritus sanctus; <sup>9</sup>immensus pater, immensus filius, immensus spiritus sanctus; <sup>10</sup>aeternus pater, aeternus filius, aeternus spiritus sanctus: <sup>11</sup>et tamen non tres aeterni, sed unus aeternus; <sup>12</sup>sicut non tres increati, nec tres immensi, sed unus immensus et unus increatus. <sup>13</sup>Similiter omnipotens pater, omnipotens filius, omnipotens spiritus sanctus; <sup>14</sup>et tamen non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens.

(c) *In which Christian Truth acknowledges the Trinity.* <sup>15</sup>Ita deus pater, deus filius, deus spiritus sanctus, <sup>16</sup>et tamen non tres dii, sed unus deus. <sup>17</sup>Ita dominus pater, dominus filius, dominus spiritus sanctus; <sup>18</sup>et tamen non tres domini, sed unus dominus: <sup>19</sup>quia sicut singillatim unamquamque personam et deum et dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur; <sup>20</sup>ita tres deos aut tres dominos dicere catholica religione prohibemur.

ii. *Divine Relationships in Scriptural Terms are unique, co-eternal, co-equal.* <sup>21</sup>Pater a nullo est, non factus nec creatus nec genitus: <sup>22</sup>filius a patre solo est, non factus nec creatus, sed genitus: <sup>23</sup>spiritus sanctus a patre et filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens. <sup>24</sup>Unus ergo pater, non tres patres; unus filius, non tres filii; unus spiritus sanctus, non tres spiritus sancti. <sup>25</sup>Et in hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil maius aut minus, <sup>26</sup>sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt et coaequales. <sup>27</sup>Ita ut per omnia, sicut iam supra dictum est, et trinitas in unitate et unitas in trinitate vueranda sit. <sup>28</sup>Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de trinitate sentiat.

II *The Incarnation.* <sup>29</sup>Sed necessarium est ad aeternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.

i. *We confess that Christ is in two Natures.* <sup>30</sup>Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur quia dominus noster Jesus Christus dei filius et deus pariter et homo est:

<sup>31</sup>deus est ex substantia patris ante saecula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in saeculo natus; <sup>32</sup>perfectus deus, perfectus homo ex anima rationabili et humana carne subsistens; <sup>33</sup>aequalis patri secundum divinitatem, minor patre secundum humanitatem:

ii. *Is one Person.* <sup>34</sup>qui licet deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed unus est Christus; <sup>35</sup>unus autem non conversione divinitatis in carne, sed adsumptione humanitatis in deo; <sup>36</sup>unus omnino non confusione substantiae, sed unitate personae. <sup>37</sup>Nam sicut anima rationabilis et caro unus est homo, ita deus et homo unus est Christus:

iii. *The Redeemer, The Judge.* <sup>38</sup>qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos, resurrexit a mortuis, <sup>39</sup>ascendit ad caelos, sedit ad dexteram patris, inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos. <sup>40</sup>Ad cuius adventum omnes

homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem; <sup>41</sup>et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam aeternam, qui mala in ignem aeternum. <sup>42</sup>Haec est fides catholica: quam nisi quis fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

Variants:

v. 1. "would"—"needful that he held fast."  
 v. 2. "a man have kept"—"eternally." v. 3. "Now"—"the one God as a Trinity, and the Trinity as an Unity." v. 4. "confusing." v. 5. "a Person"—*om.* "and." v. 6. "Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is one: their glory equal, their."  
 v. 8. "uncreated" (*ter*)—*om.* "and." v. 9. "infinite (*ter*)"—*om.* "and." v. 10. *om.* "and." v. 12. "they are not three uncreated nor three infinities; but one infinite, and one uncreated." v. 13. *om.* "and." v. 15. "the Son God: the Holy Ghost God." v. 17. *om.* "likewise"—*om.* "and." v. 18. "yet they are." v. 19. "to confess each of the Persons by himself to be both." v. 20. "to speak of three." v. 21. "of none: not made, nor created, nor begotten." v. 23. "and the Son: not made." v. 24. "There is therefore." v. 25. "before or after: none is greater or less" (*om.* "than another"). v. 26. "all three Persons are co-eternal one with another." v. 27. "all ways, as is aforesaid: both the Trinity is to be worshipped as an Unity, and the Unity as a Trinity." v. 28. "Let him therefore that would be saved: think thus." v. 29. "eternal"—"believe faithfully." v. 30. "The right Faith therefore"—"at once both God." v. 31. "He is God"—"and he is Man." v. 32. *om.* "and"—"of reasoning soul and human flesh consisting." v. 33. "Godhead: less than the Father." v. 34. "is one Christ." v. 35. "One, however, not by change of Godhead into flesh: but by taking of Manhood." v. 37. "as reasoning." v. 38. "to the world below"—*om.* "the third day." v. 39. "Ascended (*om.* "He") into heaven, sat down at the right hand of the Father: to come from thence to." v. 40. "deeds." v. 41. "will go into life eternal: they"—"eternal." v. 42. "have faithfully and steadfastly believed."

The teaching on the doctrine of the Trinity is here set forth on the lines made popular in the West by St. Augustine. It represents an important shifting of the centre of gravity, so to speak, as compared with the theology of the Nicene Creed. There the predominant interest is metaphysical, the battle of Nicaea raging round the word *homoousios*, "of one substance," which became a technical term in the argument for the essential Godhead of the Son. Here the predominant interest is psychological, and turns on the use of the term *person*, which was just the term that the Greek theologians lacked. St. Athanasius could say of the Divine Persons "another and another and another," but he lacked the term *Person*, which in its Latin form had been used by Tertullian, but with a legal flavour about it which somewhat spoiled it for subsequent use. In the eyes of a lawyer a *person* is one who has legal rights. Therefore a corporation may be a *person* in the eyes of the law, although only by a legal fiction. Perhaps it was in view of such legal associations that St. Augustine at first shrank from using the word, though he felt constrained to fall back on it.

**11. On the Trinity.**

represents an important shifting of the centre of gravity, so to speak, as compared with the theology of the Nicene Creed. There the predominant interest is metaphysical, the battle of Nicaea raging round the word *homoousios*, "of one substance," which became a technical term in the argument for the essential Godhead of the Son. Here the predominant interest is psychological, and turns on the use of the term *person*, which was just the term that the Greek theologians lacked. St. Athanasius could say of the Divine Persons "another and another and another," but he lacked the term *Person*, which in its Latin form had been used by Tertullian, but with a legal flavour about it which somewhat spoiled it for subsequent use. In the eyes of a lawyer a *person* is one who has legal rights. Therefore a corporation may be a *person* in the eyes of the law, although only by a legal fiction. Perhaps it was in view of such legal associations that St. Augustine at first shrank from using the word, though he felt constrained to fall back on it.

His *Confessions* mark a turning-point in the history of the human mind coming to self-consciousness. Led on by his striving after self-knowledge, he was led to analyse the thought of his limited human personality and to argue from it as to the existence of the Triune Divine Personality which is complete and infinite. Thus he found in his new philosophy, which was profoundly psychological and was closely akin to the tendencies of present-day thought, complete justification of the simpler teaching of earlier theologians, who had quoted without much questioning the teaching of the Bapt. Formula. I do not suggest that the words used (*person, substance, infinite*) are not metaphysical. No man living fails to be a metaphysician if he uses such terms at all. But it is quite a mistake to criticise the QV. as if its author were merely propounding a series of metaphysical conundrums. That is far from his purpose.

The author's method of stating what has been handed down to him as Catholic Faith and Bible Truth is as simple as it is effective.

**12. Exposition.** He leads us (1) to worship, for spiritual things can only be "spiritually discerned"; (2) because the eternal distinctions in the Godhead have been made known through the teaching both of the Lord and His App. about His Father and the Holy Ghost, he uses the term Trinity which had been sanctioned by the usage of the Ch. for more than two cents, not as explaining but as expressing the mystery. We dare not confuse the Persons as if God had revealed Himself first as one, then another. Nor dare we "divide the substance" by thinking of the Son or the Spirit as in any sense "created beings." We approach the mystery with awe. We dare not be wise "above that which is written." "I and the Father are one" (John 10 30). Therefore all the attributes—uncreated, infinite, eternal, almighty—which belong to the Father as God and Lord may be ascribed to the Son, and to the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son.

The Scriptural terms "Begotten" and "Proceeding," guarded by the repeated denial "not made nor created," are claimed for the Son and the Spirit as a further reason why we do right to confess each to be Lord and God, while we are forbidden to say three Gods or three Lords, worshipping the Unity in the Trinity.

On the Incarnation the teaching given is no less wise and weighty. The Incarnation must be believed loyally. There are

**13. On the Incarnation.**

tendencies common to the human mind everywhere and in every age which threaten to dissolve it into unreal theory. While Arians deny the true Divinity, the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, on the one side, Apollinarians take away from the perfect manhood on the other, by denial of the human soul in which the Lord touched the very heart of our nature, reasoning with human thoughts, albeit in the very effort limiting His mode of self-expression, willing to be in all points tempted

like as we are, willing in that human soul to go into the unseen world while His Body lay in the grave, sharing our condition even after the moment of His willing death, not regarding His equality with the Father as a prize to be grasped at, but humbling Himself in His Manhood. But this entailed no change of the Godhead into flesh, when the manhood was thus taken into God. The union of soul and body in one man is an illustration of the union of Godhead and Manhood in the One Christ.

The tone of the passage is still anti-Apollinarian. The heresies associated with the names of Nestorius and Eutyches, though in the air, had not been elaborately developed. The former, whether Nestorius himself was guilty of it or not, as taught by his followers, minimised the Divine Glory of Christ, asserting a union of the Man Jesus with the eternal Son, and therefore required a more elaborate assertion of the unity of His Person. The latter, beginning from violent reaction against such minimising, taught the virtual absorption of the Manhood in the Godhead, which was equally hostile to a balanced doctrine of the Incarnation. The clauses which guard against these errors are by no means out of date and need to be kept sounding in the Church.

The warning (or damnatory) clauses are intended to teach the Scriptural principle that

#### 14. The Warning Clauses.

a man is responsible for his beliefs which must in the long run mould and colour his actions. The parable of the two ways (Matt. 7 13, 14) leading to life and to death stands at the back of clause 41 about going into eternal life or eternal fire. These are Scriptural metaphors which have been interpreted spiritually and in a materialistic sense. But the mistakes of commentators, and even the probable bias of the author of the QV. himself towards a wrong method of interpretation, need not deter us from supplying a better. The case is otherwise with clause 2, which is the great crux of the formulary as an expression of the mind of the Ch. We acknowledge that our Blessed Lord made statements which He left it to men to qualify as need required—"Give to him that asketh thee" and "Resist not evil" are well-known instances. And in the words of Professor Mozley, "Just as *moral instruction* requires its liberty of speech, and has modes of statement which must not be tied to the letter, so has *judicial and condemnatory language*."<sup>1</sup> So it is quite reasonable that we should agree to put a gloss on the words which urge us to preserve the faith and hold it undefiled on pain of eternally perishing. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness," and from the heart proceed the evil thoughts which tempt to sin, so that any weakening of the foundations of faith at the same moment weakens the convictions of morality. But it is not possible to read within the lines of the tremendous statement, "without doubt shall perish eternally," any

hope that the writer could tolerate such an explanation as that given by Canon Newbolt: "Surely they do not mean that every soul at the Last Day will have to give a strict account of his adhesion to terms such as *incomprehensible, substance, Person*, and the like which perhaps he does not understand." Most people agree with Canon Newbolt, but they cannot find a loophole for such an interpretation in words which seem almost chosen to exclude it. Thus weak consciences are caused to stumble, and the need for some alteration of the use becomes urgent, because we cannot be always teaching that we claim our right in this instance to qualify the statement and to bring it into harmony with the Revealed Truth that God "willeth all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," and that when self-will rejects all the overtures of His mercy it will stand self-condemned because it has sinned against light and love. But we refer the judgment to God, and therefore shrink from all appearance of judging those who through invincible ignorance fail to accept the truth here and now.

Further information may be obtained from the following: D. Waterland, *A Critical Hist. of the Ath. Creed*, Oxf. Ed., 1870; G. D. W. Ommanney, *Dissertation on the Ath. Creed*, 1897; Bp. E. C. S. Gibson, *The Three Creeds*, 1908; A. E. Burn, *An Intr. to the Creeds*, 1899, and *Facsimiles of the Creeds (HBS)*, 1908.—U3. A. E. BURN.

**QUIET DAY.**—QDs., in their modern form, are of comparatively recent origin in the Ch., but the Table of Fast<sup>s</sup> in the PB points to one of their essential elements—the withdrawal of the mind (as much as possible) from mundane and bodily pleasures to the stricter contemplation of divine things. The spirit of the QD. has always existed among devout souls (cp. Mark 6 31) in the desire to gain spiritual refreshment and to deepen personal communion with God. One of the essentials of such a day is that it should be *quiet*, save for the united utterance of praise and pr., and the instructions of the conductor. Ordinary conversation is suspended until the last common meal is partaken, and even then it is restrained. The dominant feature is the contemplation of the deep things of God, and the formation of resolutions finding their outcome in greater practical obedience to the will of God.

QDs. are now held at many centres (often with direct episcopal encouragement and sometimes conducted by the bp. himself) for ordinands—immediately prior to ordination itself (usually in the Ember seasons)—and for men and women (frequently in Lent and Advent). The common desire of all who attend should be to gain deeper knowledge of God's will in their own lives and a clearer insight into their own motives and conduct, to amend their ways to the glory of God, and to develop their own usefulness as His servants and members of His Church.

The *Conductor* is a bp. or priest. He officiates at all the services and gives a series of addresses (based upon some of the theological mysteries or a portion of Holy Writ), his great aim being to awaken contrition in the hearts of his hearers and dispose them

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 194.

to the future service of God. Consequently, some portion of the time not otherwise occupied is given to private spiritual conferences between him and his hearers; such conferences being often of the nature of those prescribed in the last paragraph of Exh.<sup>1</sup> at HC.

All assemble at the guest-house on the previous evening, when Evensong is said, followed by the Conductor's introductory address indicating the general tenor of his instructions and emphasising the chief points upon which he will subsequently dilate. The day itself opens with a celebration of the HC, followed by breakfast, a short interval, and then Mattins with the first address. A time of quiet follows for private meditation and interviews, and then the midday meal, often preceded by the short office of SEXT. In the early afternoon the second address follows (with or without one of the HOUR offices), and, after tea, Evensong with the concluding address. An alternative Order for a Parochial QD. might be as follows: 8 a.m. HC, 10.30 a.m. MP and 1st Address, 12.30 p.m. Lit. and brief INSTRUCTION, 3 p.m. Metrical Lit. and 2nd Address, 5 p.m. EP and 3rd Address. It is well for hearers to make short notes of the addresses as they are delivered; these are useful for recalling the main topics of thought.

In an age like the present these opportunities of spiritual retreat are becoming increasingly valued (especially by the clergy) as a wholesome antidote to the many distractions of an over-busy, hurried life. Sensibly and simply used, they are an abundant help to those who in quietness and confidence desire to renew their strength by waiting upon God.—Pf. H. E. SCOTT.

**QUIGNON'S BREVIARY.**—This work exercised a considerable influence on the construction of the English PB. The need of a

**1. Origin.** a simplification and purification of the Roman Breviary had been felt

by many devout members of the Roman Church in the early years of the sixteenth century; and on the mandate of Clement VII the work was undertaken by Cardinal Francisco de Quiñones (known generally in this country as Quignon), a Spaniard of noble birth, a member, and formerly General, of the Franciscan Order, and a much esteemed councillor of the Emperor Charles V. He engaged on the task in 1529, and the result of his labours appeared at Rome on 1st March, 1535. By July, 1536, no fewer than six editions (Rome, Venice, two at Paris, Antwerp) had been issued. The title of the first edition was *Breviarium Romanum ex sacra potissimum Scriptura et probatis sanctorum historiis constans*. The sweeping character of the changes made by Q. roused violent opposition; and more particularly his omission of *antiphons*, and the reducing of the number of Lessons on all days alike to three, were strongly censured by the Theological Faculty of Paris. Q. yielded to pressure, and in a second form of his book he re-inserted antiphons. But the fortunes of this remarkable work, with its suppression by the Pope Paul IV in 1568, do not concern us; it is of importance to English Churchmen because of the influence of the first form on the PB and the taking over from it and embodying, in the prefatory matter of the PB, considerable parts of Q.'s Preface.

Before a PB in the English tongue had been considered, Cranmer had made preparations for a reformed Latin Breviary, much on

**2. Description.** the lines of Q., and his attempt is now preserved among the MSS. of the British Museum. In the document in our PB, now entitled *Concerning the Service of the Church* (up to 1662 entitled *The Preface*), free use is made of Q.'s Pref., and some of the paragraphs are little more than a slightly modified translation of the Latin. The most characteristic features of Q.'s Breviary are thus described by himself. There is a return to the practice of the "old fathers" in the reading of Holy Scripture, by omitting antiphons, *capitula*, responsories, many hymns, and other things of a like kind, which impeded the reading of the Scripture. Of the OT the most useful and weighty books are read. These include the greater part of the Prophets, the whole of Genesis and Deuteronomy, the greater part of Exodus, portions of Joshua, the Proverbs, and the whole of 1 Samuel. Of the NT nothing is omitted except nearly all of the Apocalypse. The first lesson is taken from the OT, the second from the NT, and the third Lesson also from the NT, unless when on a Saint's day the history of the saint is read. The histories of the saints Q. draws from approved authors, Greek as well as Latin; he frees these histories from those features which had sometimes aroused "the contempt and derision of the readers," and he claims to write them in a less rude style than that of the old Breviaries. The few hymns retained are those of greatest weight and authority. The Pss. are all said once a week, but they are distributed in such a way as to give three to each service of the canonical hours; and this he contrasts with the then prevailing practice of omitting most of the Pss. and repeating a few throughout nearly the whole year. He complains of the perplexing rules of the old Breviary, so that "there is sometimes little less labour in finding out what is to be read than in reading it when it is found out." The varying dates of Easter and the movable feasts make it impossible to dispense altogether with rules "of which the former Breviary was so full that scarce a lifetime would suffice for thoroughly mastering them" (the "Rules called the *Pie*," *Concerning the Service of the Church* in the PB), but he endeavours to make the rules so few and so clear that it will be easy to understand them. The Office of the Virgin is no longer to be said daily, but only on Saturdays (if a feast does not fall on that day), and at Matins and Vespers there is to be a daily commemoration of the Virgin in lieu of the Office. He reiterates the importance of "the continuous reading of the Holy Scriptures." He declares that he had aimed not at brevity, but at usefulness and convenience, yet as a matter of fact though the Lessons are longer there are fewer of them, and this with the omission of versicles, responsories, and antiphons, makes the recitation of the Office shorter.

Q. concludes his Pref. with words which were followed in the old Pref. of the PB and which were omitted only in 1662 (an omission which on historical grounds is to be regretted). It will be best to cite the words as they appear in the old Pref. of the PB: "And if any would judge this way more painful (*laboriosum*, Q.) because that all things must be read upon the book, whereas before, by the reason of so often repetition, they could say many things by heart (*memoriter*, Q.); if those men will weigh their labour with the profit in knowledge, which daily they shall obtain by reading upon the book, they will not refuse the pain in consideration of the great profit that shall ensue thereof."

The placing of the Conf. and Absol. (in the PB of 1552) at the opening of Matins and Evensong had been anticipated in the first form of Q.'s Breviary.

It will be seen that the English Reformers went further than Q. Not only were antiphons and

3. **Comparison with PB.** Responsories ("responds," PB) to the Lessons omitted, but also the invitatory which Q. had retained. The third Lesson with histories of the saints disappears, and the Lessons were confined to Holy Scripture, including some parts of the Apocrypha. The weekly recitation of the Psalter was not adopted; and the Office and commemorations of the Virgin were omitted. All hymns disappear.

The first form of Q.'s Breviary has been edited by Dr. J. Wickham Legg (Cambridge, 1888), and the text of the second form, under

4. **Bibliography.** the same editor, was published (1908) by the HBS. The Latin text of various parts of Q.'s Pref. corresponding to parts of *Concerning the Service of the Church*, as it now stands, are exhibited in Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*. The whole of Q.'s Pref. is printed, together with the censure of the book by the University of Paris, in Guéranger's *Institutions Liturgiques* 1 397-403. See also Batifol's *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain* 220-227; J. M. Neale's *Essays on Liturgiology*, p. 3.—B. J. DOWDEN.

**QUINQUAGESIMA.**—See FESTIVAL, § 15; SEPTUAGESIMA (RATIONALE OF SERVICES), § 3.

**QUIRE (or CHOIR).**—Originally meaning a body of singers, the word came to mean the part of the church occupied by them. In the basilicas of the early Church, while the bishop and clergy occupied the apse behind the altar, it soon became the custom to provide an enclosed Q. in front of it where the chanters sang the service. In England before the Reformation, the Q. was always in the eastern part of the church in front of the altar. Western galleries for singers are first met with in the reign of Elizabeth. In many churches there was both vocal and instrumental music in the roodloft across the chancel arch, but it would seem that these pieces of music were additional to the liturgical service itself and consisted of what we should now call "voluntaries" and "anthems" (then called MOTETS), and the performers were regarded as minstrels rather than as a Choir. It may be remarked that the metrical Pss. introduced by the Reformers were equally external to the liturgical service. The service itself was sung in the chancel by the parish clerk alone, or with the assistance of such boys, men, chantry-priests, etc., as were available. In many Benedictine churches, and all Cistercian, the part east of the transepts was so short as only to afford space for the sacarium, while the Q. was placed either entirely west of the transepts (Westminster, St. Alban's, etc.), or extended across the transepts and somewhat west of them (Winchester, Gloucester, etc.); but in most churches of Canons Regular, and in almost all of Canons Secular, the Q. was east of the principal transept, and a second smaller transept sometimes came between the Q. and the SACRARIUM (Lincoln, Salisbury, Southwell, etc.). In the rubric: "InQUIRES and places where they sing,"

etc.—the word *quire* is [thought by Mr. Micklethwaite to denote those large churches, cathedral or collegiate, where there is a permanent staff of trained singers: but the word is more commonly used as synonymous with CHANCEL.—R6.

