THE LITURGICAL QUESTION

WITH REFERENCE TO THE

PROVISIONAL LITURGY

OF THE

GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

A REPORT

BY

THE "LITURGICAL COMMITTEE."

PHILADELPHIA:
LINDSAY & BLAKISTON.
1862.

HENRY B. ASHMEAD, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER,
Nos. 1102 and 1104 Sansom Street.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE *Liturgical Committee*, in whose hands the Provisional Liturgy was placed by the Synod at Easton, for final revision, having met for the purpose in Lancaster, found themselves unable to agree in regard to the general plan on which they were to proceed with their work; in view of which difficulty, finally the following action was unanimously adopted:—

"WHEREAS, in the endeavor to revise the Provisional Liturgy, the Committee discover, after a long discussion, protracted through several days, that there is a radical difference of opinion among its members concerning the import of the instructions of Synod, therefore:

"*Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin prepare a report to Synod, setting forth a clear, definite, and full idea of both schemes of worship advocated in Committee, in order that Synod may understand the real question at issue, and state in explicit terms what it requires at our hands.

"*Resolved*, That the report be submitted for consideration and adoption to an adjourned meeting of the Committee, to be held at the call of the chairman."

A meeting of the Committee was held subsequently in Lebanon, at which the following report was received and adopted, and at the same time ordered to be published for the consideration of the Church.

The object of the Committee is sufficiently plain. It is not to resist or force in any way the will of the Church. All know and feel that the Provisional Liturgy needs revision and change. But this, to be successful, must be in conformity with some ruling theory or plan. What that shall be, it is for the Church to say; and the purpose of the present report, accordingly, is simply to bring the whole subject as plainly as possible before the Church, that it may have an opportunity of knowing and expressing its own mind in regard to it, in the most free and deliberate manner.

J. W. NEVIN.

Lancaster, May, 1862.

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

THERE are two general conceptions of the meaning and purpose of a *Liturgy*, which need to be carefully distinguished, in any effort which is made to provide for public worship in this way. The conceptions agree in this, that they are alike opposed to what is called the use of free prayer, in the ordinary sense of the term. But beyond that, they are so unlike, that the difference between them may be said to be wider altogether than their common difference from worship in the free form.

I. In the first place, the notion of a Liturgy may be made to include simply *a mechanical directory of the manner in which the services of the sanctuary are to be conducted, with written forms of prayer and other public address, more or less full, thrown together in an outward and prevailingly independent way.*

With very many this is the only meaning of liturgical worship. A Liturgy in their view is merely a Prayer Book, in which precomposed forms are provided for different public occasions, to be used instead of any private productions brought out by the officiating minister at the time. Such a book

fication, and that to a large extent, accordingly, the function is discharged in a very unsatisfactory and most unedifying way. As a general thing, these free prayers are either themselves stereotyped private forms of thought and phraseology, into which the minister has fallen for himself he can hardly tell how, or else irregular and desultory effusions which are entitled to but small regard on the score of either piety or sense. Why, it is asked, should the devotions of the congregation, in this most important part of sanctuary worship, be at the mercy of a single mind, called to impart direction and shape to them at the time? It would be considered monstrous on all hands, if it were pretended to fasten the praises of the congregation in this way to the use of hymns dictated for them at the time by the minister, even allowing such hymns to have been carefully prepared by him for the purpose beforehand. Why then should it seem right, to commit the solemn service of prayer to such dictation, not generally premeditated, but determined for the most part by the impulses of the moment? Is it right that the whole assembly of God's worshipping people, in thus coming before him and calling upon his name, should be made to hang not only on the mouth of the minister, but upon his mind and heart also, for the way in which the approach is made? Is it right that his uncertain powers, his varying frames and dispositions, his humors and caprices, his individual opinions, fancies and prejudices, his