A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**RAILS.**—Altar R. were unknown in England until after the Reformation. Abp. Laud introduced them in 1636. He directed that all altar-tables should be removed from the nave where they had met with much indignity, placed in their ancient position within the chancel, and railed off for the sake of greater reverence. Altar R. were almost everywhere destroyed during the Commonwealth, and there are very few Pre-Commonwealth R. now in existence. New R. were re-erected however during the latter part of the 17th cent., and are now almost universal not only in the Church of England but also among Nonconformists. Anterior to Laud's time kneeling benches of wood were used, and are still in existence in some churches, e.g., Wimborne Minster; these, however, generally fell into disuse after the introduction of R. Altar R. are made in iron, brass and wood, with metal or wooden supports.—R5.

G. VALE OWEN.

**RATES AND TAXES.**—"My duty towards my neighbour" may be called to mind anent this subject.

1. **Local Rates.**—Local and county rates such as Poor, Highway, Sanitation, Education, Prison, Courts of Justice, Asylum Rates, etc., who does not feel the burden of them? As society becomes more complex, these various charges tend to multiply and to increase. It is important for ratepayers, and especially the clergy, to understand what purposes these various rates are intended to serve, how they are assessed, computed, notified, collected, and what are the legal allowances and deductions. It is important for a man of education, appointed by the Ch. to be a public teacher, not to weaken his influence by aimless and foolish railing against rates. The writer would advise such to work up the subject of local taxation, mainly through his own experience supplemented by reading. He will find ample opportunities of employing his knowledge to promote peace among his people, and soothe the anxieties of the less instructed. And it will be well if his neighbours and parishioners, who have knowledge, are encouraged to share it with others.

The Poor rate dates from the time of Queen Elizabeth, and was consequent on the dissolution of the monasteries. It is an integral part of the modern social system. It aims at discouraging begging, vagrancy, idleness, want of work, and so forth. We are instructed on the highest authority that we have the poor always with us. So we have the Poor rate as a permanent claimant, but it is devoutly to be wished that the Poor Law system may have speedy and drastic improvement, and that economy may be effected in what are called "Establishment Charges."

2. **Imperial Taxes.**—Security of life and property, personal liberty, equal laws, respect for the rights of conscience—these and other national blessings we enjoy, as subjects of the King. In return, at the beginning of the year, the Chancellor of the Exchequer sends in his bill for Income, Property, Land and other taxes, charges which are essential in order to provide a fund for the good conduct of the country. Not every Briton loves to see the bill, but as a loyal subject he pays. He wants to maintain the national defences. Imperial,



like local, taxation is a large subject, the fringe of which can be only touched in this place, but the suggestion may be offered here also that every intelligent subject should endeavour to learn what are the sources of his country's revenue.

Eccles. property and clerical incomes are subject to local and imperial charges like other property of the same class, except that Consecrated Churches are exempted from Poor rates; and that half the rates on Tithe and Glebe are provided out of the Consolidated Fund, in the same way as for other landed property; see Tithe Rent Charge (Rates) Act, 1899.—A6. J. S. WILSDEN.

**READER.**—In the subapostolic Ch., side by side with the regular threefold ministry, there was a charismatic ministry of persons described as evangelists, prophets, teachers, and readers (see **EVANGELIST, CATECHIST**). The R.'s duties were to read the scriptures, and possibly to interpret them, and to read homilies. The R. is mentioned by Justin, and in the *Apost. Ch. Order* (c. 300) he ranks next to the presbyter. But in the West, in the time of Tertullian, he already ranks below the deacon, and the office was gradually depressed till it became one of the minor clerical orders, and was conferred on boys in the *schola cantorum* as a step towards the priesthood.

In the Middle Ages, especially in the 13th cent., the work of the parish clergy was supplemented by that of the friars, who as laymen were allowed to preach; and, from the 4th cent. onwards, the lay *clericus* or clerk had a recognised position. In England such laymen, the forerunners of our Parish **CLERKS** and Cathedral singers, often fulfilled most of the duties of the Minor Orders. Owing to the dearth of clergy in the early years of the reign of Elizabeth, an attempt was made by Parker to establish an order of Readers, but it did not prove satisfactory.

In the 19th cent. the development of church life, and of society generally, called forth a vast amount of lay help, both at home and in the mission field. This was necessitated partly by the deficiency of clergy and partly by the need of relieving them of work more suitably done by laymen. The need of defining, regulating, and recognising this work was felt; and various provincial or diocesan synods, individual bishops, and missionary societies have drawn up regulations defining conditions of appointment to, and the duties involved in, the various offices of evangelist, catechist, sub-deacon, reader. In 1904 a committee of Conv. drew up a short but exhaustive report on the whole question (Nat. Soc., No. 383), and in 1905 the Abps. and Bps. issued their *Regulations respecting Rs. and other Lay Officers* (SPCK), a document which, though it makes the office of R. merely diocesan or even parochial, may be said to have advanced the movement by regulating it and giving it official sanction.

The whole subject of lay work was discussed at the Pan-Anglican Conference of 1908 (cp. Pan-Anglican Papers, *The Call of the Ch. to Laymen*). The chief need at present is to define

lay work and to differentiate it from that of the clergy, so that each may develop on its own lines and supplement the other, and that the activities of the Ch. may be neither clerical nor secular but catholic. The verdict of history shows that lay readership should not be regarded as an apprenticeship to Holy Orders, or a cheap substitute for the regular ministry, and that a priest should not be a mere lay worker in black clothes, and commanding a higher salary. With more definite development of lay work will come a more efficient training and an improvement in the status of readers. This development is being largely effected by the work of the C.E.M.S., while questions of recognition, training, organisation, etc., are considered annually at a representative Conference of Lay Readers (Reports in *The Lay Reader*, the quasi-official organ of the movement, Simpkin, Marshall & Co.). For literature, see **MINOR ORDERS.**—A3. CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

**READING.**—It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of clear, distinct and impressive R. in the conduct of Divine Service. A

**1. Importance of Good Reading.** well-known passage in Hooker sets forth that R. a lesson is the execution of the very office of preaching (*EP* v. 31), and that the efficacy which the Puritans attributed mainly to sermons, those for whom he spake attributed to R. also. In the introductory chapter to the PB, "Concerning the Service of the Church," it is shown that the Reformers exercised great care that the R. of Holy Scripture should be so set forth that all things should be done in order without breaking one piece from another, *i.e.*, that the R. of the Bible should be continuous and regular. In the opinion of those best able to judge, the R. of the lessons has been a most effective part of Divine service. But the effect obviously depends largely upon the way in which they are read. Men were drawn to attend daily service for the sake of hearing the late F. D. Maurice read the lessons. On the other hand, it is to be feared that many have been repelled by the hurried and bad R. to be heard in some churches.

There are those who think that a good reader is born, not made; but of late years increasing attention has been paid to methods

**2. Training.** of training speakers and readers in voice production, distinct enunciation, good pronunciation and expression without artificial stagginess.

The first essential is to master the method of *breathing* correctly. Inhalation should be normally

**3. Breathing.** through the nose, with the mouth shut, or with the soft palate raised at the back to block the mouth passage.

The abdomen should swell out and the swelling spread from the abdomen to the ribs. The shoulders should not be raised. We all breathe naturally when we are lying down, and it is well, therefore, to begin the practice of inhalation in this attitude.

Exhalation should be slow and steady, through the open mouth. The breath should not be allowed to escape hastily, but kept under control. Wrong breathing is the cause of much throat trouble.

Suitable exercises to form the habit of breathing correctly will be found in text-books (see below).

In *Enunciation* the reader should aim at two things: (a) that his R. should be audible, and (b) his utterance as agreeable and as free from peculiarities as possible. There should be plenty of practice in the pure production of the different vowel sounds. The common tendency is for certain vowel sounds to be produced more faintly than others, though the reader is not aware of this.

If it is possible to make a phonograph record of our own speech we shall be surprised at our unsuspected defects, and we shall learn better than by any other means what are the faults we have to cure. The bad but common habit of dropping the voice at the end of a sentence should be guarded against. There is no reason why a lower tone should not be adopted without lessening the amount of resonance. A good reader can make a whisper audible to his audience. A candid friend at the back of the church is the best helper in this matter. Let me impress this strongly, for more of us are guilty of this fault than we generally suspect. The tone should be neither too high nor too low, but that medium tone which is most natural and easy to the reader, and from which he can rise or fall, as may be desired.

To intersperse R. or speaking with unmeaning vowel sounds is another bad habit which may be overcome by care and watchfulness. The speed of utterance should be carefully regulated. It is very difficult to follow a rapid speaker, and very few can read rapidly without losing clearness and distinct enunciation. A slow, halting delivery is the fault in the other extreme. On the other hand, the rate should not be mechanically uniform, but should vary naturally with the subject-matter, a change of speed being one of the most effective means of expression (see further below).

The correct *Pronunciation* of words is another element in good R. The standard of what is correct

**5. Pronunciation.** may be found in the usage of well-educated people, whose speech is free from provincialisms and vulgarisms. Much may be learned by listening to good readers and observing their pronunciation of words and names. Reference to the Greek Test. would save many mis-pronunciations of proper names. It may be well to add a caution against pedantry. The received pronunciation of some proper names is doubtless incorrect, but custom and long usage have sanctioned it, and it is better to be guided by them.

Everyone will feel the importance of R. Scripture with due *Expression*. We do not want a monotonous chant, still less a hurried gabble. Nor

**6. Expression.** do we want the reader to give the impression that the passage is of no special interest to him or to anyone else. Yet these styles are not unknown in our churches. On the other hand, a highly dramatic style of R. is not suitable in Divine worship, and is apt to defeat its own end by producing irreverence and detracting from the sacred character of the Bible. The Word of God must not be treated as if it were the word of man. At the same time, we rightly desire that the reader should show a sympathetic appreciation of the passage, and should convey to his hearers the solemnity, the beauty and the depth of its meaning. To do this, it is essential that he should himself feel, as much as possible, its meaning and beauty. This implies a previous and careful study of the passage to be read. The writer believes this to be quite essential, especially for beginners, and ventures to press it strongly. He would add that a short ejaculatory pr. while walking to the lectern, that the

Holy Spirit may bless what is read to the good of the hearers, has the reflex action of solemnising the reader and putting him in the right spirit for his office.

The mechanical side of expression lies in the right management of the voice. The chief elements are Inflection, Modulation, Emphasis, and Phrasing. By the variation of these expression is produced.

*Inflection* is the ascent or descent of the voice to a higher or lower note. It does not imply that the tone is louder or softer, but it is the variation from monotone. The

**7. Inflection.** Rising Inflection carries on the attention of the hearer to what is to follow, while the Falling Inflection denotes the completion of the statement; e.g., "Quit you like mén, be strông." "Cast thy bread upon the wáters: for thou shalt find it after many days." "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wóol."

It is not possible within the limits of this art. to specify the cases in which the Rising or Falling Inflection should be used. The reader must refer to the under-mentioned books. After all it is largely a matter of rhythm to which the ear becomes attuned by practice.

*Modulation* is effected by changes of Tone and of Time. For convenience sake we may speak of three

Tones: High, Medium and Low. The **8. Modulation.** Medium Tone is that of habitual utterance. The Low Tone is expressive of deep feeling, and may be used with advantage in passages of pathos, solemnity and awe, e.g., the description of the Holy City (Rev. 21 22-27). The High Tone is expressive of strong emotion, joyous feelings and animated description, e.g., Is. 35. With the difference of Tone goes also the change of Time. It is natural that the High Tone should be accompanied by a quicker time and the Low by a slower.

Next we come to the very important point of *Emphasis*. The meaning of a passage may easily

be obscured or changed by emphasis **9. Emphasis.** being laid upon the wrong words.

On the other hand, there are passages the meaning of which cannot be clearly brought out unless emphasis is laid upon the right words. See Romans 4 9 ff. as a good example of this and also an instance of a passage which calls forth the skill of the best readers. It may be well to add that too much emphasis savours of the grotesque and defeats its own object. A common fault is to emphasise pronouns, which, as a rule, are not the emphatic words in a sentence. One often hears the commandments read with the emphasis on the words "Thou" and "not" instead of on the name of the sin: "Thou shalt not steal."

Lastly, careful attention is needed about *Phrasing*, i.e., the grouping together of related words. Smaller

groups are thus readily indicated by a slight prolongation of the last syllable, but without necessarily emphasising it. Larger groups may need an actual break in the voice. Experience and the watching of good readers will teach how this is done. But it should be noted that the punctuation, which is a purely grammatical device, is very little guide to phrasing. Many commas should be absolutely ignored in reading, and, on the other hand, good phrasing requires prolongations of syllables and pauses where there is no stop at all.

It remains to mention some of the most common faults against which the reader should guard. These are: (1) failure to sound the final consonant, especially in words ending in *d* and *t*; (2) the omission of the final *g* in words ending in *ing*; (3) the

#### 11. Some Common Faults.

carrying on of the final consonant and prefixing it to the beginning of the next word when that word has a vowel for its first letter, e.g., "We have heard with our (r)ears." (The writer heard this clause in the Lit. read thus for some weeks in a church he attended.) An opposite blunder is to make it "our (y)ears." These may seem small matters, but they may good Reading.

Above all, it is necessary to take pains and to keep the attention fixed. But, when we consider how much R. and speaking enter into the work of the clergy, is it not worth while to spend time and trouble upon making them as good as possible?

Literature: Burrell, *Plain Reading and Good Speaking*; Prof. Wyld, *The Teaching of Reading*; Garry, *Elocution, Voice and Gesture*.—Te.

MORLEY STEVENSON.

**READING DESK.**—Bp. Sparrow states that, previous to Cromwell's time, what was then termed the "reading pew" had a double purpose, as signified by the two desks with which the pew was furnished. One of these was for the reading of the Prs. and faced towards the East, and the other for the reading of the Lessons faced towards the body of the church. The Advertisements of Abp. Parker were drawn up by the command of Elizabeth expressed in a letter dated Jan. 25, 1565, and were issued in the year following. These merely ordered that "the Common Prayer be said or sung decently and distinctly, in such place as the Ordinary shall think meet for the largeness and straightness of the church and choir, so that the people may be edified." The canons of 1604 are even less definite. Canon 82, after giving directions regarding the Communion-table and other matters, adds, in almost a casual manner, "and likewise that a convenient seat be made for the Minister to read service in." The Rubric prefixed to MP (which rubric assumed its present form in 1559) directs that it shall be said "in the accustomed place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel," but does not specify any spot in the building from which it shall be read. The only reference to the RD. in the PB is in the rubric at the beginning of the Communion Service which is to be read in "the Reading Pew or Pulpit."

The reason why the RD. which is so prominent a feature in our churches to-day, received so scant notice in earlier times is probably to be found in the fact that in Pre-Reformation days the Service of the Altar had much more prominence over all other services in both the popular and the clerical mind than subsequently. The popularisation of Matins and Evensong has invested the RD. with an importance it did not formerly enjoy.—R3.

G. VALE OWEN.

**REAL PRESENCE.**—See BLACK RUBRIC.

**RE-BAPTISM.**—The Sacr. of Bapt. may be administered only once to each individual. This directly follows (a) from its object—incorporation into the body of Christ; (b) from the figures under which it is described in the NT—new birth (John 3 5), burial with Christ (Rom. 6 4), etc.; (c) from such texts as 1 Cor.

12 13, Eph. 4 5. The above principle has always been acknowledged in the Ch., but at times difficulties have arisen as to its practical application. Christians are universally agreed that the proper matter of the Sacr. is water, and that the proper form must contain the words "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28 19). But is the *minister* of the essence of the Sacr.? Is Bapt. valid when administered (a) by a *layman*, (b) by a *heretic*? For (a), see LAY BAPTISM. With regard to (b), a great controversy arose in the 3rd cent. between Cyprian and Stephen, Bp. of Rome, the former of whom denied, the latter affirmed, the validity of heretical Bapt. The main original authorities for this controversy are Cyprian (*Eps.* 69-75), Eusebius (*HE* vii. 2-9), and the anonymous treatise *De Rebaptismate*. The conclusion finally arrived at was that Bapt. administered by any baptised person with the right matter and form is valid, though it may be irregular. And this conclusion has been generally accepted in the Ch. of England.

The difficulty arising from cases of doubt as to whether a person has been baptised or not has been solved by *Hypothetical* Bapt. (see BAPTISMAL OFFICES, § 31).—ID.

J. W. TYRER.

### RE-CONSECRATION.

Re-consecration is the common, though hardly appropriate, term applied to the consecration of a fresh supply of bread or wine, or of both elements, necessitated by the number of communicants being larger than had been anticipated. What was done in the early Ch. in such a case we do not know; most likely it very seldom happened, as the customs then prevailing made it needful to consecrate in very large quantities for purposes of RESERVATION. There are obviously greater objections against consecrating a large quantity of wine than a large quantity of bread, and, accordingly, it is in connection with the former that we first hear of Re-consecration. About the 8th cent., it was customary to pour fresh wine into the chalice, and this wine was believed to be consecrated at once by mixture with what was already consecrated (so Mabilon's Third *Ordo Romanus*). This belief was not likely to last long after the idea that the Words of Institution were the *form* of the Euch. had become firmly established, and with the belief the practice would naturally die out.

In the Ch. of Eng. bef. the Reformation the question of Re-consecration was of little practical importance, as communions were infrequent, and Reservation covered exceptional cases. But the *cautels* of the Sar. Missal provided that if, after the celebrant had communicated in one kind, he found out that he had been officiating without wine in the chalice, though it would be better for him to start again with consecrating both kinds, still, to avoid possible scandal, he might merely put wine and water into the chalice and consecrate them, beginning with the words, "*Simili modo posteaquam*

*cœnatum est,*" i.e., "Likewise after supper" (Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy of the Ch. of Eng.*, 3rd ed., p. 243).

The principle underlying the latter part of this *cautel* was developed in the *Order of the Communion*, 1548, where communion in both kinds was restored to the laity after three cents. of disuse. The chalices of those days being small, the priest was ordered, on days of general communion, to consecrate the "biggest chalice, or some fair and convenient cup or cups," and, if necessary, re-consecrate, beginning with the words "*Simili modo*." The PBs of 1549 and 1552 contained no order with regard to Re-consecration, but canon 21 of 1604 provided that "no bread or wine newly brought shall be used; but first the words of Institution shall be rehearsed when the said bread and wine be present upon the communion-table." This provision was developed in the Scottish PB of 1637, and still more in the rubric of our present PB. With regard to the latter it is to be observed that:—(1) it assumes the possibility and lawfulness of bread and wine being consecrated separately; (2) it assumes *either* that the Words of Institution are the *form* of consecration, *or* that the previous Pr. "embraces in its intention all the bread and wine on which the Priest may afterwards lay his hand, the second supply no less than the first." On the other hand, the *Scottish Communion Office* and the Amer. PB, with far greater propriety, require, for a re-consecration, (1) *both* elements to be consecrated together, (2) the *whole* of the main part of the Pr. of Consecr. to be said over them.

(Scudamore, *NE*, pp. 707 ff., 760 ff.; *DCA*, art. *Consecration (Eucharistic)*; Dowden, *ASCO.*, pp. 222-3; *Commentaries on BCP.*)—HZ.

J. W. TYRER.

**RECTOR.**—The normal title of a parish priest is R. The Bp., being the person to whom the spiritual government of the diocese belongs, devolves, always subject (under necessary conditions) to correction and oversight, the government in spiritual things of a part of the diocese, the parish, to the priest whom he institutes to the cure of Souls. Neither Bp. nor parish priest is a "lord over God's heritage," but, nevertheless, they both represent, to the souls they have to care for, the kingly, as well as the priestly and prophetic, functions of the great Head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ. The idea of spiritual government is that which is involved in the expression of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (13 17), "Obey them that have the rule over you"—*οἱ ἡγουμένοι*—one of the instances of the application in that Epistle of political terms to the Christian Society. Such government is, of course, constitutional, not in any sense arbitrary, though some details must depend upon the reasonable discretion of the person who has the grave responsibility of ruling. But he must rule in strict accord with the canons, traditions and customs of the Ch.

The words of institution express this, "We do by these presents commit unto you the Cure and Government of the Souls of the parishioners of the said Parish." (See also *INCUMBENT.*)—  
ta. E. G. WOOD.

**RED-LETTER DAYS.**—See **FESTIVAL**, § 3.

**REFRESHMENT SUNDAY.**—See **LENT**, § 4.

**REGENERATION.**—(The Biblical doctrine). The word *Regeneration* (*παλιγγενεσία*) occurs only twice in the Bible; Matt.

1. **Word and Idea.** 19 28 ("In the regeneration . . . ye shall sit on thrones"), and Titus 3 5 ("the laver," or "bath," "of regeneration"). This latter alone, of the two, seems to refer to personal New Birth. But the idea occurs very frequently under various but converging phraseology. Thus we have it in connection with the word *Birth*. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God . . . Except he be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter, etc. . . . That which is born of the Spirit is spirit . . . Ye must be born again . . . So is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3 3-8; cp. John 1 13). "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God . . . Everyone that loveth is born of God . . . Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world . . . Whosoever is born of God sinneth not" (1 John 3 9, 4 7, 5 1, 4, 18). "Being born again . . . of incorruptible seed, by means of the word of God" (1 Pet. 1 23). The practically identical imagery of *begetting* appears Jas. 1 18: "Of His own will He begat us, with the word of truth," and 1 Pet. 1 3: "He hath begotten us again to a living hope."

It appears too in the very numerous passages where a *filial relation* with God, above that of nature or creation, is predicated of Christians.

2. **Kindred Terms.** Thus, "What manner of love hath the Father bestowed upon us that we should be called the children of God! . . . Now are we children of God." "In this" (by not sinning and by sinning) "the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (1 John 3 1, 2, 10). "As many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God . . . The Spirit beareth witness with our Spirit that we are the children of God . . . The . . . creation waiteth for . . . the liberty of the glory of the sons of God" (Rom. 8 14, 16, 21). The same class of ideas is before us where a spiritual revolution is shown under other imagery. Thus, "A *new heart* . . . and a *new spirit* I will put within you" (Ezek. 36 26); "If any man be in Christ he is a *new creation*" (2 Cor. 5 17; cp. Gal. 6 15). So too, of course, where a divine gift of new life is spoken of without imagery. Thus, "The Son quickeneth (giveth life to) whom He will" (John 5 21); "You hath He quickened, who were dead in sins" (Eph. 2 1); "He that hath the Son hath the life" (the "eternal life" just mentioned), "and he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life" (1 John 5 11, 12). We may group under the same head the great range of passages which dwell on the Christian's life "*in Christ*" as against a previous and contrasted state; e.g., Rom. 16 7: "They were in Christ before me." Compare too the distinction, broad and deep, between.

the "spiritual" man and others, as in 1 Cor. 2 14, 15 : "The natural (lit. *psychical*) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," etc. A like contrast appears in the words of the Lord Himself (Matt. 11 27) : "No one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."

Viewed as a whole, this representative collection of Scriptures gives us the following main elements of a doctrine of R. *First*,

**3. Doctrine Summarised.**

the mysterious need that man, to be right with God, should pass through a spiritual change so great, so deep, as to demand expression in terms not of amendment but of a new vital departure, the gift of a new vitality and its issues. Adequately to weigh this element, we need to weigh with something like adequacy the Scripture doctrine of Sin, original and actual, and, yet more, to understand conviction of sin in experience. *Then*, we find the change in question presented as (at least ideally) critical, decisive. This is not to say that the consciousness of it must always be so; but, from the Divine side certainly, it is as true an epoch as natural begetting or natural birth can be. *Further*, it appears everywhere as a thing not dormant or potential but actual and with results; the "sound of the wind" is "heard" when it breathes; "the children of God are manifest"; they "love," "do righteousness," "overcome the world," "are led by the Spirit." *Further*, the mystery (which is thus also so operative a fact) is bound up with the work of the Spirit as Life-Giver and with Christ as Life. Vital union with Christ by the Spirit is Regeneration, is New Creation.

The relation of Regeneration thus viewed to holy BAPTISM (see John 3 5, Titus 3 5) is not our subject here. Enough to express our conviction that the relation is real and sacred, while yet it cannot be such as to obscure the magnificent directness and simplicity of such words as those of John 1 12, 1 John 5 1. And to view the Sacrs. as supremely the Divine seals to faith of the New Covenant of grace seems to us best to secure the true relation; cp. BAPTISM, §§ 10-14; RELIGION, § 8 ff.—*Id.*

HANDLEY MOULE.

**REGISTRAR (BISHOP'S).**—The R. is appointed by the Bp. by letters patent under seal, usually for the term of the R.'s life. The R.'s presence is necessary for the due performance of any judicial act done by or on behalf of the Bp.: and it is the R.'s duty to conduct the business of the CONSISTORY COURT of the diocese subject to the directions of the CHANCELLOR of the diocese, and to advise and assist the CHANCELLOR or his deputy in legal matters. The R. also has charge of the diocesan registry, in which are kept documents relating to certain eccles. matters, e.g., conveyances of ch. and parsonage sites, and to which should be forwarded annually copies of the parochial registers of baptisms and burials. The R. issues marriage licences and prepares certain other eccles. documents. The R. is paid by fees fixed by Act of Parliament, of which he is required to make an annual return to the Home Secretary.—A3.

HUGH R. P. GAMON.

<sup>1</sup> Or "the Spirit"; see the alternative translations of πνεῦμα in John 3 8.

**RELICS.**—Special care and reverence were bestowed by the first Christians upon the remains of the departed and upon the places of their burial. This was doubtless due to the faith which was in them that the body was "the temple of the Holy

Ghost" and should have its part in the Resurrection. During the age of the persecutions this feeling of reverence was especially marked and strong. The martyrs were the heroes in the fight, their burial was a matter of careful and loving attention, and their graves became meeting-places for worship, but not of the martyr or his R. There is nothing that can be complained of in sentiments so true as these.

Eusebius (*HE* iv. 15 41, 42), in his account of the burial at Smyrna of St. Polycarp (A.D. 155), points out with emphasis that *worship* is offered to Christ as the Son of God, but to the martyrs *love*, as His disciples and imitators. He relates how the bones of Polycarp were taken up and laid where it was fitting, and that the Christians of Smyrna assembled there and celebrated the birthday of his martyrdom, both as a memorial of those whose contest was done, and for the preparation of those who should enter upon it.

Chapels, as at the cemeteries of Rome, were built over the burial-places of saints with a communication between the chapel and the grave. Such a chapel came to be named the *confessio*. And sometimes the burial-place of a popular saint in a catacomb would be converted into an underground chapel, the ground being excavated that the grave might be enclosed in the building. This seems to be the origin of some of the great churches at Rome.

Later on the Pope, owing to the violation of the cemeteries at Rome, had the remains of the saints removed into the city and placed in the churches. This action was followed elsewhere, and from it there arose the custom, resulting afterwards in a law, that the R. of a saint should rest beneath the altar of every church. This brought about the collection in churches, with a view to increasing their sacredness, of as many R. as possible. Hence followed the forgery of R. and the existence of doubts as to their genuineness. Then came the revolt against the whole system.

It may be that the reputed finding of the cross by the Empress Helena in 326 stimulated the desire for R., and so the R. of martyrs and saints came to be unduly and superstitiously venerated, and miracles attributed to them.

**4. Veneration of Relics.** It was during the Middle Ages that Relic worship and adoration took such hold and in the 14th cent. reached their height. R. multiplied to an extraordinary degree, fragments of the true Cross, phials containing the Sacred Blood, bones of saints, and other precious things were to be found everywhere, not always genuine, but certainly of considerable profit to those who possessed them.

The account of Erasmus of his visit with Colet to Canterbury (c. 1511) gives an insight into the condition of things as they then existed in this matter of R. The reaction soon set in, and in 1547 shrines were ordered to be taken away. It is impossible to justify the pillage which followed and the ruthless destruction of so much that was really beautiful, but that the superstitious abuses should have been got

**5. The Reaction.**

rid of is indeed well. (For the judgment of the Church of England on the subject of R., see Art. 22.)—oc. H. D. MACNAMARA.

## RELIGION.

### I. THE NATURE AND SEAT OF RELIGION.

The PB is a book of R., but its function is to promote and not to define it. The word occurs several times in it, and in several connections; but, just because R. touches man at so many points, its meaning varies from one sentence to another. It is very commonly used as a convenient term for some form or aspect or department of religious organisation, the *lex credendi* ("the Catholic R.," QV. 20; Christ's "true R.," 5 times), the *lex orandi* ("a R. to serve God . . . in the freedom of the spirit," Pref.<sup>3</sup>), or the *lex agendi* ("Christian R. doth not prohibit . . .," Art. 39), or again the organised society ("admitted into the fellowship of Christ's R.," Easter 3 Coll.). The *system* of DOCTRINE, RITUAL, DISCIPLINE, or CH. ORDER, in which a form of R. is embodied, takes the name. But R., like the sacramental rites which everywhere serve its ends, has an inward core of reality as well as an outward embodiment. And "the principles of the Christian R." (Bapt.<sup>3</sup> rubric<sup>1</sup>) must cover both.

Many attempts have been made to define the essence of R., and an analysis of these is not uninteresting. But it is sufficient here to note that the large number of failures is due either to a confusion between the inward and the outward or to a defective analysis of the nature of man. If the sense of R. which corresponds to its essence must be that which expresses its inward core, then the definition may be ventured, that R. is a life of reverential fellowship with the unseen Being on whom we depend. In order to justify and illustrate this definition, a series of quotations will be made from the works of an Ang. writer, who has written on R. with a rare combination of penetrating depth of thought with trenchant lucidity of expression, William Law the Non-juror. They are all taken from his later works, after his reading of the mystical writings of the German shoemaker, Jacob Böhme, had transformed his religious conceptions. Prof. Du Bose recently wrote, after making late acquaintance with these works, as contrasted with the precious but one-sided and comparatively immature *Serious Call*, that "to have known him would have too much forestalled the blessed labour of a lifetime." Law's conception, though not that which lies on the surface of the PB (cp. MYSTICISM), will, it is believed, be found by many to be just what is needed alike to unify the several elements of PB religion, and to relate it to other forms.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All the quotations are found in W. Scott Palmer's *Liberal and Mystical Writings of William Law*, 1908. Page refs. are not given, as the extracts are often pieced together from scattered paragraphs. It has been necessary to print so much of the text for this very reason. (a) *The Spirit of Love and Appendix to the Spirit of Prayer*; (b) *Errors of a late*

R., then, is the life of God in the soul of man. (a) "Every creature that is to be good and happy . . . must have the life of nature and the life of God in it. . . . Its creaturely life, which, by the creating power of God, it has in and from nature . . . has a power of *understanding, willing and desiring*. . . . Whilst the soul has only its natural life, it can only be in such a state as nature, without God, is in, viz., a mere hunger, want, contrariety, and strife for it knows not what. . . . The highest life, therefore, that is natural and creaturely . . . cannot possibly be a good and happy life but by the life of God dwelling in and in union with it . . . because God is an universal *all*; and nature, or desire, is an universal *want*, viz., to be filled with God. . . . And this is the twofold life that of all necessity must be united in every good and perfect and happy creature. . . . For love is delight, and delight cannot arise in any creature till its nature is in a delightful state, or is possessed of that in which it must rejoice. . . . There are in all the possibilities of things but two states, or forms of life; the one is nature, and the other is God manifested in nature; and as God and nature are both within you, so you have it in your power to live and work with which you will, but are under a necessity of doing either the one or the other. There is no standing still; life goes on, and is ever bringing forth its realities, which way soever it goeth."

It may be noted that, of the three modes of natural life here distinguished, "understanding" answers to *reason*, "willing" to *will*, and "desiring" to *imagination* (coloured by *will*), in the art. on MAN (§§ 18–20). The next extract, by a further undersigned coincidence, places the seat of religion in the *heart* (MAN, § 21, and Tables).

(b) "Every man has the fullest inward conviction that his heart is not his reason, nor his reason his heart, but that the one is as different from the other in its whole nature as pain, and joy, and desire are different from definitions of them. . . . What our heart is, that is our religion; what belongs to the heart, that belongs to our religion; which never had nor can have any other nature, power, or perfection, than that which is the nature, power, and perfection of our heart. . . . Your heart wants nothing but God, and nothing but your heart can receive Him. This is the only place and seat of religion, and of all communication between God and you."<sup>1</sup>

But the heart can only thus receive God if it be, as the image of God in man, itself akin with the Divine.

(c) "That which is spirit in man must be godlike, before it can unite with that Spirit which is God. And was there not a Divine spirit in man truly born of, and proceeding from, the Spirit of God as His real offspring, no union of will, love, or desire could be between God and man."

It might have seemed that nature and God are contradictions, but that is only when nature, as the sphere of God's immmanence, is isolated from God as eternally transcendent.

### 5. R. Founded on Nature.

*Book*; ( ) *Letter III*; (d), (e), (f) *The Spirit of Love*; (g) *The Way to Divine Knowledge*; (h) *Christian Regeneration*; (i) *Letter V*; (k), (l) *An Earnest and Serious Answer*; (m) *The Spirit of Love*; (n) *Letter V*; (o) *An Appeal to all who doubt*; (p) *A Short Confutation*; (q) *An Earnest and Serious Answer*; (r) *Some Animadversions*.

<sup>1</sup> But see further § 13 below on R. and Truth.

(d) "A religion that is not founded in nature is all fiction and falsity. . . . Nature is the opening and manifestation of the Divine omnipotence. It is God's Power-world: and therefore that God doth is and must be done in and by the powers of nature. God, though omnipotent, can have no existence to any creature, but it must have that existence in space and time.—Time comes out of eternity, and space comes out of the infinity of God.—Yet time can only be subservient to the omnipotence of God according to the nature of time, and space can only obey His will according to the nature of space. . . . Right and wrong . . . true and false, happiness and misery, are as unchangeable in nature as time and space. Nothing therefore can be done to any creature *supernaturally*, or in a way that is *without*, or contrary to, the powers of nature. . . . And this is the true ground of all divine revelation. . . . It is not to appoint an arbitrary system of religious homage to God, but solely to point out and provide for man . . . that one only religion that, according to the nature of things, can possibly restore to him his lost perfection. . . . For a religion is not to be deemed natural because it has nothing to do with revelation; but then it is the one true religion of nature, when it has everything in it that our natural state stands in need of; everything that can help us out of our present evil, and raise and exalt us to all the happiness which our nature is capable of having. . . . The mysteries of the Gospel are so far from showing the Gospel not to be the one true religion of nature, that they are the greatest proofs of it, since they are that alone which can help man to all that good which his natural state wants to have done to it. . . . What a grossness of error is it, therefore, to blame that doctrine which asserts the incarnation of the Son of God, or the necessity of the Word being made Flesh; when, in the nature of the thing, nothing else but this very mystery can be the natural, efficacious cause of the renewal of the divine life in the human nature, or have any natural efficacy to effect our salvation!"

(e) "You might as well imagine that no particular kind of element was needed to extinguish fire, or that water can supply the place of air in kindling it, as suppose that no particular kind of religion is absolutely necessary to raise up such a divine life in the soul as can only be its salvation; for nature is the ground of all creatures, it is God's manifestation of Himself, it is His instrument in and by which He acts in the production and government of every life. . . . Therefore, all the particular doctrines, institutions, mysteries, and ordinances of a revealed religion that comes from the God of nature, must have their reason, foundation, and necessity in nature.—I speak here of eternal nature, which is the nature of the Kingdom of Heaven."

(f) "Was there no eternity, there could be no time; was there nothing infinite, there could be nothing finite. . . . Everywhere in all worlds, nature must stand between God and the creature as the foundation of all mutual intercourse; as God can transact nothing with the creature, nor the creature have any communion with God, but in, and by, that nature in which it stands.—I hope no one will here ask me for Scripture proofs of this, or call these truths nostrums, because they are not to be found in the same form of expression in some particular text of Scripture. . . . And yet . . . there could be no truth in the Scripture, or anywhere else, if these things were not undeniable. . . . There is the same agreement, and the same difference, between the true religion of nature and the religion of the Gospel, that there is

between the breaking of the day and the rising of the sun to its meridian height; the one is the beginning, and the other is the perfection, of the same thing."

In man's actual state, however, he does not as a matter of course, and by a merely natural process, find this life of God in the heart: he has

#### 8. Evil as Self-Will.

to rise to it.

(g) "The fall of man . . . is not a thing learnt from any history, but shows itself everywhere, and every day, with such clearness as we see the sun." (h) "All the disorder and corruption and salady of our nature lies in a certain fixedness of our own will, imagination, and desire, wherein we live to ourselves, *are our own centre and circumference*, act wholly from ourselves. . . . There is not the smallest degree of evil in us but what arises from that selfishness, because we are thus all in all to ourselves. It is this Self that our Saviour calls upon us to deny; it is this life of Self that we are to hate and lose, that the Kingdom of God may arise in us; that is, that God's Will may be done in us." (See, for the Divinely prompted and guided process by which redemption is apprehended and the new life begun, CONVERSION and REPENTANCE.)

On this view the statement, that morality is implicit R., and R. is implicit morality, is easily justified. If R. is fellowship with God, and God is in a man's neighbour (whether patent or latent, it matters not), then the religious man must seek fellowship with his neighbour, in a word, must love him as himself, in and under and for God. So R. is implicit morality. Again, the sense of imperative obligation, under which heroes risk life for others and ordinary people take trouble for love's sake, can only rest on some universal and eternal bond, linking all men to an unseen Divine Kinsman whose nature is love. And so morality—not of course mere prudential conformity to a social standard of morals—is implicit religion.

Accordingly (i) "You may know with the utmost certainty that if you have no inward peace, if religious comfort is still wanting, it is because you have more wills than one. . . . Give yourself up to ever so many good works, read, preach, pray, visit the sick, build hospitals, clothe the naked, etc.; yet if . . . in the doing of them you have anything else that you will and hunger after, but that God's Kingdom may come, His Will be done, they are not the works of the new-born from above, and so cannot be His life-giving food," for God's will alone was Christ's 'meat and drink.'

On the other hand, the happy and happy-making state of the surrendered soul, "willing nothing but what God wills, loving nothing but what God loves," is thus described:

#### 10. Happiness of R.

(k) "Then the Kingdom of God is come, and His Will is done in that soul as it is done in heaven. Then heaven is in the soul, and the life and conversation of the soul is in heaven. From such a man the curse of this world is removed; he walks on consecrated ground, and everything he meets, everything that happens to him, helps forward his union and communion with God. For it is the state of our *will* [with or against the *heart*] that makes the state of our life; when we receive everything from God, and do everything for God, everything does us the

same good, and helps us to the same degree of happiness."

However far from attainment the Gospel standard may be in fact, the ideal is meant to be realised on earth.

### 11. An Ideal Unrealised.

(l) "We pray . . . that God's Kingdom may come and His will be done by us as it is in heaven. And this, we may be sure, is not only necessary but attainable by us, or our Saviour would not have made it a part of our daily prayer. It may now justly be asked, Have we yet obtained that which we have been so long and so universally praying for? Can we look upon the Ch. of this nation as drawing near, or even tending to, this state of perfection? Can we be carried to any one parish, either in town or country, where it can with truth be said of any one Pastor and his flock that there the Kingdom of God is coming, and His Will is done on earth<sup>1</sup> as it is done in heaven? The Christian religion has not had its proper effect, nor obtained its intended end, till it has so set up the Kingdom of Heaven amongst us that His Will is done on earth as it is in heaven."

R. is the affair of the heart, controlling the merely natural will. But the universal experience of the conflict between heart and will is the best kind of evidence for the truth of R. as

### 12. Inward Evidences.

defined, for

(m) Whether you consider that which is good or bad in a man, they equally prove the perpetual indwelling and operation of the Spirit of God within us, since we can only be bad by resisting, as we are good by yielding to, the Spirit of God; both which equally suppose a perpetual operation of the Spirit of God within us." (n) "Turn therefore inwards, and all that is within you will demonstrate to you the Presence and Power of God in your soul.<sup>2</sup> . . . And what is best of all, you will never be without a living sense of the immediate guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, always equal to your dependence upon it, always leading you on from strength to strength in your inward man, till all your knowledge of good and evil is become nothing else but a mere love of the one and mere aversion to the other. For the one work of the Spirit of God is to distinguish the good and evil in you, *not as in notion, but by affection.*"

## II. RELIGION IN RELATION TO DOCTRINE, RITUAL AND ORDER.

If the view stated above be accepted, that R. is a union of the life of God and of nature, that

<sup>1</sup> Hatch, in his *Hibbert Lectures*, trenchantly argued that the Ch. had never recovered from the lowering of its ethical standard produced by its natural, we might almost say inevitable, use of the Hellenic educational system, with its peculiar atmosphere, which it found in possession. So W. Temple (see *Christ and Human Need*, 1912, p. 63), addressing the Quadrennial S.V.M.U. conference at Liverpool, said, "It is deep in our own moral and spiritual nature, it is in the *pagan standards* of our own consciences, that we find the root of the problems of society. *Our whole way of looking at life is heathen.* Apart from a passing emotion now and then, or an occasional act of self-denial, our whole morality is heathen. . . . And because of our heathenism, society is in ruins. It ought to be a glorious fabric, each part supporting and supplementing all the others; it is a chaos of competing interests. . . . And the same spirit possesses the nations."

<sup>2</sup> Cp. a similar passage in the *Way to Divine Knowledge*. "With the same self-evident certainty as you know that you think, and are alive, you know that there is goodness, love, benevolence, meekness, compassion, wisdom, peace, joy, etc. Now this is the self-evident God, that forces Himself to be known, and found and felt, in every man, in the same certainty of self-evidence as every man feels and finds his own thoughts and life."

it is founded in nature, and remains dependent upon nature as "the foundation of all mutual

### 13. R. and Reason.

intercourse" between the soul and God (see §§ 3a, 5d, 7f), then it follows that reason, imagination, and will, as the "natural" modes of the soul's being, must have a *necessary* function to discharge in R., and the only questions will be, what the function of each is, and how it may most efficiently be performed. We begin with the province of reason.

Law himself, who so clearly enunciates the principle, fails to apply it in due proportion. In regard to reason, in particular, he is so busy in demonstrating with brilliant irony the possibility that reason may busy itself with R. and its belongings without there being a spark of true R. in the reasoner, that he forgets that his plain man, in discerning and yielding to the Spirit of God, is using reason as well as heart (for a poor idiot is shut off from R. proper), and forgets also that all his own acute writing is an exercise of reason.

When, by an act of humble and adoring faith, the Christian finds out, through trusting God in Christ, that love is duty, and duty is love, and that both are the breathing of God's Spirit in his heart, his act of faith is also, on account of the unity of man's nature, a judgment of the reason, or he could not express it in such words as those of St. Paul's confession, "I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day." But Law has courage to press the caution that those who rejoice in the brightness of the Sun of righteousness must not deny the fainter illumination of the twilight and the dawn, for

(o) "This same Jesus Christ, who came in human flesh to the Jews in a certain age, was that same Saviour who through all ages, and in all countries . . . is the common Saviour, as He is the common Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. . . . When, therefore, you look upon the Gospel as narrowing the way of salvation or limiting it to those who only know and believe in Jesus Christ since His appearance in the flesh, you mistake the whole nature of the Christian redemption." (p) "For the Spirit of Christ, or—which is the same thing—the Spirit and Power of His Process, did not begin to be but only came into outward manifestation in the Gospel age; it was, and had been invisibly, the one only possible source of goodness in man as well before, as after, His Incarnation . . . goodness cannot come into man, or belong to him two different ways, or from two different causes."