peculiarities of thought and diction, should be allowed to thrust themselves in continually as a medium between those who pray, and Him to whom prayer is made, coloring and refracting the universal devotion thus to their own tone? Surely to one considering the matter properly, this must be counted a worse bondage for the congregation, than any which is imposed by the fixed forms of a prayer book. The confinement of a liturgy, composed with premeditation and care, and accurately understood beforehand, may justly be regarded as liberty itself, in comparison with any such necessity of following the random lead of another, without any previous knowledge whatever of its extemporized turns and starts. Of all sorts of tyrannical rule indeed, the most slavish always is that which owns no law, and moves in no fixed orbit, but stands only in the arbitrary will and pleasure of the individual by whom it is exercised. Better in any case an objective form than a purely subjective despotism. It is a great misnomer to call extemporary prayer free. For a congregation, it is just the opposite of this, in proportion precisely as it recedes from the character of some generally acknowledged, though unwritten form, and affects to be wholly original and indepenent. Your ranting expectorations, born from the feeling of the moment, and your eloquently sentimental harangues to the Deity, got up to please the ears of a refined audience, are both alike, in this view, an outrage upon the true freedom of Christian worship.

Looking at the matter in this way, the advocates of liturgical worship, in the sense now under consideration, are not willing to allow, of course, that the other system has the advantage of being less outward and more full of devotional life. The use of forms is not necessarily a dead quiescence in forms. There is no reason why the spirit of devotion may not flow actively in such channels of prayer, as well as in the corresponding channels of praise which are offered to it by the spiritual songs of the sanctuary. Nay, on any right view of the case, it will be found that long established, long familiar forms of worship have a far greater fitness for devotional use than such as are strange and new. There are no such vehicles of pious sensibility as old hymns, old prayers, old religious utterances generally. It is not true that they serve to generate and encourage lifeless formality. Where the spirit of religion is wanting, they may indeed furnish opportunity for this abuse; just as the sameness of the Scriptures may become a soporific drug in the same way. But who would think of meeting and correcting this difficulty in the case of the Bible, by throwing the Bible continually into new forms and versions? The old text, for those who have been all their lives familiar with it, is ever for all devotional purposes the best text. And so is it also with hymns and prayers, catechisms and creeds. Where there is any susceptibility for religious emotions or affections, old formularies, embalmed as it

were in the sacred memories of the past, are always better adapted to call it into exercise than any that are modern and new. Novelty and variety may stir the understanding, or please the fancy; but they have no power to feed the inward life of the soul. That seeks rather communion with the past, and an intensive appropriation of what is already at hand. Here emphatically that word is true: "No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, *the old is better.*" In religion, the law is universal. Religious sentiment, actually at work in the soul, seeks and finds its most natural outlet always in forms of thought and language, which need no invention, but are already at hand, consecrated for the purpose, and made solemnly familiar by long use.

Such liturgical forms, in this view, have an immense educational worth. It is of vast account to have the mind stored from the beginning with the wholesome words of sound doctrine and right religious feeling, even where the sense of them may not be at first properly perceived or duly laid to heart. Especially important is it, we may say, that such preoccupation of the mind should be secured in the way of forms which utter and act forth, not simply the knowledge of religion, but its actual power and life—the faith of the Church in this manner going before the faith of her infants and children, her novices and catechumens, and struggling to form itself in them as the hope of glory.

"As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings," so doth this holy mother of us all fulfil here her sublime office of winning the fledglings of baptismal grace to a true heavenward flight. There is no teaching in religion like this *in-forming* process, which puts into the soul, with divine authority, the outward word of religion, in order to make room for the coming of the same word in its inward power and glory. If it may be said with truth that the familiar songs and ballads of a nation are of more power for the character of it than its laws, there is still more room to affirm of these established forms of Christian belief and worship, that they go far beyond all other modes of culture in determining what turns out to be at last the actual institution of nominally Christian men. Catechisms for the young, in this way, are of more account than systems of theology for the old. Hymns are perpetual sermons. Texts of Scripture stuck in the mind like proverbs, enforce their own lessons, where all commentaries are dumb or forgotten. What a world of education is comprehended, in this way, in the articles of the Creed, and in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Do *they* lose their force by repetition? Are *they* formal, because they are familiar? Would it be an improvement to have them continually in new paraphrases and versions, or to have them superseded altogether by free effusions extemporized for the