An illustration may fitly close what we have to say here about R. and reason. Few swimmers are students of hydrostatics, and not every student of hydrostatics can swim. The theorist, whose knowledge rests on indirect testimony, can only gain the intimate knowledge of practical experience by an *act*, and an act of *faith*: he must trust himself to the buoyancy of the water. In the finer element of air we are told that the secret of aeroplaning was delayed for years by two errors in theory, one about the resistance of air, and the other about the relative efficiency of the internal combustion engine. Now people can fly with little knowledge of



theory. The applications are simple. We may be religious with little theology, and have much theology with little R. But if the man, whose business it is to turn people to R., makes obvious mistakes in history or theology, or makes R. consist in something which a thinking man can see is no essential, he may easily fail to win such a hearer. In a word, theology has the same sort of value as the science attached to other elements of human life. Sound and well-based theology, related to other realms of knowledge, will (1) commend R. to thoughtful men, (2) remove stumbling-blocks from the path of doubters, and (3) so far as it becomes general will free R. from irrelevant and superstitious accretions, and make it more general and more effective. It is not ignorance that makes an earnest preacher effective, but earnestness which more than neutralises the hindrance of his ignorance. (See further, TRUTH, AUTHORITY, KNOWLEDGE, DOCTRINE.)

The function of the *imagination* is equally vital. The world seems to be one thing—man's

**14. R. and Imagination.** all in all. The Christian has learnt that it is another thing—God's footstool for man first to kneel on, and then to live and work upon, under the throne of the God of love. By the imagination, and in no other way, can he borrow from created things the lively images of better things unseen. "PRAYER is the Christian's vital breath," and Prayer is simply the willing entry of imagination into the service of the regenerate heart. Poetry, music, painting, sculpture, rhythmic motion, all modes of soul-expression may be enlisted as handmaids of R.; but none of them, nor all of them, can *constitute* Religion.

(g) "All ways and opinions, all forms and modes of divine worship, stand on the outside of religion. They may be, and certainly are, great and desirable helps to the Kingdom of God, when we consider them only as the gate, or guide, to that inward life which wants to be raised and brought forth in us. But this is unquestionably true, that our salvation consists wholly and solely in the birth of the Son of God and the renewal of the Holy Ghost<sup>1</sup> in our souls. When this begins our salvation begins; as this goes on our salvation goes on; when this is finished our salvation is finished." The purpose of Ritual is to make the worshippers better Christians. (r) "Every man, as such, has an open gate to God in his soul, he is always in that temple where he can worship God in spirit and in truth; every Christian, as such, has the first fruits of the Spirit, a seed of Life, which is his call and qualification to be always in a state of inward prayer, faith, and holy intercourse with God. All the ordinances of the Gospel, the daily sacramental service of the Ch., is to keep up, to exercise, and strengthen this faith, to raise us to such an habitual faith and dependence upon the Light and Holy Spirit of God, that by thus seeking and finding God in the institutions of the Ch. we may be habituated to seek Him and find Him, to live in His Light and walk by His Spirit, in all the actions of our ordinary life." (Cp. RITUAL, § 2.)

It is to be feared that genuine religious impressions are often dissipated because the imagination is not enlisted in this high and heavenly

task. And that brings us to the part to be played in R. by that element in man which is

**15. R. and the Will.**

most sharply marked off as natural, the *will*. All the other modes of being of which the spirit of man is capable must perforce work with the will. It is not enough that once, at some dazzling moment of clear vision, the heart should pluck the will free from all the clinging entanglements of habit, and so turn and lift the soul towards Christ and God and heaven. The emancipated heart must keep its grip upon the will, and through it harness the other powers of the soul; and of these the imagination must come first.<sup>1</sup> At first the very simplest expressions of penitence, praise, and prayer, regularly and often repeated, will be the best. Public worship, *coming after* such private devotion, will enlarge and inform the soul, till it begins to breathe a new atmosphere of faith and hope and love. Step by step with the devout imagination, the heart must also, through the will, drive the reason in search of new messages from God in Scripture, in the Creeds, in the heart, in the Ch., in nature. Only freshly fed thought can keep the religious imagination on the one side from the fatal slumber of formality, and on the other from vain fancies and idle superstitions. Lastly, the Christian who has found the image of God breathing and moving within his heart, knows that the same image is, awake or asleep, in other hearts, and yearns to see the Kingdom of God so established on earth that they may press into it, and all may do God's will as it is done in heaven. So the heart has to bend the will upon its own proper task in the service of R., the organisation of it so that it may tell adequately in the world. Money, time, and trouble have to be given, simply to prepare, equip, and maintain the machinery, the institutions, without which the Ch. cannot be fully efficient. Neither can the Christian be content with the Ch. as God's instrument. "The powers that be are ordained of God," and so far as he can aid in controlling or enabling those powers so as to Christianise society, his heart—so long as it is beating in unison with his Master's—gives the will no rest till he has done his part as a Christian citizen to make his city (or his village) and his country Christian. There was a time when the end of R. was thought to be the perfunctory preparation, by arbitrarily appointed means, for a perfect state under unknown conditions *elsewhere and hereafter*, and consequently most of life *seemed* to be unconnected with R. It is now seen that the real end of R. includes, as the proper preparation for a better state, the serious and sustained endeavour progressively to perfect society *here and now*, and accordingly the whole of life becomes at once relevant to R. (cp. § 11.)

<sup>1</sup> See BODY, §§ 6-9; ORDER, § 3; and cp. the quotation from Thorndike (*ib.*, § 9) about the primary aim of Ch. Order. The same point is well brought out by R. R. Marett, *Enc. Brit.* (11), art. *Ritual*. "Ritual," which he defines as "the routine of worship," "is to R. what habit is to life . . . by bringing subordinate functions under an effortless rule, it permits undivided attention in regard to vital issues."

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Coll. for Christmas Day, and Pr. 1 in Confir.

A few words must be added about *false forms* of R., all of which arise from some one-sided emphasis upon one or another element in R.

**16. False Intellectualism** either identifies R. with theology, or requires, as a *prior* condition to any real religious experience, advanced or elaborated knowledge or such defined views as properly belong to a later stage and are not essential to religion.

*Æstheticism* is so absorbed in the externals of worship, that its sensuous impressions, and the grateful and soothing effect that they have, are taken as proofs or constituent elements of religious experience.

*Legalism* turns R. into a commercial transaction, in which the Christian earns his salvation, and the complacency and self-importance derived from prominence in Ch. work, together with the interest some temperaments take in helping to manage anything, foster the idea that all is well.

*Emotionalism* exaggerates the importance of the feelings which normally, but not invariably, accompany the yielding of the heart to God, and disparages the share of the mind and will in R. (cp. MAN, § 24).

Reference is necessary also to what has sometimes been diagnosed as akin, but is really foreign, to R., viz., *Magic*. Magic is unlike R., and like our dealing with the natural world, in that it is non-personal, and deals with things and forces, not with personal beings as *such*; and also in that it is supposed to constrain, and not merely to beseech or persuade. But it is unlike both religious behaviour and common-sense action, in that its power is irrational and secret, stored up in the charm or incantation, or residing in the person of the magician. R. is always liable to be adulterated with magical elements. This kind of degeneration was a principal cause of the Reformation. And even in England to-day popular Romanism is honeycombed with semi-magical superstitions, which those in authority make no adequate effort to suppress. But in all Chs. the same danger exists, though in less crude and obvious forms. The cause of this tendency to relapse into magic is that in magic outward things and forces are used which yield power and advantage without requiring any elevation or change of character or conduct.

The last topic that requires allusion here is *Comparative R.*, the branch of inquiry which investigates all forms of R., and compares them

**17. Comparative R.** with one another. No disciple of Him who is the truth need fear such inquiries. Rather may we anticipate that a closer study of other faiths will bring out the needs of the heart of man more clearly, and enable the Christian missionary to present Christ more effectually as holding within Himself, to be progressively manifested as His Mystical Body grows, the summing up (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσις*) of all things true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report.

Cp. CHRISTIAN RELIGION, for specific embodiment of R. in the PB; see further, Liddon, *Some Elements of R.*; Church, *Discipline of the Christian Character*; Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*; Myers, *Catholic Thoughts*; Gifford *Lectures*, by Gwatkin, Tièle, E. Caird, and J. Caird; *Hibbert Lectures*, by Kuenen and Hatch; Jevons, *The Idea of God in Early R.*, 1911.—KI.

G. HARFORD.

**RE-OPENING OF CHURCHES.**—The Irish form for use after "Restoration" (1666) appoints that, even after a complete rebuilding of a demolished Church, no repetition should be allowed of the consecration of the *place*, "because the place was consecrated before," and that otherwise all else

should be as at the Consecration. This principle has been usually followed, and appropriate selections made (with some verbal changes) from the form of Consecration, applying especially to any extension of the fabric, particularly if this has entailed a removal or change of the altar. Unless there must be for this reason a new consecration, a priest may, and often does, take the place of the Bishop. Special features are: an acknowledgment of God's presence and our unworthiness to enter it, Ps. 118 19-29, second Coll. for Good Friday, and prayers for clergy and congregation. The Irish book of 1666 has an "Expiation and Illustration of a Church, desecrated or profaned by murder and bloodshed, or uncleanness."—S4.

J. E. SWALLOW.

**RE-ORDINATION.**—The question has arisen from time to time in the history of the Ch. as to whether Ordinations performed by heretics or schismatics were thereby invalidated, and whether, if those

who had received them became reconciled to the Church, a second Ordination was required before they could be recognised as clergy. The controversy is very similar to that with regard to heretical and schismatical Bapts. (see RE-BAPTISM). A divergence of opinion on the latter subject existed between the East and the West; the more lenient view that the Sacrament must not be repeated being generally held in the West—the opposite being frequently adopted in the East. In the East, too, it would appear that the severer line with regard to Re-ordination has usually been taken. Thus the *Apostolic Canons*, which are still part of the Eastern Code, forbid any Bp., priest or deacon to be re-ordained "unless he shows that he has his ordination from heretics: for those who are ordained and baptised by such can neither be members of the Church or Clergy" (canon 68, cp. canons 46 and 47). The practice of re-ordaining Monophysite clergy was common in the East, and, though it is not easy to ascertain their present doctrines and practices, it seems probable that the Easterns still reserve to themselves the right of re-ordaining those whom they consider to be heretics.

The earliest explicit statements in the West on this subject will be found in the writings of St. Augustine. At the time of the Donatist schism the custom had arisen among these heretics of re-ordaining Catholic Clergy. St. Augustine's view on this practice

will be found very clearly expressed in his treatise *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani* 2 28, written c. 400, where he says as follows:—"Each of these (i.e., Baptism and Ordination) is a Sacrament, and each of them is given to a man by a certain consecration, the one when he is baptised, the other when he is ordained. And therefore in the Catholic (Church) neither of them can be repeated." In this way St. Augustine expresses the view that the character imprinted by Holy Orders is indelible, and this view ultimately prevailed throughout the West.

The Western practice, however, from the 7th to the 12th cent. frequently contradicted this theory;

The Western practice, however, from the 7th to the 12th cent. frequently contradicted this theory;

and theologians of that period found divers ways of justifying the action of various popes and other prelates in this matter. It will be convenient to divide this period into two parts:—(a) 7th to 10th cents.; (b) 11th and 12th centuries.

### 3. Western Practice.

(a) In the first period we find a trace of the new attitude in the bearing of Pope Pelagius I (556-61) towards the schismatics of Milan and Aquileia, and his sentence, "*Non est Corpus Christi quod schismaticus conficit*" ("What a schismatic consecrates is not the body of Christ"), was frequently appealed to in later times for the justification of the papal practice. Possibly the earliest instance of re-ordination is that of our own Abp. Theodore, who disputed the validity of British ordinations; this was probably due to Greek influence. There is some evidence for the belief that St. Chad was re-ordained "*per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos*" ("through all the Church orders"), though the statement of Bede (*HE* 4 2) may simply mean that he received some confirmatory rite. At Rome itself, an important precedent was founded in 769 when Stephen III (IV) declared invalid the ordinations of his predecessor Constantine II, who had been deposed on the ground of irregularities. In the next cent. (853) we find the Council of Soissons pronouncing the ordinations of Ebbo, Abp. of Rheims, performed after his deposition, invalid. A few years later, John VIII, in 880, annulled a consecration performed by Ansbert, Abp. of Milan, who had been excommunicated, and required that Joseph, Bp. of Vercelli, who had been consecrated by him, should be re-ordained. At the close of this cent. we also note the case of Pope Formosus who had held the Papacy for a number of years, all of whose ordinations were decreed invalid by his successor. Finally, John XII, in 964, declared the ordinations of his rival, Leo VIII, to be invalid. The instances cited above were, for the most part, dictated rather by a spirit of political expediency than by any theological principle, and we may observe that the principle of St. Augustine was upheld by various theologians, such as Rabanus Maurus, who protested against the papal practice.

(b) The 11th and 12th cents. witnessed a widespread reaction against the prevalent practice of simony, and a view grew up which denied the "simoniacal heretics" all power of Orders. This view, which appears to have originated with Guido of Arezzo, but was subsequently ascribed to Pope Pascal I, was elaborated by Cardinal Humbert, and obtained the support of many theologians and canonists of that period. It resulted in the wholesale re-ordination of those who had been convicted of simoniacal practices.

But in the 13th cent. we note a great change, and from that time onwards the great Schoolmen set forth with sufficient clearness the doctrine which has since held the field on this head. The principles of St. Augustine, referred to above, have been very generally accepted, and the practice of re-ordinating those who had received heretical or schismatical ordination has been dropped in the West.

The doctrine and practice of the Ch. of Eng. in this respect are summarised as follows by

### 4. The Church of England.

the late Bp. of Salisbury:—"Using the word 'Sacrament' in the broader sense given to it by ancient theology, which, of course, includes under the term other efficacious signs of sacred realities than those of the two great Sacraments of the Gospel, we hold in the Church of England, quite as strongly, I think, as it is held in any part of Christendom, that the

'Sacrament of Order' requires laying on of hands, with prayer suitable to the office conferred, and with a general intention of making a man what the Church intends as a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon. We hold that such an ordination conferred by a Bishop, as sole or chief minister, who has been himself so ordained, even if he is a heretic, is valid and cannot be reiterated without sacrilege, and that it is impossible to bind the power so conferred by Church censure."

(On this subject see especially:—Saltet, L., *Les Réordinations*, 1907; and Wordsworth, John, Bp. of Salisbury, *Ordination Problems*, London, SPCK, 1909, in which a description and criticism of Saltet's work will be found.)—rd.

H. LEONARD PASS.

**REPAIRS.**—For R. of churches before the abolition of church rates, see Hook's *Church Dictionary*. The following article

### 1. Churches.

relates to repairs in modern times and practically under the voluntary principle. With the exception of the chancel which usually falls to the Rector, lay or eccles., R. of the church are the concern of the whole parish; a wise incumbent will do well to recognise this. The way may be prepared by informal conferences. Care should be taken to allow the parish to speak its mind and offer suggestions. Parishioners cannot be expected to take an interest in, or provide money for, an enterprise in which they have no voice.

It is important to have the repairs under contemplation clearly defined, remembering that it is an advantage when men and plant and materials are on the spot to get all repairs carried out that can be reasonably attempted. Further, all present at a public meeting may be capable of giving a vote, but all have not the special experience, or technical skill, or familiarity with business ways, which are needful for delicate negotiations and arrangements. This kind of difficulty can be got over by appointing small committees to handle certain questions, and to report or make recommendations, or to suggest a way out of an *impasse*.

When the parish has made up its mind, the approval of the Bp. and his advisers should be sought; in other words, a

**2. Procedure.** FACULTY should be applied for. Before the faculty issues, all manner of information will have to be supplied to the Chancellor.

It is quite obvious that more attention should be given to heating and ventilation; if hotels can be satisfactorily dealt with, why not churches?

Given a Faculty, given the approval of the parish, given also an architect who enjoys the confidence of the Repairs Committee and can be treated as a professional friend, like a doctor or a lawyer, given also an adequate subscription list, there comes the business of submitting the "plans and specifications" to builders; at this stage nothing of the nature of personal favouritism should be found, regard should be had only

to real efficiency and to the character of the selected firm.

The appointment of an architect is a crucial step. It is submitted that a Committee of Selection should recommend a man, having first visited some of his work and made confidential inquiries from previous patrons.

For his own house the parson himself is responsible. Let him (1) keep down R., (2) effect minor R. himself, (3) be content with R., without aspiring

### 3. Repairs to Parsonage.

to fanciful or doubtful *improvements*. Paper and internal painting are his private concern, into which the diocesan surveyor does not intrude unless to order paint as a protection against decaying woodwork.—R6.

J. S. WILSDEN.

## REPENTANCE.

- I. PRELIMINARY, § 1.
- II. THE MEANING OF REPENTANCE, § 2.
- III. THE PROCESS OF REPENTANCE, § 3.
- IV. THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH. ABSOLUTION, §§ 4-11.
- V. THE PLACE OF REPENTANCE IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER, § 12.

I. The idea of R. is interwoven with the whole texture of the PB. R. and Faith are man's response to God's Grace. They are

1. Preliminary, required of those who are baptised (Cat.) and are necessary for a right reception of HC (Cat., HC *passim*). By penitence we prepare for Daily Prayer. The awakening or deepening of R. is to be sought for in the discipline of sickness (VS). In every year the season of Lent calls to R. and to penitential discipline (Commin.; and Colls., Eps. and Gospels for Lent). The Ordination Service speaks of the authority given to the Ch., and within the Ch. to the Priesthood, in connection with Christ's ministry of forgiveness.

II. R. (*μετάνοια*) denotes a "change of mind"—a change from sin to God. It is the necessary condition of forgiveness.

### 2. The Meaning of Repentance.

Sin is the assertion of man's will against God's: it therefore of necessity separates us from Him. In R. the sinner gives his will back to God, in heartfelt sorrow for his sin, in full confession of it to the Father, in steadfast purpose of amendment. Then and not till then can God restore the man to fellowship with Himself: that restoration is forgiveness.

It is needless to discuss whether R. comes of God's gift or of man's free-will. Certainly it is God's gift which we pray Him to bestow (Lit., Ash-W. Coll., Exh. MEP; cp. Acts 11 18). Indeed, our Saviour won for us the gift of R. on the Cross. On the other hand, strong and frequent exhortations to repent (Exhs. HC, VS, etc.; cp. Mark 1 15, Acts 2 38, 17 30) imply that we are free to choose or to reject God's gift.

There is a close connection between R. and Faith. Remorse but not R. is possible without faith: a man cannot turn from sin to God unless

he believes in Him. On the other hand, a man cannot truly believe in God, so long as wilful sin stands in the way. That whole-hearted self-surrender, which should be the first movement of the regenerate life, includes both R. and faith. Thus the two great Sacraments, which mark the beginning and the renewal of our Union with Christ Who is our Life, require of necessity the presence of that Faith and R. which they, in turn, purify and strengthen.

III. When we truly repent, we make Christ's act our own. His death (a) expressed the divine hatred of sin, (b) was the full acknowledgment of guilt, (c) was the act of satisfaction for sin.

In all these cases Christ did for us what we could not have done for ourselves. Nevertheless He made possible for us that R. which expresses (a) hatred of sin in *Contrition*, (b) acknowledgment of guilt by *Confession*, (c) *Satisfaction* for sin by *Newness of life*.

(a) *Contrition* is spiritual sorrow for sin. A contrite sinner realises that the sin is an outrage on the God of Holiness, and is ingratitude to the God of Love. Before Contrition can be complete he must not only be convinced of the sin but assured of God's mercy (note the use of Ps. 51 in Commination).

The scholastic distinction between *attrition* and *contrition* was a real distinction, though (as we shall see below) the use made of it led to some strange doctrine. The attrite sinner is sorry for himself and afraid of the punishment: the contrite sinner thinks rather of the wrong done to God. Attrition springs from servile fear: contrition from filial love.

(b) The PB insists on the absolute necessity of *Confession* of our sins to God (Exhs. in HC, MEP, VS, Commin., etc.). That this Confession may be real and thorough, there must be honest self-examination.

The 1st Exh. in HC exhorts those who intend to come to the HC "to consider the dignity of that holy mystery and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof; and so to search and examine your own consciences (and that not lightly, and after the manner of dissemblers with God; but so) that ye may come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast, in the marriage-garment required by God in Holy Scripture, and be received as worthy partakers of that holy Table. The way and means thereto is: First, to examine your lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life." The insertion of the Ten Commandments at the beginning of HC is clearly for the purpose of helping communicants in their self-examination. The quotations from Deut. 27 at the beginning of the Commin. Service evidently have the same purpose. In the office of VS the minister is directed to help the sick man in this self-examination: "Then shall the minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins," etc.

From the insistence on thorough self-examination it is evident that the PB enjoins not only a confession of sinfulness but a particular confession of sins. We are to own them one by

one in order that we may disown them. Confession of sin is made to God. Is it to be made in the presence of man? The PB provides forms of general Confession to be said by all (MEP, HC). This public acknowledgment can of course only be of a general character. Under certain circumstances the PB recommends private and particular confession in the hearing of a priest. This will be dealt with when we speak of Absolution.

(c) It is obvious that, from the PB standpoint, no sinner can make *Satisfaction* to God in the same sense in which our Lord "by His one oblation of Himself once offered made a full sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." It is equally plain that every true penitent must "steadfastly purpose to lead a new life" (HC Exh. and Invt., Commn. Exh.). If the sin has been against man as well as against God, he must make "restitution and satisfaction to the uttermost of his power" (Exhs. in HC and VS).

IV. The PB insists with the utmost emphasis on the direct access of the individual soul to

God. Sin is an offence against

4. **Absolution.** God. It is God's forgiveness that we need. God's love moves us to

Contrition. To God we confess. Before God we promise amendment. Yet with equal clearness the PB teaches that the Church, and the Ministry as the organ of the Church, have a function and an authority in connection with Forgiveness, and that for two reasons. (a) We are members one of another. Therefore sin is not only a matter between God and the individual. It concerns the whole society. It is specially obvious that the presence of a notorious sinner at the Sacrament of Fellowship will be a scandal and an injury to the whole Body (see Rubric at beginning of HC and Exhs. 1 and 3). Even when the sins are secret, grave mischief may be done. Therefore it is right that, in the interest of the whole society, the Church should exercise discipline, and should be satisfied of a sinner's R. before he is restored to fellowship with the Body. (b) Our Lord has committed to His Church the Ministry of Reconciliation. The Church is privileged to bring home to its penitent members the assurance of God's forgiveness. It fulfils this work through the Ministry.

In order to understand the PB teaching about Absolution it is necessary to consider at some length (i) the Scriptural authority for the doctrine, and (ii) the history of Penitential Discipline in the Church.

(i) With regard to *Scriptural authority*, in Matt. 16 19, 18 18, "Our Lord is committing to His Church, the new Israel, the office which was

5. **Scriptural Teaching on Absolution.** claimed by the synagogue of acting as arbiter or judge in all questions of religious truth and error, wrong and right.

The Church is to exercise on earth a judicial authority in spiritual things, which so far as she is true to Christ and guided by His Spirit will be ratified in Heaven. And the Church may exercise this authority either in her corporate capacity or through duly

qualified officers. In John 20 23 it seems that we have a particular application of the power signified, viz., that of passing judgment in reference to the sins of men. To forgive sins is one form of loosing (Job 42 9 LXX, Rev. 1 5 RV), to retain them is one form of binding. Authority to remit and retain sins was delivered by Our Lord to the eleven and to those that were with them (Luke 24 33) when He appeared to them on the evening of the first Easter Day" (Prof. Swete, *Fulham Conference on Confession*, p. 4).

It is clear (a) that the Commission of John 20 22, 23 was given to the Church as a whole. Thus the Absol. in VS says, "He hath left power to *His Church* to absolve," etc. But the ministry is the natural organ of the Church for the purpose, so that our Ordinal rightly repeats Our Lord's Commission to every Priest who is ordained. "The Officers of a spiritual body are charged with spiritual work, and need spiritual power to do it. To remit and to retain sins is the mission of the Church, and the Lord, who knew the extreme difficulty of this most exacting of tasks, endowed her for it with a special gift of 'Holy Spirit' (John 20 22, 23). But the Church's duty in this respect is chiefly fulfilled, at least since the end of the Apostolic age, by the three Orders of the regular ministry, and the Easter gift of the Spirit goes with this exercise of responsibility. On these grounds the Western Church was justified when it ordered the use of *Accipe Spiritum sanctum* at all ordinations to the diaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate; and the Anglican Church when it followed the Latin Church so far as to retain the words at the Ordering of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops, adding on both occasions the solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit in the hymn *Veni, Creator Spiritus*" (Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 323-4).

In the case of the discipline exercised on the sinner at Corinth, St. Paul speaks with apostolic authority (1 Cor. 5 3, 2 Cor. 2 9, 10); but he is careful not to act independently of the whole Church (1 Cor. 5 4, 5, 2 Cor. 2 7).

(b) Our Lord's commission is not limited to Absol., still less to a mere release from "Church censures." The words cover all that the Church does in applying our Lord's redemptive work to sinful man. They include Bapt. and the whole "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5 18), of which the ministry of Absol. is certainly a part. The PB evidently alludes to John 20 23 in the Absol. of MEP: "He hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution," etc.

(ii) Passing to the *teaching and practice of the Church*, "in the primitive Church there was a godly

6. **History of Penitential Discipline in the Church.** discipline, that, at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be more afraid to offend" (Commn.). The accuracy of this description may be seen by reference to Tertullian, *De Poenit.* 9-11; Cyprian, *Ep.* 16 (9) 2; Eusebius, *AE*, vi. 34; and many other passages of the Fathers.

In cases where the sin was notorious, the course was clear. But it sometimes happened that Christians knew themselves to be guilty of equally heinous sins of which the Church was ignorant. In such cases they would confess their fault to the Bp. (or to some priest authorised by him), and he would decide whether a public confession and penance were requisite. Presumably, in cases where he considered

public confession undesirable, the Bp., when satisfied of a person's R., would readmit him to communion by some sort of Absolution. In a letter to the Bishops of Campania (*Ep.* 168, *Ad Episc. Camp.*, etc.) Leo deprecates the Public Confession: "It suffices that the guilt of the conscience be laid open to the priests alone in secret confession . . . let so unadvisable a custom (as the public penitence) be done away, lest many be kept from the remedies of penitence . . . for that confession sufficeth which is made first to God, then to the priest also, who draweth near to pray for the sins of the penitents. For so at length may more be stirred up to penitence, if the sins confessed by the penitents be not published in the ears of the people."

It would seem that in the East a larger liberty was left to the individual conscience. Thus, St. Chrysostom says: "I exhort and pray and beseech you again and again to confess your faults to God. I do not wish to make you a spectacle to your fellow-servants, and to make your sins known to man. Open your conscience before God, show Him the wounds and seek the remedy of Him. Show them to Him Who heals without upbraiding." On the other hand, from the days of Origen onwards, there are frequent exhortations to sinners to confess their sins to the priests when a guilty conscience kept them from Communion. The Fathers spake with no uncertain voice as to the reality of Absol.: e.g., Chrysostom (*Hom.* 5 r), "Heaven receiveth the beginning of judgment from earth: the judge sitteth on earth, the Master followeth the servant."

An entirely new departure is marked by the decree of the IVth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), which requires Confession of all persons, once in the year, under pain of excommunication in life and unhallowed burial after death.

#### 7. Mediæval Developments.

Instead of the practice of universal and compulsory confession being based on theology, mediæval theology on penitence seems to have been based on the practice. The character of this theology is well described by Canon Moberly: "Now the Schoolmen were nothing if they were not pitilessly logical. Their method herein was a method which would have destroyed, by excess of technical definition, even a basis that was in itself unexceptionably true. But their basis was not unexceptionably true. It was vitiated by having the compulsoriness of confession as its fundamental assumption. I will ask you to notice that (whilst using a method essentially faulty in itself) they had to use it to maintain the following positions which their basal assumption involved. They had to show theologically: (1) that the sacrament of penance was, in fact, an element, by Divine necessity, in the life of every Christian; (2) what that quality was in auricular confession, as contrasted with confession in solitude, which made it adequate for contrition, and the other not; (3) what that was in private Absol. which so differentiated it as to make forgiveness ordinarily impossible without the use of it; and (4) why all this necessity was not a yoke but a blessing to the normal Christian. Working upon a basis which required theological justification of such positions as these, and working by a method of logical antithesis which would have corrupted the most evangelical truth, they were driven into a series of distinctions which sadly overlaid, even when they were based upon, the realities of spiritual experience. I may briefly mention four.

"1. *Venial and Deadly Sins.* This distinction is true and valuable, if not pressed. The older distinction was into *levia*, *gravia*, and *gravissima*, which are obviously indefinite words. But the moment

words of degree are pressed into technical distinctions of kind, the definition which aimed at truth has passed into untruth.

"2. *Attrition and Contrition.* For contrition that was obviously imperfect a new name was invented. Then the relation between this and contrition became a bewildering controversy. It is a curious experience to plunge into its intricacies in the pages of Morinus. But the tendency is clear. It is towards the generally received belief that attrition (which is quite inadequate) becomes contrition in the sacrament of penance. Now, here again, we have something not so much false in origin as made false by over-technicality. No one who has any experience can doubt that imperfect contrition may be greatly deepened in the very act of the self-humiliation which open confession involves. But to take this up into a contrast of kind, and to say that real contrition must necessarily contain either the experience or, at least, the purpose of auricular confession, is to substitute technicality for life.

"3. The word *Satisfaction* is transformed in meaning. From having expressed that loving effort of the penitent 'to be good,' which is part of the necessary impulse of any loving, that is, any real contrition, it comes to mean a quantitative payment in lieu of the still outstanding temporal punishment. Here we come to what M. Boudinhon calls 'la pénitence tarifée'—penance by tariff. And under this comes in the whole theory and system of 'indulgences.'

"4. *Form and Matter* is another distinction which has valuable meaning up to a certain point. In almost every sacrament it was pressed to far more technicality than it would bear. But it required a special act of force to apply it to the sacrament of penance at all. The ultimate Tridentine position laid down that the 'form' was the *Ego te absolvo*, etc.; and that the 'quasi-matter' was what the penitent supplied—his contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The extreme artificiality of this is obvious" (Moberly, *Fulham Conference on Confession*, pp. 34, 35 and 36).

The teaching of the PB is clear enough. It returns to the position of the Church before the

Lateran Council of 1215. It does not abolish the penitential discipline

of the Church, but it gives liberty to the individual conscience while it expresses the desire for the restoration of public penance (Commin.). The PB insists on the absolute necessity of self-examination, and confession of sins to God. With regard to Absol. the following points may be noted. (i) *Absolution belongs to the whole Church.* "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to His Church to absolve, etc." (Absol. in VS). *The priest is only the organ of the Church for this purpose.* The Absolution in MEP is to be said by the priest alone, who is also empowered to say to a sick penitent, "by His authority committed to me I absolve thee . . ." (Absol. in VS). (ii) *Absolution readmits to the Fellowship of the Church:* in this respect it is strictly "judicial." (iii) *Absolution brings home God's forgiveness to the individual penitent.* So far as God's forgiveness means restoration of fellowship to God, the absolving Priest can only declare it with the authority of God's ambassador. But in so far as forgiveness implies the renewed vitality of the soul, and this vitality depends on a peaceful conscience and a strengthened faith,

Absol. may be a means of conveying grace to the penitent.<sup>1</sup>

Absolution is of two sorts, *public* and *private*. The penitential introduction to MEP, perhaps inserted in 1552 to remedy laxity due to the disuse of private confession now no longer compulsory, has been retained in all subsequent revisions, and, coming as it does in the forefront of the PB, seems clearly to express the deliberate judgment of the Ch. of Eng. that *Public* Absolution, as is provided here and in HC, is of real efficacy.<sup>1</sup> *Private* Absolution, following on special Confession, is provided for by the PB in the following two cases.

#### 9. Private Absolution.

(a) *Visitation of Sick*. "Then shall the Minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins and be in charity with all the world. . . . Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by his authority committed unto me I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'"

(b) If it be right for a sick person with a troubled conscience to seek this ministry of Absol., it cannot be wrong for a person in health to do the same. And the PB provides for it. *The 1st Exh. in HC* describes the necessary preparation for every communicant—careful self-examination and immediate confession to God: it then continues: "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and 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, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

Some words of Hooker may here be quoted (*EP* vi. 6 2): "We labour to instruct men in such sort that every soul which is

10. *Medicine, not Food.* wounded with sin may learn the way how to cure itself; they (the Romans), clean contrary, would make all sores

<sup>1</sup> [The distinction between the two functions of Absol. noted above (ii and iii) is confirmed by the fact that, while the *judicial* act is assumed to be complete, the *conditional* character of the ambassadorial element in Absol. permits a *prayer* for forgiveness as the immediate sequel.—G. H.]

<sup>2</sup> [Some would go further and infer from its position that this is the ordinary and sufficient assurance of God's forgiveness; and would urge that this inference is further borne out by the general tenor of the Exhs. in MP and HC, with which may be compared the last Answer in the Catechism.—G. H.]

seem incurable, unless the priest have a hand in them"; and again: "To use the benefit of this help, for the better satisfaction in such cases, is so natural that it can be forbidden no man; but yet not so necessary that all men should be in case to need it" (*EP* vi. 6 17).

This ministry of private Absol., following on Confession, is obviously to be regarded as a medicine rather than a food of the soul. But who is to decide when the medicine is needed? It is left entirely to the conscience of the individual communicant to resolve when, and how often, he needs this remedy. The PB leaves us absolute liberty of conscience; any sort of compulsion to the use of private Confession and Absolution is contrary to Ch. of Eng. teaching: it is equally contrary to PB principle to deny the validity or legitimacy of this ministry, or to disparage it.

In the First PB (1549) the following words appear at the end of the first Exh. in HC: "Requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with those that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church; but in all these things to follow and keep the rule of charity." This paragraph disappeared from subsequent editions of the PB. It must be remembered that the liberty given in the Ch. of Eng. to use or not to use private Confession and Absol. was a tremendous innovation. When men were accustomed to the change it may well have been thought unnecessary to repeat the appeal for liberty and charity.<sup>1</sup> It ought to be unnecessary now.

*The forms of Absolution* provided in the PB are: (a) in MEP, "He pardoneth and absolveth . . ."; (b) in HC, "Al-

#### 11. Forms of Absolution.

mighty God . . . have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins," etc.; (c) in VS, quoted above. The particular form used is not a matter of primary importance. In every case the Priest is exercising the "ministry of the Word," and the Absol. is based on Scriptural authority. The precatory form of ABSOLUTION (as used in HC) is certainly the oldest. The earliest instance of the form used in VS ("*ego absolvo te*") is in the Pontifical of Egbert (8th cent.). But, whatever form is used, the minister in Absol. is generally held to be exercising a special ministry, different from that of the preacher or the teacher.

In the First PB (1549) the Rubric preceding the Absol. in VS was worded thus: "shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions." In subsequent editions "after this form" became "after this sort," and the last clause was omitted. Liberty was thus

<sup>1</sup> [Another interpretation of the omission is that these words might seem to leave the systematic resort to private Confession as in the view of the Eng. Ch. an equally desirable alternative with the use of the public Absolutions after private preparation gathered up in the public Confessions; whereas the Reformers definitely adjudged the latter to be the primary and normal course, and the former to be the last resort. But the argument in either case is somewhat precarious as being *esilientio*.—G. H.]

given to the minister to use whatever form he thought best.

V. There can be no question that the PB regards R. not as a mere temporary condition, precedent to receiving God's forgiveness, but

**12. Repentance and Character.** as an abiding attitude of the soul. Hooker rightly speaks of R. as "a name which noteth the *habiti* (*ἔξῆς*) and operation of a certain grace or virtue in us" (*EP* vi. 5 3). The more sure a Christian is of God's forgiveness, the deeper will his contrition become. It is for this reason that the Confession in the Communion Service, offered by those who are preparing to draw near to receive that holy Sacrament, expresses a stronger sense of sin than the Confession at MEP: "The remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable." Thus the season of Lent is ordained in the Church not only to awaken to R. those who are sinful and forgetful of God, but to deepen the contrition of the faithful. The measure of a Christian's contrition is the measure of his peace with God, and a peaceful conscience is the indispensable condition of a life of active and loyal service.—Pe.

J. A. KEMPTHORNE.

#### REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH COUNCIL.—

This body grew out of the Houses of Laymen formed in 188 by the Convs., and consists of the four Houses of Conv. sitting jointly with the two Provincial Houses of Laymen. The interpretation and definition of points of faith and doctrine are beyond its scope. It is hoped by many that it may become a legislative body with large powers, but subject to the veto of Parl. (cp. ORDER, § 21). This is, however, a matter for the future. And it is a question whether it be not too unwieldy a body to "do more than express big opinions upon big questions" (Abp. Davidson, *R. Com. Eccles. Disc.* 3 363). See further, CONVOCATION, § 7; FRANCHISE.—A2. G. HARFORD.

**REPROACHES.**—A form of service used in the Lat. Ch. on Good Friday in which Christ is represented as *reproaching* his people, mainly in words taken from Scripture, for the insults and cruelty with which they treated him at his Passion.—99.

J. W. TYRER.

**REQUIEM.**—The first word of the Introit in Mass for the departed. Hence this whole Mass came to be called R., or *Mass of R.*—ob.

A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**REREDOS.**—The word R., formerly also otherwise applied (*N.E.D.*), now signifies the ornamental wall or screen behind an altar. In early times a Baldachin surmounted the Holy Table, e.g., the magnificent silver one in

Sta. Sophia. Wren designed one for St. Paul's, and one has recently been put into Peterborough Cathedral. In English parish churches the east window was usually brought down to within a short distance of the altar slab. Underneath it (sometimes) ran an arcade of arches, e.g., Exeter and Ely Lady Chapels; or the space was filled in with panelling and sculpture, e.g., Oldham Chantry, Exeter; or a R., about the same height as the altar, consisting of a few niches with figures, or of one or more subjects,

was placed above it, and was called a "Table" (*English Altars* and other works, Alcuin Club). Later, the R. became much loftier, either as an open screen with statues (Durham), or a Triptych (Durham), or a wall covered with niches and statues, e.g., Christchurch Priory (late decorated), Winchester, St. Albans, St. Mary's Overye, and New, All Souls, and Magdalen Colleges (Oxford). Many similar smaller ones were built; some still remain in Westminster Abbey, etc.

At the Reformation all "Tables" were ordered to be destroyed. The wall was to be repaired, and a copy of the Decalogue, etc., "imprinted for the said purpose," to be fixed upon it.

#### 2. In Post-Reformation Times.

In Cathedrals, "the said precepts be more largely and costly painted out to the better show of the same." Rs. came back in Stuart times. Many old ones had survived, and new ones were made. The Puritans, when in power, made short work of these, but after the Restoration many "altar-pieces" were put up, like those which Wm. Law's (1727) *Patronus* would "go 40 miles to see." Georgian altar-pieces abounded, generally enshrining the Decalogue, etc., sometimes with Moses and Aaron as supporters. During the early Gothic Revival something more "correct" was desired. In 1843 (September) the *Ecclesiologist*, in a piquant article well worth reading, protested against this craze, and suggested an ancient model which "would not cost the fifth part of some that only serve to spoil a church." But the craze has continued, and more money has been wasted on bad Rs. than on any other church furniture. Yet many good ones have been built, and some ancient ones restored. The Exeter Judgments (1873-75) upheld the lawfulness of sculptured figures on the R., and the St. Paul's Judgments (1889-91) that of representations of the Crucifixion. But in Pre-Reformation times many Rs. were without the Crucifixion. It is found at Winchester, St. Albans, and All Souls, but not at Christchurch Priory (Tree of Jesse), Magdalen, or New Colleges. But statues abounded, and the *motif* generally seems to have been the Communion of Saints. Van Eyck's subject for the great Ghent altarpiece was the Adoration of the Lamb. The *Last Supper*, often represented on modern Rs., was not formerly so used. Da Vinci, Ghirlandajo and others painted the *Last Supper* in the Refectory, then esteemed the proper place for it.—R4. W. A. WICKHAM.

**RESERVATION.**—The rule to let nothing of "the body of the passover" remain over until the morning (Exod. 12 10) may be

#### 1. Primitive Usage.

traced among Christians in Jerusalem alone (Hesych. Hieros., *in Levit.* 8). Early Christians used to send by the deacons, c. 155, portions of the Euch. elements to those unable to be present, and some took them home for their own subsequent use in private. In a more formal way Bps. or priests from Irenaeus' time sent them to others at



Easter as a sign of inter-communion (1 Cor. 10 17). This was forbidden in the East in 365, but at Rome itself Zephyrinus, *c.* 203, and other popes, etc., in Italy till the 8th cent. sent the "leaven" (*fermentum*), as it was figuratively called. This usage was derived from the primitive principle of doing "nothing without the Bishop," combined with the "*sancita*"—the custom of the Pope securing a material continuity in the Euch. services from day to day by reserving from each day's mass a host to be employed ceremonially in his consecrating on the day following. He also sent consecrated bread from his own mass to priests whose duty was to celebrate in the *tituli* or churches in the city (Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, and Eng. ed., 185). Thus the rite of the PRESANCTIFIED, which obviated consecration on Good Friday and Easter Even by reserving from the Euch. of Maundy Thursday, was a very simple matter in early times and grew naturally in Roman practice.

It was a work of charity to extend to those whom circumstances precluded from the daily, or frequent, communion in the congregation of the faithful, which their soul desired, some part of the Apostolic usage of "breaking bread at home," Acts 2 46. Tertullian, *c.* 192, contemplated the possibility of his widow marrying a heathen, who would see her consume a particle of the Euch. species which she might have with her in the house (*Ad uxor.* 2 5). In time of persecution and when some, like Cyprian, felt that to be deprived of daily participation was a spiritual danger, R. was widely practised in the case of those in prison or in hiding. In 250 Cyprian advised, for sake of caution, that only one priest and one deacon should for the future go, otherwise unattended, to "offer" the Christian Sacrifice in confessors' cells (*Ep.* 5 2). Indiscriminate carrying of the Euch. on the person (as Satyrus, the brother of St. Ambrose, used to carry it), or reserving it at home in casket or receptacle (*arca*) by persons of either sex, was sometimes attended with undesirable circumstances (Cypr., *De laps.* 26, *De spect.* 5). After persecutions ceased, it became necessary in some places (Armenia, Spain; cp. Scudamore, *Notit. Euch.* 905) to curtail the old liberty of R., and as a general rule restrict it for the use of the sick. When recrudescence of persecution was anticipated, *e.g.*, in Thessalonica *c.* 519 (cp. Scotland *c.* 1688-1792, and, not improbably, England *c.* 1642-60, as Jer. Taylor practised R.), resort was had once more to reservation.

Reservation for the sick and dying was continued in East and West all through the Middle Ages. In the Eastern Church the Sacrament reserved for the sick was continued to be placed entirely out of the sight of persons worshipping in the nave. In W. Europe the fact of its presence outside the time of celebration and communion by priest or congregation was, from *c.* 1100, by various expedients made more noticeable as time went on, while the doctrine

connected with Transubstantiation, a term coming into use about the time of the Norman Conquest, became familiar to the clergy through the hymns and lessons provided by Aquinas for the Corpus Christi feast in 1264. Meanwhile changes introduced in the church buildings in the 12th and 13th cents., some time before this festival was firmly established in England, prepared the layfolk to accept the use of the Sacrament for centralising their adoration. The veil which in earlier times had completed the enshrinement of the altar was removed except in Lent, and the faithful, gathered in churches built and furnished in the Gothic style, were enabled to concentrate their gaze upon the altar or upon the pyx. This receptacle (called at one time *chrismale*), which in England, as in some other places, was shaped like a dove, was suspended by chains or cords and pulleys just above the altar, and contained the host in readiness for being carried to the sick. It was not until the latter part of 15th cent. that in some churches in this country a niche in the reredos was provided, having lock and key; and the pyx, no longer suspended, was then constructed with a stem and foot, after the manner of a covered chalice. Although the Sacrament had been carried in procession at Canterbury on Palm Sunday and used for R. on Maundy Th. and Good Fr. from the time of Lanfranc, *c.* 1080, the entombment of the host in the Easter Sepulchre was a custom perhaps no earlier than the 13th cent., and was distinctly later than the burial of the rood. The use of a monstrance, or *ooster*, and a practice of benediction with the chalice are found locally, but had never become generally observed or enjoined by canon in the Church of Eng. before the parting of the ways was reached *c.* 1550. A generation earlier, in northern countries of western Europe, attention was drawn to the divergence between the original institution of the Euch. and its presentment in those days, both in terms of its doctrinal definition and in the furniture and arrangement of their churches. It was admitted by the fathers at the Council of Trent, 11 Oct., 1551, that the original purpose of our Saviour's institution of the most holy Sacrament was its reception, "*ut sumatur*" (Sess. xiii, cap. 5); but from that point they parted company with the English and German reformers. On the part of the Church of Rome the dogma of Transubstantiation was affirmed, *latría* to the Sacrament defended, reverent and triumphant processions of the Sacrament approved, and likewise R. thereof *in sacrario* and carrying in time-honoured manner to the sick (with bell and light), anathema being denounced against those who should maintain the contrary.

The Eng. clergy, on the other hand, were committed, notwithstanding, to the propositions of the 42 Articles of 1552, published in May, 1553, previously drafted in Cranmer's 45 Latin Articles, and, after some modification, included in their final form among the

### 2. Practical Grounds.

### 3. Mediæval and Tridentine Use.

### 4. Anglican Doctrine.

Elizabethan 39:—"The Sacrs. were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should rightly (duly, 1562) use them" (Art. 25, *olim* 26). "Transubstantiation . . . cannot be proved by holy Writ, but . . . hath given occasion to many superstitions" (Art. 28=29, *Of the Lord's Supper*). "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not (commanded) by Christ's ordinance (to be) kept (reserved, 1562), carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped" (*ib.*). Bp. E. C. S. Gibson (*Articles* 664) thinks it possible that the last paragraph may be due to the promulgation of the decrees of Trent. The Council there had before it the Lutheran and Augsburg teaching as well as the opinion of the Franciscans (Darwell Stone, *Hist. Euch.* 2 141 ff.). The introduction of the Declaration on kneeling (BLACK RUBRIC) by the King's Council in 1552, its presumable purpose, its omission in 1559, and subsequent reissue as altered by authority in 1662, are narrated by Stone (2 144, 204, 318). Art. 28 does not in so many words declare that reservation is a thing unlawful in itself, but it draws attention to the truth that the practice in question, among others, was not by Christ's ordinance so done or established. Further, some results of the practice were declared to be superstitious.

Shortly before the Arts. were imposed, the rubric of the 1549 PB had limited the use of R. to days when there was a celebration of the

#### 5. Use of 1549 PB.

Lord's Supper and "open Communion" in church. It prescribed the use of Gen. Conf., Absol., and Comfortable Words before the curate (having himself received in church) should distribute HC in the sick person's house; and the Thanksgiving to be said aft. On days when there was no HC in church, on warning received by him, he was to "visit the sick person afore noon," and, after short VS when requisite, celebrate in the house, using Introit, *Kyrie*, etc., and Canon of 1549. If there were other sick in the parish to receive HC the same day, he was to "reserve so much of the Sacr." in both kinds as should suffice for all, and after the 1st private Communion, at which he himself also was to partake, he was immediately to carry what remained on to the other house or houses to administer to expectant sick and their friends. A short form of Anointing was also provided. The thought of spiritual Communion, found in St. Augustine *In Jo. Evang. tr.* 25, was already familiar in Eng., through Sar. and York *Manuals*, and was addressed particularly to those too ill to swallow. Alex. Aless in his Latin PB introduced another consideration, lateness of hour. The recitation of the Canon or Consecr. in presence of the sick, and priest's Communion with them, were in 1549 a novelty in Eng., but were a return to primitive and perhaps apostolic custom. They had been recently suggested by German Ch. Orders, and were an expedient advocated by Hermann von Wied in 1543. The Abp. of Cologne forbade carrying the reserved Sacr., and encouraged private celebration even for men in health living far from "temples." At the rising in Devon, July, 1549, it was demanded to "have the Sacrament hang over the high altar and to be worshipped as it was wont to be." This demand was resisted. According to inventories taken 10 Apr. only 27 pyxes remained in Lincs. In Bucks, in 1552, 45, besides 1 monstrance, remained among 122 churches. Instances are found here and there where a

local authority allowed the pyx to be kept, presumably for clinical Communion, in July (6 Edw. VI), 1552 (*Hæterurg. Anglic.* 2 158). Many more parishes had sold it, and where this had not been done Edwardian Commissioners inventoried this ornament to the king's use. After Mary's accession Card. Pole, 10 Feb., 1556, required parishes to have *tabernaculum decens*, etc., and pyxes were replaced in 1554 under Marian Injunc. 13.

After the death of Queen and Primate, pyx and tabernacle were sold or done away with everywhere, and Easter Sepulchres commonly "defaced" or "broken," between taking of inventories under Injunc. 47 in 1559 and Elizabeth's 8th year, 1566. Whereas Bonner in 1554 had required clergy to "preserve" the Sacr. in a pyx, or otherwise, week by week, Abp. Grindal visiting his provinces (York, 1571; Cantuar, 1576) inquired whether among "monuments of superstition and idolatry" any "pixes" remained undefaced. He required the silver chalice with "a cover of silver for the same, which may serve also for the ministration of the Communion bread," to be everywhere provided (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* 1 148, 151, 399).

"From 1549 to 1552 reservation in the Ch. of Eng. was in its purpose limited to communicating the sick. In no case was the Sacr. to be kept beyond the day on which it was consecrated" (J. Dowden, *Further Studies on PB* 249). In 1552 the PB dropped all provision for even a limited reservation.

Winchester and Eton joined Oxford and Cambridge in petitioning Q. Eliz. to authorise prayers in Latin, for educational purposes. Her patent, 6 Apr., 1560, does not seem to have been continued by her successors, though Latin PBs. were sometimes introduced in colleges (Ch. Ch., 1615; Peterhouse, 1633). The majority of colleges at Cam., c. 1568, refused Latin prayers (Mullinger 2 203). It is questioned whether Walter Haddon's appendix, *Communio Infirmorum* (*Liturg. Services Q. Eliz.* 404), was ever used. It did not represent the PB of 1552 or 1559 accurately, and was largely derived from Aless, 1549. Though never reprinted till 1847, and superseded as it was by corrected eds. 1572, 1574, etc., it may yet have tended to keep alive the thought or practice of R. among English students, and possibly in Ireland, where Latin was allowed long after the pyx had been confiscated at Winton<sup>1</sup> and the tabernacle destroyed at Eton where Haddon had been a scholar and, in 1560, visiting commissioner.

So long as the rubrics continued vague, 1552-1661, as to what amount of the Order of HC was

#### 7. The 1662 Settlement.

to be said in the sick house, a priest here and there might naturally be found to consider himself at liberty to reserve, particularly in times of persecution, as under the Puritan Directory, or in danger and isolation such as attended Jacobite Episcopals in parts of Scotland. Writing while the PB was proscribed, Ant. Sparrow used the liberty of the press to publish his *Rationale* (1657). In one passage, 279, he says, citing Gratian, etc., that what is consecrated and remains "is all to be spent with fear and

<sup>1</sup> Three Communion service-books in Latin (and 3 Litany books and a calendar) were bought for Winton Coll. Chapel in 1567 (Kirby, *Annals* 281). Possibly these were separate portions of PB, as B. Mus. C. 25 b. 5, *Ordo Distributionis*, 1548; cp. B. Mus. 221 e. 5, A.D. 1551, in the case of Aless.

reverence by the communicants in the Church": but, 349-50, he recommends following "the former directions in time past" (1549), on the ground that the rubric then in force from (1552 and) 1559 was not sufficiently explicit as to the rite of Communion of Sick. In 1662 the direction to consecrate the Euch. in the sick man's house was definitely supplied, but the permission or direction to make reservation in the Ch., which Bp. Sparrow had mentioned and which it is presumed he wished to see widely and by express authority restored, was not re-instated (though he reprinted his *Rationale* unaltered), while, on the contrary, in the Order for Administration in churches a new rubric was added, to require that, "if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church; but the Priest" with others "shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." This, like the somewhat similar rubric of the Scottish liturgy of 1637, was probably intended by some of the revisers to prevent desecration (cp. 3 *Decretum, De consec. 2 23*). At the same time its effect and, as our Archbishops, 1 May, 1900, have judged, one of its objects were prohibitive of such reservation as Cosin before 1640 and Thorndike, another of the revisers of 1661, had in mind, and which Jer. Taylor practised, presumably in time of persecution, and, as the inscription on his *pyxis* seems to imply, continued as a bishop of the Restoration, c. 1661-7. Those Non-jurors who practised R. for the sick among minor "usages" put their practice into form. They composed a rubric in 1718 (cp. *Alcuin Club Collection 17 90*) which would in the opinion of the present writer hardly have been sanctioned by authorities in England in 1661-2.

In recent years, when many Eng. priests have scrupled to receive HC unless they are fasting, and in some cases have been distressed by the surroundings in crowded slums, they have resorted to R. for the sick with or without their Bp's cognisance. The attempt made in some quarters to introduce the "Salutation of the B. Sacrament" and other devotions never authorised in the Ch. of Eng. has discouraged any movement towards securing authority for definite authorisation of a practice which is a relief to sundry consciences, but which has been held by highest Eng. authority in 1900 to be illegal at present. There is some hesitation also about taking a step which would tend to withdraw after 350 years the privilege which sick and bedridden people have enjoyed according to the use of the Ch. of Eng., in having the Euch. consecrated with their friends around them: much as the totally different custom in Scotland has become endeared to generations of Episcopalians across the border.

In the Scottish Episcopal Church, R. for the sick, though practised in Celtic and mediæval times, went generally out of use from 1560 until c. 1718, when the "usage" party among the English Non-jurors

published their HC office in London, deriving it in part from the 1549 PB (J. Dowden, G., 15 Nov. 1889). It was in fact forbidden already by the Scottish canon of 1636:—"In the ministration he," the Presbyter, "shall have care that the elements are circumspectly handled; and what is reserved thereof be distributed to the poorer sort, which receive that day; to be eaten and drunken by them before they goe out of the church." In the next year the PB issued for Scotland contained a Rubric (Keeling, *Liturg. Brit.* 230) which in the opinion of Bp. Dowden and Dr. W. Bright distinctly excluded R., until a change was made for the Episc. Ch. of Scotland by the Scottish office of 1735 which has no rubric corresponding to the Eng. one, "*And if any of the bread and wine.*" Accordingly, for the last 1½ centuries and more, the clergy who have used the Scotch office have not uncommonly reserved the Sacr. for communicating the sick. "There was nothing that even seemed to forbid them so to do" (Bp. Dowden, G.). Early 18th cent. eds. of the Scottish office (previous to the new order of 1735 and 1764), printed in Edinburgh and professing to be "authorised by K. Charles I. anno 1636," were apt to omit the rubric, "*In the ministration . . . out of the church.*" The Non-jurors' office of 1718 (Ja. Bettenham, Pater-noster-Row) has the post-comm. rubric recognising clinical reservation (Dowden, *Annotated Scotch Comm. Office 321*). No special form is used at communicating with the reserved Sacr. in Scotland (F. C. Eeles, *Alcuin Club Coll.* 17 90 n., 1910).—HC.

CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH.

**RESPOND.**—A peculiar species of antiphon, sung aft each lesson at Nocturns, and, for the most part, in earlier times aft. the short chapters at the other Hours of Pr. as well. It consists of a text, which generally, in the more ancient Responds, is rather founded on Scripture than expressed in its actual words, and which is always divided into two or more clauses. This is followed by a second text, called the *Versè*, and then the latter of the above clauses is repeated, the *versè* being usually contrived with some ingenuity to join on to the clause and make one continuous sentence with it. For instance: "God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him: Take now thy son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and offer him to Me for a burnt offering\* upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of. *Versè*: Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the most Highest\* upon one of the mountains," etc. The Respond, like the Antiphon, is one of the most ancient features of the Divine Service in the Western Church. Responds were frequently lengthened by having additional *verses*. One such *versè* in constant use was the first half of the *Gloria Patri*—without "As it was," etc. Aft. the last *versè* in every case came the repetition of the last clause of the text with which the Respond began.—B2.

A. M. Y. BAYLAY.

**RESPONSE.**—See **VERSICLE**.

**RESTITUTION.**—The restoring of what has been misappropriated, wherever this is possible, is the necessary evidence of a genuine repentance. As such it is prescribed as a part of the preparation for HC (1st Exh.): "If ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make *restitution* and satisfaction,<sup>1</sup> according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the word *satisfaction* is used to indicate *equitable compensation* in cases where actual restitution is impossible.

you to any other." The Jewish law of R. is given in Ex. 22 1-9; cp. Num. 5 7. David fixed the extreme of R. in the case of the offender whose transgression was described in Nathan's story (2 Sam. 12 6); and Zacchæus was willing to make like amends for his extortion of which he might have been guilty (Luke 19 8).—Pc. E. HOBSON.

**RESTORATION OF THE ROYAL FAMILY.—**  
See STATE HOLY-DAYS.

**RESURRECTION.—I.** The Resurrection of Christ is, and always has been, a principal article of the Creeds. The starting-point

**1. Christ's Resurrection.** of Christian belief is the conviction that Jesus Christ is living, that His ministry did not end at the cross, but that it is still continued on earth and in heaven. The apostles' assurance of this did not rest solely on a general belief in the future existence of the good; it rested on the assertion of those who said that they had seen Jesus alive after He had been committed to the tomb. They believed that "Jesus lives" because they believed that "Jesus rose." For them the Easter Faith depended on the Easter Message. No one now challenges the sincerity of those who bore this witness. So axiomatic for the early Christians was the R. of Christ that it is continually used as the ground of symbolic language about the possibilities of the Christian life (Rom. 6 4, Phil. 3 10, Col. 3 1), and incidentally it is alleged as the guarantee of His sovereignty and redeeming power (Rom. 4 25, 8 34, 14 9, 2 Cor. 5 15).

Not even in 1 Cor. 15 does St. Paul aim at proving Christ's R.; rather does he presuppose it and adduce it that he may convince those who doubted their own Resurrection. He reminds his correspondents that it is part of the Christian tradition which he had received and preached that Christ "rose the third day" and was seen by various witnesses. His enumeration of these does not pretend to be exhaustive; he merely rehearses the main facts in the form already stereotyped by use. This was the Christian tradition when the Church of Corinth was founded (A.D. 50); and even earlier, for St. Paul had "received" it after his conversion (A.D. 35). The position and quality of the witnesses in this statement are noteworthy:—(1) *Peter*, the leader of the Twelve; cp. Lk. 24 34; (2) *the Twelve*, i.e., the Lord's most intimate companions; cp. Lk. 24 36, Jn. 20 19, (Mk.) 16 14; (3) *the Five Hundred*, *ἑκκάρη*, i.e., "once for all"; it did not happen again to this large company to have such an experience (this is probably the appearance recorded Matt. 28 16, as being observed in Galilee; there were, apparently, only 120 disciples in Jerusalem, Acts 1 15); (4) *James*, i.e., James the Lord's brother, afterwards head of the Jerusalem Ch. (the *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews* gives an apocryphal account of this); (5) *all the Apostles*, the term "apostle" being here used in its widest sense; cp. Lk. 24 50, Acts 1 4. The witness of these leading individuals and well-recognised groups was the

rock on which the Christian Gospel rested; the other recorded appearances of the Risen Christ to (a) *the women* (Matt. 28 9, Jn. 20 14); (b) *the Travellers to Emmaus* (Lk. 24 13); (c) *the Seven in Galilee* (Jn. 21 1), were rather of a *private* character, and so were not recounted in the traditional form of words (1 Cor. 15 4 ff.).

How could these witnesses have been mistaken? Men, sometimes, see visions when

there is no objective reality corresponding to the mental picture; but in such cases there is a pre-disposition to see them, and here

there was no expectation of the kind. To all seeming, the cross was the end. Nor were these apparitions observed only by individuals; they were seen by companies of persons. A plurality of witnesses increases greatly the difficulty of explaining, as the creation of subjective fancy, the fact to which they testify. It is further impossible, on the "visions" theory, to suggest a reason why these wonderful experiences ceased when they did, and why the last took shape in the story of the Ascension or final departure of the Master from sight. There must have been an objective reality behind the conviction of the apostles, which was so strong that, in the face of all obstacles, the Church was built upon it.

Christ, then, was *seen* (ὄφθη). He was *objectively* present to the organs of sight (although none, apparently, saw Him save those whose vision was quickened by devotion and faith). But, if so, there is no difficulty in the details of the Gospel narratives which tell that He was *heard* and *touched*. The act of vision is as intimately associated with material processes as are touch and hearing; the true visibility of the Christ would demand a materialisation (so to speak) of His Personality quite as much as speech or even the act of eating.

According to the Pauline tradition—of which the Christian Sunday is a perpetual reminder—the Christ rose on "the third day."

**4. Its Time and Place.** There is no evidence that the first Christians found any prophetic forecast of this in their Scriptures (Hos. 6 2 is irrelevant, nor is it quoted of the R. in the apostolic age), so that it cannot be regarded as evolved from exegesis of the OT. And the predictions of His R. by Jesus (Mk. 8 31, 9 9, 31, 10 34) were not understood by those who heard them. Thus the tradition of "the third day" rests on fact, and at this time Peter and the rest were at Jerusalem, where, therefore, the first "appearances" of the Risen Christ were observed.

With this conclusion Lk. 24 and Jn. 20 are in complete agreement; these Gospels (as well as the Appx. to Mk.) follow what may be called the "Jerusalem tradition" of the R. Lk. 24 is a much-compressed narrative, for it cannot be supposed that the Ascension, which is described in the concluding verses, took place on the first Easter Day; and hence it is not inconsistent with the chronological data of

Acts 1 3, which leave "40 days" between the Resurrection and the Ascension. Thus there is nothing in Lk. which forbids us to accept additional evidence for "appearances" in Galilee, although this Evangelist does not mention them. And of these we have accounts in Jn. 21 and Matt. 28, the latter story probably being based on what was contained in the lost conclusion of Mark. Mk. 16 8 breaks off in the middle of a sentence, and what followed in the original Gospel we can only guess at; but the parallelism between Matt. 28 1-8 and Mk. 16 1-8 is so close that we may reasonably infer that the end of Matt. 28 was derived from the same source as the beginning. We have, then, two traditions as to the R. preserved in the Gospels, that of Jerusalem and that of Galilee, distinct from, but consistent with, each other; and the Pauline tradition, set down in writing before either of them, suggests that the Risen Christ was seen in both localities, but first at Jerusalem. The variations in detail of the several reports are not greater than might be expected.

II. The "Resurrection of the body" is as much a part of Christian belief as is the "Life Everlasting." It is emphatically asserted in the Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds, the version of the former in the Baptismal Office literally translating the phrase of the Old Roman Creed *carnis resurrectionem*. But "the resurrection of the flesh" is not a NT phrase, and it has offended many thoughtful minds. That the material elements of the body of flesh are to be re-collected and revived at the Last Day is a doctrine which taxes faith seriously. But the phrase "carnis resurrectio," while useful as suggesting continuity between the present and future modes of our being, need not be taken so crudely; and it is with a wise instinct that the Anglican Church has preferred the rendering "resurrection of the body," as nearer to the apostolic words (cp. Rom. 8 11, 1 Cor. 15 44).

Belief in the "resurrection of the body" rests upon belief in the fact of Christ's bodily

R., and St. Paul's discussion of this (1 Cor. 15) demands the closest scrutiny. We must distinguish two

**6. Relation to Christ's R.**  
*momenta* in his argument. (1) There is a sense in which Christ's R. only proves the *possibility* of ours (1 Cor. 15 12-15). His epiphanies after His Passion show that, at any rate, He survived death. There is, at least, one great exception to the negative "dead men do not rise." He survived; why should not we? Death is not the inevitable end, the *terminus ad quem* of human life. But (2) St. Paul's main argument goes beyond this. It rests, not upon the *likeness* of Christ's R. to ours, but upon its *unlikeness*. It was a unique event, and it carries with it and guarantees the R. of all who are "in Him." He is not only "the first fruits of them that sleep," but "in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15 22). He is the *ζωοποιός*, the Life-giver. Bearing this in mind, we approach St. Paul's illustration of the sowing of the seed. Many

commentators<sup>1</sup> have interpreted the "sowing" of 1 Cor. 15 36 as if it signified the burial of the corpse, and the choice of 1 Cor. 15 for the Lesson in the Burial Office has done much to confirm this perverse interpretation. But, in truth, the act of sepulture is not in St. Paul's thoughts anywhere in this chapter (except at v. 4), and his argument forbids us to equate *sowing* with *burial*. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die" (v. 36); that is, there are three stages in the transformation of a seed, viz., *Sowing, Dying, Quickening*, and they succeed each other in this order. The seed is sown *before* it dies. But the burial of a corpse comes *after* death. There is no analogy between the sowing of a seed which *precedes* the death of the seed, and the burial of a human body which *follows* the death of that body. What, then, does the sowing of the seed stand for in St. Paul's thought? The answer is that it stands for our *birth*, not our *burial*. And to describe the "sowing" of this human seed, the apostle adopts the imagery of Gen. 1, 2, where the story of the Creation is told. Man's birth is the time when the seed is sown—in corruption, weakness and frailty during this mortal life—to blossom out after death into the perfect fruit. Birth and R. are the crises; death is but an incident, a change through which emancipation comes. The *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, the body of earth, can only reach its highest, like all other living organisms, through the passage of death. It is not quickened except it die. Of Christ this was also true. Even His Life-giving powers could not find full scope except through death's release. He "became a Life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15 45) at His R., and not in fullest measure until then.

The *unlikeness* between Christ's R. and ours becomes thus apparent. After death His

**7. Unlike as well as Like.** *σῶμα ψυχικόν* was quickened into the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, "the body of His glory," the action of the

Divine Spirit being so overmasteringly efficacious that no sensuous or fleshly element was left behind in the sepulchre. It was transfigured, the body of earth being in His case—for He was sinless—a fit habitation for the *πνεῦμα*. But that is not true of His disciples. For them the fleshly body has the taint of sin, and sin has the seed of death. Its "redemption" must involve the abandonment of what is tainted and corruptible, in order that the worthier elements of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* may be transformed into a fit abode for the spirit. The *σῶμα πνευματικόν* does not, then, bear exactly the same relation to the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* in the case of the Christian, that it bore in the case of Christ. In our case there is no question of the "empty tomb." Our bodies of flesh will be resolved into their original elements. But, for all that, there will be a "something" which will persist, which can be quickened into a larger life only through the passage of death. This "something" is the seed of the spiritual body

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Findlay's commentary in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* is free from this common mistake.

of the hereafter, and it will be quickened into life by the action of the life-giving Spirit of Christ upon the *πνεῦμα* which has assimilated and attracted it, and used it as its appropriate organ.

The Christian doctrine of the R. of the body rests, then, not upon unassisted logic, but upon the revelation of the issues of Christ's R. Yet it meets the demand of reason for the continuance of earthly friendships and affections, whose progress has been interrupted by death. It expresses our belief in a future where intercourse and communion may be conceived as natural, or even as inevitable. The R. body will, we need not doubt, present sufficient resemblance (if that is the right word) to the earthly body to make identification possible. But men ask "With *what* body will they come"? Is it with the body of youth, of manhood, or of old age? We have no certain information. A curious speculation (based on Eph. 4 13) is given by Thomas Aquinas,<sup>1</sup> "Christus in juvenili aetate pati voluit . . . ut futuram resurgentium qualitatem in seipso prae monstraret." There is no means of testing such a theory, but the idea is a noble one, however faulty the exegesis, that our spiritual bodies shall all possess that state which corresponds to the perfect humanity in which Christ rose from the dead; for He, as the Head of the human race, is the ideal of youth, of manhood, and of old age alike.

The argument of 1 Cor. 15 is discussed at length by the present writer in the *Exp.*, May and June, 1908, and he has examined the evidence for the R. of Christ in *QJR*, Jan., 1906;

both of which essays have been drawn on for this brief article. The bibliography of the subject is inexhaustible; but those who use this Dictionary will find Sparrow Simpson's *Our Lord's Resurrection* and Latham's *The Risen Master* useful. The most considerable destructive essay is that by Schmiedel in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. The works of Westcott, Swete, Milligan and Orr on the subject will repay examination.<sup>2</sup>—K2<sup>2</sup>.  
J. H. BERNARD.

**RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.**—To the modern mind belief in Christ's Sinlessness seems easier than belief in His R. Hermann (*e.g.*) in his *Communion with God* holds that God communes with us not so much through nature as through the historical phenomenon of Jesus Christ. Christ, unquestionably, as the Last Supper shows, thought Himself sinless. He "could not have spoken as He then did if He had been conscious of guilt within Himself." We see in Jesus the Almighty God: "God makes Himself known to us as the power that is with Jesus." This is a Gospel indeed. But R. is not a Gospel. It is in the sphere of the miraculous, not of the moral; and therefore

a hindrance to accepting Christ. "It is no Gospel, be it never so impressively delivered."

i. This distinctly modern objection is open to the following criticisms. 1. Both Sinlessness and R. are parts of the impression made by the Personality of Jesus upon His disciples. A personality which makes the first impression only is not the same personality as one which does both. We are here dealing with a religious experience. It can be taken as a whole or rejected as a whole, but it cannot consistently be treated eclectically and still assumed to be the same religious experience.

2. Both hang together as a matter of historical religious belief. It is true that some moderns believe in the Sinlessness without believing in the R.:  
**2. Both Beliefs** <sup>need</sup> **Explanation.** but religious history shows that this separation does not permanently continue. Those who deny Christ's R. always tend to deny His Sinlessness also. And the reason is that Sinlessness is just as much a miracle in the moral sphere as R. is in the physical. It requires an explanation. If the personality in Christ was really Divine, then His Sinlessness is explained. And at the same time His R. is rendered reasonable.

Moreover Sinlessness is unique. If Christ is unique in moral experience, so He may be, for anything we know to the contrary, in physical experience also. There may be an inner relation between Sinlessness and R., unless we are prepared to argue that the moral and the physical are unrelated. And if there is no parallel to Christ's R., neither is there to His Sinlessness. And we cannot recognise His uniqueness and then instantly demand a parallel.

ii. The modern mind requires carefully to realise what R. means, in the Christian idea of it. Christ's R. does not mean His mere survival of death. The contemporary Jews believed in survival apart from R. It is not a mere equivalent to immortality of the soul. Nor does it merely mean the triumph of the soul. The Jews knew that the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God. The disciples meant more when they affirmed that Christ was risen.

1. Resurrection means the triumph of the spiritual over the material. Popular religion regards man as a dualistic temporary combination of spirit and matter, which is to terminate in a permanent division at death. This is exactly what Christianity does not teach. Christianity holds that Body is the self-expression of Spirit; that the present body is an inadequate self-expression; but that ultimately the Spirit shall pervade the material and entirely subjugate it to the purposes of Spirit. Thus R. means the transmutation of our physical constitution into a perfect instrument for the expression of personality. This is not a doctrine to be lightly set aside as superfluous, or no Gospel at all.

2. Resurrection also signifies Redemption.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa*, Pars 34, Quaest., xlvi, art. ix, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> [C. H. Robinson adopts an independent attitude; E. A. Abbott, *The Kernel and the Husk*, etc., and K. Lake contend for an objective, but not a physical, Resurrection.—G. H.]

Christ died for our sins and rose again for our justification. [See also RESURRECTION.]—K2<sup>b</sup>.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

**REUNION.**—The word "reunion" does not occur in the PB, but the evils of disunion are plainly acknowledged in the Prayer for Unity, which was added to the

**1. Introductory.**

Accession Service when George I came to the throne. In this beautiful Collect, based in part on Eph. 4 4-6, there is an acknowledgment of the evils which arise from "our unhappy divisions," a petition for the removal of "all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord," and an expression of the desire that henceforth we may be "all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee." It is much to be desired that this prayer should be transferred to some more conspicuous place in our public services. A more familiar but less emphatic petition for unity is found in the Prayer for the Church Militant—"beseeching Thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity and concord."

The principle and obligation of Unity are dealt with in other articles (see CHURCH, HERESY, SCHISM); the object of the present article is to describe (1) the present state of religious disunion, (a) in Christendom generally, (b) in England especially; (2) the evils arising from religious dissension and chaos; (3) the attempts made toward Reunion in the past; (4) the nature of the proposals that are put forward at the present time; (5) some considerations which in the judgment of the present writer are essential to any fruitful negotiations.

(1) *The Present State of Religious Disunion.* A glance at the present condition of Christendom reveals the existence of great bodies

**2. Christendom Disunited.**

of Christians which are not only not united for common action in a single organisation, but are estranged by differences of doctrine, by want of mutual understanding, and, to a large degree, by a spirit of jealousy and by conflicting claims to authority. In the first place there is the great schism of East and West, which has existed now for some nine centuries, and which for more than four centuries there has been no serious attempt to heal. In its origin the schism was due far less to doctrinal causes than to political and racial differences, to the rival ambitions of Rome and Constantinople, and to the extreme claims of Papal absolutism. And so to-day it is not so much the question of doctrine that perpetuates the gulf as the question of government; but centuries of interrupted communion have widened the breach by emphasising differences of inherited tradition and atmosphere, and by familiarising men with the idea of separation as a permanent condition. Eastern Christianity has remained stationary and immobile, while the Church of Rome has developed fresh claims and new dogmas, and Western Christendom has been rent asunder by the effect of the Reformation. And the existence in some countries of "Uniate"

Churches, which combine obedience to Rome with an admixture of Oriental rites and of customs elsewhere forbidden by Rome, has not acted as a bridge between the two communions, but has rather been a source of strife.

When we turn to Western Europe, we find the Church of Rome nominally in possession of Italy, France, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and about one-third of Germany, although in several instances the great majority of the population appear to be hostile or indifferent to any definite form of Christianity. In Northern Europe the principles of the Continental Reformation have prevailed, and some form of Protestantism is professed by the great majority of the people, Lutheran being the most widespread type. In some countries—e.g., Germany and Switzerland—episcopacy has been altogether discarded; in Scandinavian countries there are bps., but the succession has been broken, except (probably) in Sweden, where it is not so highly regarded as in Eng. Speaking generally, the Protestants of the Continent are separated from Rome not only by their repudiation of the authority of the Pope, but by wide theological differences, by divergences of custom and discipline (e.g., clerical marriage), and also of worship and ceremonial. The OLD CATHOLICS represent an important principle, and their divergence from Rome is less considerable, but numerically they are weak. The Ch. of Eng., or rather the Ang. Communion, occupies a place apart. It differs from the Continental Reformation in its greater care to preserve the principle of continuity both in the episcopal succession and in its Creeds and public worship. It has claimed the rights and privileges of a national or particular Ch. without any intention of violating the principles of Catholic Unity; but in fact it is denied recognition and intercommunion by Rome, while it is in large measure isolated from Continental Protestants owing to their greater laxity as to questions of Ch. order and their disregard of continuity.

Lastly, we have in Eng. and in English-speaking countries all over the world the extreme

**3. Anglo-Saxon development of particularism, Dissent.**

development of particularism, which shows itself in the multi-plication of "Dissenting" or "Separatist" bodies. This is a peculiarity of the Anglo-Saxon race; in Continental Protestantism this fissiparous tendency is not nearly so marked. In England and Wales sixteen different denominations are represented in the "Free Church Council," the largest bodies being the Wesleyan Methodists, the Congregationalists and the Baptists; and this by no means exhausts the list of Christian denominations. In the United States it is said that 150 different religious bodies have an organised existence. And in addition to the organised denominations it must be remembered that there are a very large number of baptised Christians whose position is eclectic and undenominational; they are influenced by Christian morality and to some extent by Christian theology, but they do not

acknowledge Ch. membership or authority in any form. In view of such facts it is plain that in the Christendom of to-day we have a state of extreme religious diversity and disorder, which it is hardly an exaggeration to describe as "chaos."

(2) *The evil results* of this religious diversity are manifest to all thoughtful minds. They

have become most evident in the mission field, where rival Christian organisations are competing for converts among heathen peoples, to whom the significance of the doctrines or principles which divide them is often unintelligible, under conditions in which the original causes of strife in some cases no longer exist. Yet the evils are plain enough in any country. Waste and overlapping are perhaps the least of them, but they are very real evils. An English village or a Canadian township, for which under conditions of unity one clergyman and one place of worship would amply suffice, may have three or four half-empty churches or chapels and three or four half-starved ministers of religion, while there is a scarcity of men and money for carrying on the work which is needed elsewhere among heathen at home and abroad. The consequent waste of labour, machinery and funds is incalculable. But far more serious than the waste is the spirit of jealousy, rivalry and ill-will which almost inevitably springs up when different Christian bodies are at work in the same area. This may be, and sometimes is, mitigated by the cultivation of charity and mutual understanding. Yet it is almost impossible for human nature to avoid jealousy and rivalry under conditions which provoke competition. And this rivalry not only produces spiritual deterioration in the religious bodies themselves, but is a scandal and a cause of alienation to those who are outside. Experience both in the mission field and at home shows that religious diversity and competition are a great obstacle in the way of winning converts. At best they cause perplexity and bewilderment and doubt; when they degenerate into ill-will, they discredit Christianity altogether. "See how these Christians hate one another!" is often the excuse for, indeed the real cause of, aloofness from Christianity. Nearly 400 years ago Cranmer declared that we might easily convert even the Turks if we were agreed among ourselves, and the intervening centuries have only multiplied proofs that the task of the Ch. is made tenfold more difficult by her disunion. Nor need this be wondered at, if unity, external as well as internal, was the intention of our Lord and a fundamental principle of the Primitive Church.

(3) Before entering on the discussion of any proposals that are now suggested for Reunion, it may be useful to glance at some of the attempts which have been made in the past in that direction. Before the Reformation the one great breach of external unity was the schism between the Eastern Ch. and Rome. Two chief

attempts were made to heal this division, the first at the Council of Lyons in 1274, and the second at the Council of Florence in 1439. In both cases union was actually proclaimed and a *Te Deum* was sung, but in both cases the scheme entirely failed. The project of conciliation was in each case urged by the Eastern Emperor, under the growing pressure of Turkish attack, without any real support from the bps. or the general public opinion of the Eastern Ch. At the Councils there was no adequate discussion of the real points of difference, and the agreement arrived at was instantly repudiated by both clergy and people in the East. The failure is instructive. Since the Council of Florence there has been no serious attempt at reunion between Rome and the East, although in the 18th cent. some doctors of the Sorbonne took advantage of Peter the Great's visit to Paris to interest him in a scheme of conciliation. As regards the relations between the Ch. of Eng. and the Eastern Ch., some correspondence took place in the 17th cent. between Abps. Abbot and Laud and Cyril Lucar, but Cyril became a Calvinist, and perished under Jesuit intrigues.

The Reformation broke up the religious unity of Western Christendom; but this was not the intention of the first generation of Reformers. They had demanded reform, and had not intended to set up a rival Ch.; and in Germany, long after the deaths of Luther and Calvin, conferences were held with the hope of re-establishing communion; but Luther's abandonment of Episcopacy was a grave obstacle, and the Jesuit influence was strong against conciliation. Cassander, Wicelius, Pareus, Grotius, Calixtus, and John Durie (who obtained help from many English bishops, including Laud and Davenant), all in different ways worked at the problems of reunion. If Gustavus Adolphus had lived longer, something might have been effected, especially in conciliating Lutherans and Calvinists. In a later generation negotiations took place between Bossuet, the champion of Gallicanism, and the German philosopher, Leibnitz. The most obvious issue of these movements was the establishment of the United Ch. of Prussia by Frederick William III, from 1814 onwards.

In England the feeling against Rome was intensified by the cruelties of Mary's reign and by Romanist plots afterwards; but in the time of Charles I a Papal agent sounded Bp. Mountague, and reported favourably on the tenets and worship of the English Ch. The great English divines of the 17th cent. were more in sympathy with reunion than those who had preceded them, but the most definite negotiations took place in the 18th cent., when Abp. Wake entered into correspondence with Dupin and other theologians of the Sorbonne, with a view to uniting the Ch. of Eng. with the Gallican Ch. The proceedings, however, had no sanction from Rome. The French representatives were ready to recognise Eng. Orders, and Wake held that Transubstantiation need cause no difficulty. The death of



Dupin and the opposition of the Jesuits brought the matter to an end. The correspondence showed an admirable spirit on both sides, but in neither country was the general feeling ripe for such a movement.

As between the Eng. Ch. and Presbyterian or other dissenting bodies, attempts at conciliation have not been wholly wanting. In 1610 James I brought about the consecration of Presbyterian ministers, or titular bishops, to restore a modified episcopacy in Scotland. Thirty years later Abp. Ussher's book, *The Reduction of Episcopacie*, had a similar aim. After the Restoration, Richard Baxter and Jeremy Taylor were prominent champions of conciliation. Baxter and his friends submitted a scheme, based on Ussher's plan, according to which the bps. were to become presidents of diocesan boards of presbyters; and Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Propheying*—a noble plea for toleration—pointed in the direction of comprehension. It was natural that when William of Orange came to Eng. he should wish, for political as well as for religious reasons, to fuse the Protestant Dissenters with the Ch. of Eng. The attempt was made, but without any sufficient knowledge of the principles at stake, and the failure of the scheme of comprehension can hardly be regretted.

(4) For the understanding of the *present state of the question and the proposals now suggested*,

we must resume the history of R. from 1850 onwards, limiting ourselves to those aspects which specially concern the Ch. of Eng.

**6. Recent Attempts towards Reunion with Rome.**

Two influences combined to reopen the question in the middle of last century. (a) The rapid growth of infidelity caused in many minds a sense of the need of uniting all Christians against a common enemy. (b) The Oxford Movement laid stress on the unity of the Visible Ch. as a fundamental principle: its adherents could not acquiesce in disunion, but their convictions on the subject of Orders and Apostolical Succession led them to look towards union with Rome or the Orthodox Eastern Church rather than with Nonconformist bodies at home. Tract XC was itself in the nature of a "bridge" between England and Rome, since it denied any fundamental incompatibility between the 39 Arts. and the Tridentine doctrines. In 1853 the Anglo-Continental Society (now the Anglican and Foreign Church Society) was founded, and it has done useful work in spreading knowledge and promoting friendly relations. In 1857 the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom was formed, to bring about Corporate R. between the Roman, Orthodox Eastern, and Anglican Communions. In 1863 the *Union Review* was started, and in 1865 Dr Pusey published the first part of his *Eirenicon* (*The Truth and Office of the English Church*), in which he urged that the chief obstacle to R. with Rome lay not in her *de fide* doctrines, but in her popular system of worship. Dr. Pusey followed up his

*Eirenicon* by interviews with many of the French bps., and received some encouragement, but his hopes were dashed by the triumph of the Ultramontane party at the Vatican Council, and the promulgation of Papal Infallibility in 1870. Undoubtedly this event interposed a fresh and formidable barrier against union with Rome. Nevertheless, an attempt at *rapprochement* was made some twenty-five years later, when Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal endeavoured to secure the recognition of Anglican Orders by Leo XIII. In spite of the favourable opinion of the Abbé Duchesne, hostile influences prevailed at the Vatican, and in 1896 the Bull *Apostolicae Curvae* pronounced English Orders to be invalid (see T. A. Lacey, *A Roman Diary*). Under these circumstances it is generally recognised that proposals for R. or inter-communion are at present useless, and all that can be done is to encourage prayer, mutual courtesy and charity, and deeper study of the principles which are in question.

Our relations with the Orthodox Eastern Church are of a more hopeful kind, though progress is slow. The Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 records a steady growth of friendly intercourse between the two Communions. At the Bonn Conferences of 1874-5 Eastern theologians joined in discussing the *Filioque* clause and other points of difference from the West, and, though those Conferences were not continued, there have since that time been repeated efforts to make the principles of the Eng. Ch. clearer to the Orientals; there has been frequent interchange of courtesies between Eastern and Ang. bps.; Ang. clergy have ministered to Orthodox Easterns in cases of emergency, and *vice versa*. No definite proposals for R. can be formulated at present, but real progress has been made towards mutual recognition and a certain measure of inter-communion. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 recommended the establishment of a permanent Committee to deal with all that concerned our relations with the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and of Commissions to ascertain the precise doctrinal position of the ancient separate Churches of the East.

Among the Old Catholics of Germany, Austria and Switzerland a friendly feeling has always existed towards the Ch. of Eng., and invitations to Holy Communion have been mutually given; but the (Jansenist) Church of Holland has stood aloof, and the consecration of an Old Catholic bishop for the British Isles in 1908 was an unjustifiable act which is likely to impede the growth of friendly relations. As regards the Moravian *Unitas Fratrum*, some definite proposals for the participation of Anglican Bps. in the consecration of Bishops and ordination of Presbyters of the *Unitas*, and for the recognition of such Bishops and Presbyters, were sanctioned by the Lambeth Conference in 1908, but have not hitherto been fully accepted by the *Unitas*.

**7. Relations with the Eastern Ch.**

**8. With Old Catholics, etc.**

At the same Conference the Bishop of Kalmar in Sweden came to confer on the subject of an "alliance" between the Swedish and Anglican Churches, and produced strong evidence that the Swedish Episcopal Succession was unbroken. Further correspondence and investigation were thought desirable, and in 1909 the Bishops of Winchester, Salisbury, and Marquette, with others, visited Sweden with a view of promoting closer relations (cp. *The National Church of Sweden*, by Bp. J. Wordsworth, 1911).<sup>1</sup>

It is, however, with regard to non-episcopal bodies at home that the need of R. is most urgently felt. Perhaps the most definite pronouncement on the subject on the side of the Ch. is the "Lambeth Quadrilateral" of 1888, which laid down as the necessary basis of R. (a) the Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith, (b) the Apostles' Creed and Nicene Creed as the statement of faith, (c) the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, (d) the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to varying needs. This was reaffirmed at Lambeth in 1897, while in 1908 the Conference suggested that, in the case of orthodox non-episcopal Churches which had been careful as to the form and intention of Ordination, an approach might be made to R. on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610 in Scotland. It is indeed in Scotland that the greatest efforts towards unity have been made, by such men as Bps. Charles Wordsworth and G. H. Wilkinson, through conferences and united prayer; and a Christian Unity Association has been founded. In England a joint letter was issued in 1905, asking for united prayer for R. on Whit-Sunday, and acknowledging that "our Lord meant us to be one in visible fellowship," and that "our existing divisions hinder or even paralyse His work"; this letter was signed by the two Abps. and by the Presidents of the chief Dissenting bodies. In Australia suggestions for terms of R. were made by the Presbyterians, and have been discussed by the Bps. and the General Synod; in the United States a Committee to discuss the holding of a World Conference on matters of Faith and Order was appointed in 1910 by the Convention of the American Church.

Meanwhile the separated bodies have been taking steps towards union among themselves. The establishment of the "Free Church Council" facilitates common action on many questions; in 1907 three Methodist bodies were fused into "The United Methodist Church," and in 1909 the Established Ch. of Scotland consented to an unrestricted Conference with the United Free Ch., the latter being itself an union of two Chs. The non-episcopal bodies have awakened to the waste and unseemliness of rivalry; they no longer regard disunion as an advantage or a sign of vitality: but their view is often

utilitarian rather than based on a conviction that unity is a sacred principle, and they sometimes seem to aim at intercommunion or federation rather than at a closer unity, while the questions of episcopacy and succession are stumbling-blocks which have hitherto proved fatal to any definite proposals for Reunion.

(5) It remains to mention some points which appear to be of primary importance in attempts towards R. The process of removing deep-seated prejudices and misunderstandings must necessarily

#### 10. Conclusions.

be slow. Perhaps for some time the work must be of a preliminary nature—prayer for guidance and for charity, personal intercourse and acquaintance, historical study of the divisions of Christendom and of the principles which those divisions represent, deeper realisation of the obligation of unity and of the practical evils which disunion involves, the clearing away of cant, and the discarding of party watchwords. It has been pointed out not only by Anglicans but by members of other communions (e.g., Dr. Döllinger and Dr. Newman Smyth) that in some ways the Church of England is specially qualified to take a lead in the R. of Christendom, since she stands somewhat nearer to the Protestant non-episcopal bodies than does the Church of Rome or the Orthodox Eastern Church. Yet this very fact makes her position very difficult; if she assimilated herself to those ancient Churches she would be in danger of alienating Dissenters at home, whereas if she were to neglect the principles of succession and continuity she would (apart from the sacrifice of principle) most certainly alienate those Roman Catholics and Easterns who care for R., and make any complete R. on Catholic lines impossible. It has been observed that the evils of disunion are most keenly felt in the Foreign Mission Field, and it may be hoped that workers in that field will make many contributions to the solution of the problem. The World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 encourages that hope. In all discussions it is essential that both sides should have a clear idea of what kind of unity they are seeking. The word is ambiguous, and it is sometimes used to denote not an actual unity in a single organised body, but a loose federation, or a state of intercommunion with "interchange of pulpits." To the present writer it seems that there can be no true unity unless there is complete union of organisation and government in each area, and a central meeting-point and council in the Episcopate of the whole of Christendom. Thus, complete unity would not demand the universal acknowledgment of a centralised supremacy, like that of Rome, or absolute uniformity of ritual and discipline (or even of doctrine, except in fundamentals) among Roman Catholics, Easterns and Anglicans. But it would involve the elimination of all rival organisations in any national area such as England, and the possibility of a General Council or of machinery for the settlement of questions arising between the great Communions

<sup>1</sup> Their report, issued in 1911, recommends the offer of communion to properly qualified Swedish Churchmen by the Lambeth Conference or by a meeting of English Bishops.

of Christendom. Such unity, he believes, could only be attained on the basis of the Historic Episcopate and the principle of continuity, without which (as experience seems to show) the solidarity of Catholicism must yield to separatism and disintegration. He does not underrate the difficulty of convincing men of the essential character of episcopacy, nor can it be wondered at that those who reject the principle should regard insistence on it as a great and gratuitous obstacle to the progress of the cause of R. (see EPISCOPACY, APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION).

I. von Döllinger, *Reunion of the Churches* (Eng. Transl., 1872); A. J. Mason, *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*; Bp. Gore, *Orders*

**11. Literature.** and *Unity*; J. Armitage Robinson, *The Vision of Unity*; Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*; C. A. Briggs, *Church Unity*; *Reports of Conferences of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, 1888, 1897, 1908* (S.P.C.K.); *The Reunion Conference at Bonn, 1874*; *do.*, 1875 (with preface by H. P. Liddon); *Life of Dr. Pusey*, vol. iv.; *DECH on Reunion. The Reunion Magazine* (founded in 1909) is edited from an Anglican standpoint, but welcomes contributions from all quarters.—K<sup>6</sup>. WALTER HOBHOUSE.<sup>1</sup>

**REVERENCE.**—R. is rightly described as "fear arising from high respect." In relation to worship we may recall the derivation of the Latin word, "worthy approach to God." The directions of PB rubrics are conclusive as to attitude: "all kneeling," "all devoutly kneeling." The rubric dealing with kneeling at HC emphasises the point. The gifts of the faithful are to be "reverently" offered. The words of the Pr. of Humble Access also indicate the true spirit of reverent prayer. The confession of sin guides the expression to a real sense of divine nearness. Bodily postures, such as bowing the head when the Holy Name is mentioned, are indications of a desire to carry out the natural feeling of R. "The Lord is in His holy temple." It is prescribed in the 18th canon (1604) and in Q. Elizabeth's Injunctions (1559) that "When in time of Divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly R. shall be done by all persons present." The authority of Phil. 2 10, which deals with pr. in the name of Jesus, cannot be quoted in support, but the feeling which prompts the R. is absolutely correct, as George Herbert's lines testify:

"When once thy foot enters the church,  
be bare;

God is more there than thou; for thou art  
there

Only by His permission."

—R<sup>2</sup>. G. J. HOWSON.

**REVISION OF PB.**—Liturgical history is, for the Pre-Reformation period, concerned with the successive products of a series of waves of revising activity, modifying by changes, additions

<sup>1</sup> The late Bp. of Salisbury (Dr. J. Wordsworth) most kindly read through this art. in proof not long before his lamented death, and made several valuable suggestions and additions. No one in recent times has laboured more unceasingly in the cause of R. or has had a more profound knowledge of the problems connected with it.

and subtractions the earlier forms of Christian worship.

In England the Sarum and other

USES were so many revised recensions of common archetypes.

Cardinal QUIGNON'S work is a proof that in the early 16th cent. a fresh impulse towards revision was already strongly at work within the Western Ch., and the outstanding fact about the First PB of 1549 is that it embodies the momentous decision by which, of the three alternatives of change, (1) the abandonment of liturgical worship, (2) the construction of new forms, and (3) the reconstruction of the old, the last was the method adopted in the Eng. Ch. That the alterations were so many and so considerable as to require the term reconstruction rather than revision was due to well-known causes, of which the classical account is to be found in Pref.<sup>2</sup> (*Concerning the Service of the Church*), and Pref.<sup>3</sup> (*Of Ceremonies . . .*), both forming part of the First PB (see further, HISTORY OF PB). But the principle underlying the process is best expressed in *The Preface* of 1661 (cp. RITUAL, § 5, 17-19).

The First PB had not been long in use before "weighty and important considerations," as

the Revisers of 1661 judged in looking back, called for revision

to follow reconstruction. It is always difficult, and sometimes impossible, accurately to forecast the effect of liturgical and ceremonial changes—so many subtle and obscure currents of thought and feeling affect men's judgment in such matters. It was only natural, then, that the first revision of 1552, when the experience of the practical working of the new Service-Book was fresh, was a more extensive one than was thought necessary in 1559, when the Second PB was re-introduced practically in its entirety. When, after its second suppression under the Commonwealth, the PB came once more under discussion with a definite purpose of revision, the time was again ripe for thoroughgoing treatment, and, accordingly, the whole book was carefully overhauled, not a few additions being made and a large number of minute corrections introduced (see Art. HISTORY OF THE PB, § 20). In 1689 it seemed as if the trial of the changes of 1662 had already proved the need for further alterations. A Royal Commission was issued, and detailed proposals were made. But the moment was not opportune for such a work, and the secession of the Non-jurors had deprived the Church of some of its most devout and learned liturgical scholars. So the proposals<sup>1</sup> were dropped, after being thrown out by the Lower House of Convocation. The Gorham and *Essays and Reviews* controversies produced an immense crop of pamphlets,<sup>2</sup> most of them calling for revision to guard against Tractarian and Rationalistic doctrine; but nothing came of the agitation.

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted as a Blue Book in 1854.

<sup>2</sup> The Association for promoting a Revision of the PB, of which Lord Ebury was president, printed the titles of 66 issued from 1857 to 1863.

Some twenty years later the matter was handled in Conv., and an ed. of the PB with suggested alterations was printed in 1879 as the *Convocation PB*. But the only authorised changes have been those covered by the SHORTENED SERVICES ACT, 1872, the substitution of the new lectionary in 1871 (both results of the Ritual Commission), and certain other alterations introduced under the authority of the Crown, e.g., the excision of the special services for Gunpowder Plot, etc.

The sister Churches of Scotland (1764), the United States (in 1789 and again in 1892), and Ireland (1877), have used their powers of self-government to carry through more or less comprehensive revisions. The Report of the Royal Commission on Eccles. Discipline, followed by the issue of Letters of Business, in 1906, has given to the Convs. an opportunity of making proposals for alteration under exceptionally favourable circumstances. Committees were appointed at once, and have been twice reappointed, to deal both with the question of a new ORNAMENTS RUBRIC,<sup>2</sup> and the modification of the PB by way of enrichment or adaptation. It remains to be seen what success their labours will have.

It is widely recognised that, in any alterations proposed, the general doctrinal standard of the PB and its principles of ceremonial should be loyally maintained, and that the actual substance of the book and its main lines of liturgical structure should be reverently adhered to (see DOCTRINE, RITUAL, §§ 2 ff., 54 ff., 67 ff.). How safeguards can be provided against the overstepping of these limits, will be discussed later. Perhaps those in authority might formulate some statement of the limits they accept which would conduce to reassurance.

For many objections are raised to the policy of R. at the present juncture. The most formidable have been judiciously

**4. Objections.** handled by Bp. Chase (*Charge*, 1910, pp. 68-78), whose statement may be summarised briefly.

1. *The Dislike of Change.* . . . "Conservative adaptation and conservative reform are . . . the only way to prevent ultimate revolution and disaster. . . . Remember that the Ch. of Christ is the home of the Spirit of Christ." The distrust of the competence of revisers, which many feel, and which Dr. Wickham Legg has expressed with characteristic vigour (in his *Shall we Revise the PB?* 1911), is natural enough, and is dealt with below."

2. *Convocation is Unreformed.* "But the practical difficulties of solving the problem of the reform of Convocation are very great, far greater than they appear when we first take the problem in hand. It may be that for years to come they will prove insuperable. And, if a reformed Convocation would be a fitter machine for doing this or any other work, is Convocation, as it is to-day, a machine which can

be rightly called unfit? It is not given to rash and sudden changes. Its action is controlled and modified by many practical checks. It is profoundly conscious of, and sensitive to, outside Church opinion."

3. *The PB alone keeps the Ch. together.* But no one desires to meddle with that in the PB which makes it a bond of union. And between Conv. and Parl. there is little danger of overmuch change. (See further, § 10.)

4. *The Concurrence of Parliament.* "This in my judgment," writes Bp. Chase, "is the one really formidable argument. No one desires, no one thinks it well, that such questions should be debated in detail in the House of Commons, nor, I imagine, does the House of Commons desire to debate them. It does not seem certain that application for Parliamentary sanction could not be made in such a way as to preclude those dangers and difficulties of which we are all aware. Convocation can be trusted to consider the question of procedure with the utmost care."

On the other side, the same witness presents positive reasons for Revision.

1. *The Duty of Adaptation.* "A living Church, if her life is to continue sound and strong, must adapt her rules to the teaching of experience and to the circumstances of the present. To

### 5. Grounds for R.

have a system of rules and yet not to obey some of them because they are antiquated or ambiguous undermines the sense of the sovereignty of law; and the loss of a feeling for the sacredness of law means deterioration of character whether in an individual or in a society. I am sure that we must not exclude moral considerations from the arguments which determine our convictions in this matter."

2. *The Administrative Necessity.* "Some of those who strongly deprecate an authoritative revision of the Rubrics cut the knot by the expedient of a private revision of the Rubrics. But one who is called to the work of administration cannot to-day sanction disobedience to Rubrics and to-morrow enforce obedience to Rubrics. If the rule of a Bishop is to commend itself, as it should, to every man's conscience, it must be consistent; if his rule is to be consistent, the directions of the Prayer Book, which it is his duty to see carried out, and which his people rightly expect him to see carried out, must be clear in meaning and possible of observance<sup>1</sup>."

3. *The Special Urgency.* English Disestablishment may, by some turn of circumstance, become the lesser of two evils. The Ch. would "be able to meet all the dangers and perplexities and demands of that time . . . more calmly, more unitedly, more safely, if the question (of R.) had been already settled."

Two thorny questions, more than any other

<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that the phrase "possible of observance" is to be taken with reasonable qualification. It would be hard to say that any rubric is literally impossible of observance. But not a few are so inexpedient now that no authority could compel earnest and sensible ministers to obey them.

<sup>2</sup> See, in that art., especially § 15; cp. also § 6 below.

difficulties, block the way. And first there is the question about the ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER. The legal and historical aspects are discussed in that art., and also (from a different standpoint and with a full summary of the relevant facts) under ORNAMENTS RUBRIC and RITUAL LAW. The general principles involved are indicated under RITUAL, vii (Ornaments). Here it is only necessary in a few words to state the issues on which a decision depends. The moderates say that what the minister wears is purely a point of decency and order: and so it would be, if a *new* dress were being designed. In the present case, plain men of the Right and Left wings agree in this, that by association the Euch. vestments have come to be significant of doctrine. Now uniformity is no longer in this matter a practical policy. By no coercive procedure can vestments be universally imposed or universally banished without disruption. As things are, each side—with all variations of temper from the coolness of Gallio to the zeal of Luther or Loyola—can with a show of authority and reason describe the other as composed of law-breakers. Either side can only *persuade*, and not coerce the other. Neither is likely to convert the other within less than a generation. The question is therefore narrowed down to the two alternatives: (1) that the process of peaceful persuasion shall go on, with the unhealed sore of imputed illegality to hinder it, and with the increased scandal to the Ch. that an opportunity of healing it has been let slip; or (2) that some compromise shall be legalised by general consent (whether in one of the forms noted under OR., § 15, or in some new shape), under shelter of which a better understanding may later be arrived at. In a word, the Ch. must tacitly condone an illegal compromise, or take steps to legalise one. (See further, ORDER for the *practical*, and not *logical*, nature of ritual rules.)

The second difficulty arises in regard to the liturgical use of QV. The Irish Ch. no longer recites it, and the Amer. Ch. omits it from the PB, and has dropped the reference in Art. 8 (cp. QVICUNQUE VULT).

Those who oppose any change claim to be the defenders of the Catholic Faith against those who wish to break down all doctrinal restrictions. Those who desire a change reply that they are not proposing to alter the Art., which deals with the doctrinal status of the QV., but only to modify or discontinue the liturgical use of it as a whole, in consequence of those warning clauses which have been admitted by high authority to be gravely misleading. And again the same dilemma presents itself. In many chs. the recitation has been discontinued for very many years, and it is practically impossible to enforce it universally. So the Ch. must continue tacitly to condone an illegal compromise, or must legalise one. It may be said, and it is said, that to alter a law because it is broken is to reduce

law to an absurdity. If, however, law be, in its essence, a working compromise based on general consent (cp. ORDER, §§ 23-25), then the conclusion may merely be that the law is, for the present at least, unworkable, and should therefore be repealed or amended. The inviolable sanctity of rubrics is not an article of the Catholic Religion.

The alterations proposed were conveniently classified in Resolution 27 of the Lambeth Conference of 1908.<sup>1</sup>

"In any revision of the BCP which may hereafter be undertaken the following principles should be held in view. (a) The

**8. Proposals Classified.** *adaptation* of rubrics in a large number of cases to present customs as generally accepted," 'except where the deviation arises from negligence, or is in other respects hurtful' (*e.g.*, in regard to discretion as to the use of exhs., and of the versicles bef. and aft. the Gospel).

(b) "The omission of parts of the services to obviate repetition or redundancy," 'without breach of ancient liturgical precedent.'

(c) "The framing of *additions* to the present services in the way of enrichment," 'much valuable guidance' being 'available from the American, Scottish, and Irish Service Books.'

(d) "The fuller provision of *alternatives* in our forms of public worship," *e.g.*, 'additional Proper Prefaces,' and 'alternative endings to the Litany.'

(e) "The provision for greater *elasticity* in public worship," *e.g.*, 'a shortened form of MEP for use when another Service is combined therewith,' and, for 'the Administration of HC,' 'alternative uses of the prescribed words when the number of communicants is large

(f) "The change of *words* obscure or commonly misunderstood," *e.g.*, 'hell, wealth, damnation, indifferently.'

(g) "The revision of the *Calendar* and other Tables prefixed to the BCP," including 'the insertion of some national Saints.'

The Committee further suggested that a better or more elastic order for the recitation of the Psalter might obviate the 'difficulty and distress' caused 'to many devout and thoughtful persons' by 'the use of the Comminary Pss.,' and the inconvenience of reciting Pss. 'inappropriate to the day or season, or to the particular occasion'; and, moreover, in regard to the Lectionary, that 'further revision would be of advantage.'<sup>2</sup> "A Book containing special forms of service, which might be authorised by particular bps.," was also recognised as a desideratum, the supply of which the Abp. of Cant. was requested to further.

<sup>1</sup> Double or single inverted commas in the text mark quotations from *Resolutions of the Conference* or the *Report of the Conference Committee*.

<sup>2</sup> It may be noted that Pope Pius X has instituted a new Order of Psalter recitation, to begin Jan. 1, 1913, and is about to deal with the Lectionary. The adaptation of the Daily Lessons to the Christian year is desired by many Eng. Churchmen.

A comparison of the amendments recorded under RITUAL, § 20-54, as introduced in the

Irish and American PBs, together with the notes on interpretation, will prove the necessity for a careful overhauling of the rubrics. Those that are ambiguous need to be made plain, discretion for varying uses being clearly allowed or disallowed. Those that are impracticable, or so burdensome as to be unedifying, need to be relaxed or removed. And directions need to be supplied where an unnecessary and undesirable licence of variation is now left.

Whether PB R. can be successful depends more upon *procedure* than upon anything else.

Four stages can be more or less clearly traced in regard to previous **10. Procedure.** Rs.: (1) a *preliminary* period of criticism and trial prolonged over years; (2) an *initiatory* public or semi-public debate or conference, where points of dispute were discussed; (3) a *constructive* process of private deliberation by a limited body of divines, forming a R. Committee, and usually keeping in touch with the Government so as to avoid making impracticable proposals; (4) a *legislative* enactment by Parl. (as 1549, 1552, and 1559), or Conv. (as 1604 *ex post facto*), or by both in concert (as 1661-2).

At the present juncture, stages (1) and (2) have received ample development. For 250 years the 1662 PB has been under trial and criticism, and the last fifty years have been marked by a wide variety of practical experiments, along with an unprecedented growth of interest in liturgical studies. The R. Com. on Eccles. Disc., together with the discussions at the Pan-Anglican and Ch. Congresses, the debates in Conv., and the deliberations and proposals of Conv. committees, have been amply sufficient to initiate a R. movement. The third stage is (Feb. 20, 1912) at last being reached, the constitution of a R. Committee.<sup>1</sup>

Only some single body of manageable size can hope to grapple effectively with the problems involved. Yet such are the complications, that one liturgical scholar has been able forcibly to urge that without careful elaboration of procedure such a committee cannot safely get to work. His suggestions demand consideration, and will bear extension.<sup>2</sup> There are four distinct provinces within which it is necessary to take care lest, in seeking to amend, the Revisers make matters worse, or fail to reach the highest attainable standard. And the same persons can hardly be expected to be equally well qualified for all; so that the work of the committee will hardly be adequately done unless it includes among its members, or calls to its aid, groups with special qualification in each of these provinces.

(1) Liturgical scholars, who, by long familiarity

with many orders of service of many types, have learnt to recognise intuitively the lines of sound liturgical structure, are needed to advise in regard to additions or re-arrangements. But they will need to do more than pronounce whether proposals are or are not formally in accord with ancient precedents. To carry weight their judgment will need to indicate intrinsic merits or defects. And the proper course would appear to be to call upon such men to construct or reconstruct, with some general instructions from the committee as to the length, character, and contents of the services to be dealt with. Their drafts would then be submitted to the other groups.

(2) Men of trained literary capacity, and with ears attuned to the balance and rhythm of the best English prose, are needed to ensure that the PB shall not be disfigured by such halting, ill-jointed, and commonplace productions as have sometimes been issued "by authority." The verbal forms of any new or altered prs., etc., should be regarded as only provisional till reviewed for style and, if necessary, revised by acknowledged masters in English letters.

(3) Men with a wide range of pastoral and administrative experience and knowledge of ceremonial practice are needed to revise the rubrics from the practical and executive side, and to indicate phrases to be modified, directions to be adapted to changed customs, gaps to be filled, and relaxations to be granted. They would also criticise any drafts from the standpoint of use and convenience.

(4) Lastly, theologians of the three main schools of thought are needed in order to ensure that, under cover of convenience, or beauty, or edification, the balance of doctrine shall not be disturbed. This group should not be constituted in proportion to numerical preponderance in the Ch., but should contain (say) three of each, and each sub-group if unanimous might have power to veto the addition, subtraction, or alteration of any clause, phrase, or word, on the ground that the change proposed was regarded as out of harmony with the general tenor of the PB. By some such arrangement for blackballing suspected changes, security would be given to all parties.

A valuable discussion of the whole question will be found in Frere's *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, 1911: the author's distinction between matters which can properly be treated now, and others which may be kept in view, in case some more thoroughgoing R. be feasible at a later time, should be carefully noted, or his suggestions will be put aside at once as impracticable. Cp. W. C. Bishop, *CQR*, Oct., 1910, and *Rubrical Revision*, 1910; also pamphlets ed. H. C. Beeching; a series against R. issued by the E.C.U.; and *CCR*, 1908-11, as well as many earlier years. The proposals of Conv. committees are obtainable in pamphlet form (SPCK). —BT. G. HARFORD.

RING.—The wearing of rings, the most prominent and important of which is the *finger ring*, reaches back to the earliest civilised period. The finger ring bore the signet of the

<sup>1</sup> At present the sixteen persons nominated by the Abp. of Cant. are a purely advisory body, have no power of initiative, and have received no authorisation from York Conv. (March 12).

<sup>2</sup> See art. by W. C. Bishop in *CQR*, Oct., 1910.