same purpose and use? There is irony, as all can at once feel, in the very question. These simple formularies are powerful for the purposes of devotion and faith, just because they echo in the same words always, from childhood to old age, and from one century onward to another, what has been the universal worship of the one Catholic Church through all times. And why should we not learn from this the importance of uniform liturgical services generally, for the best kind of religious training, that namely which casts the mind, from the beginning, into the very mould of the "things which are most surely believed" among Christians, and stamps it at the same time with their ineffaceable image and superscription? A good Liturgy is an organ of religious education, more efficient even than a good Catechism or a good Confession of Faith. It reaches farther and works deeper. The Prayer Book of the Church of England has more to do with her theological spirit than the Thirty-Nine Articles. Every Church needs such a help in her prophetical office, even if she might afford to undervalue it in her priestly office. Without it, her educational apparatus, at best, can never be more than half complete.

Here, then, the friends of free worship are themselves put on their defence, in a case where they have been trying to make out a charge of religious indifference against the other side. If there be any truth in what has now been said, the system for

which they plead as being most favorable to the life and power of religion, is opposed to one of the most necessary conditions of all true Christian prosperity and growth. Unliturgical churches can have no full sympathy with the idea of educational religion, and it must necessarily suffer deplorable neglect at their hands. If they lay any stress at all on religious training, it will be in the view of it which makes it to be only a proper course of instruction in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. But important as this may be, it is by no means the whole, nor yet the main part, of what we are to understand by educational religion. This does not consist in lessons simply for the understanding, or in precepts for the right conduct of life; it is the living discipline of the soul rather into the very form and habit of religion itself—what St. Paul calls the bringing up of Christian children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Such education calls for the use of the Catechism; but it requires yet more the use of positive acts of devotion in fixed liturgical forms. These are as necessary to the growth of piety in children, as their daily meals are to the growth of their bodies. But for this there can be no proper provision, of course, in churches which eschew liturgies altogether, and look upon them as narcotics rather than tonics for the religious life. Even so far as they may find it necessary to allow any education of the sort in the simple prayers of the nursery, it will be with the feeling that all such

worship is a mechanical go-cart merely, which must as soon as possible be laid aside, in order to make room for worship in a free, self-moving form; while the services of the sanctuary are so ordered, as from the beginning to force the tender mind of childhood into another manner of religious culture altogether. In circumstances like these, the idea of Christian nurture is shorn of its whole significance and force; and it will be found, accordingly, that these unliturgical churches, as a general thing, make no earnest account, either theoretically or practically, of the great interest of covenant, educational religion; that they have no proper faith in the idea of sacramental grace which lies at the foundation of it; and that their tendency at least is always toward that opposite scheme, by which all religion resolves itself at last into a system of private opinions and purely individual feelings. It is historically certain, that the unliturgical usage, in all churches in which it has prevailed since the time of the Reformation, has been attended with a progressive movement, more or less decided, in this bad direction. No thoughtful mind turned toward the subject, can well help seeing and feeling, that there is in some way an ominous affinity between free worship and free thinking in religion, both in its fanatical and in its rationalistic polar extremes. Cold Unitarianism and blazing Methodism, or say the inward light of Quakerism in George Fox, and the inward light of the same Quakerism in Elias Hicks, alike opposed in their

genius to fixed devotional forms, show a common opposition also to the whole conception of a true churchly Christianity, and along with this, as a matter of course, a common indifference to the whole idea of a true Christian nurture in the Lord.

One may see the importance of public liturgical worship by considering how, in its absence, even the primary and most necessary forms of religious confession and devotion are apt to fall into disuse, and to become thus in the end as strange almost to the family and the school as they are to the church. It is not too much to say that the Lord's Prayer itself, in such circumstances, can never be held in proper honor and use. Where the unliturgical spirit prevails, it seems to have no proper home even in the Christian sanctuary. We have whole religious denominations, among whom its voice is scarcely ever heard in pulpit devotion. And what shall we say of the Creed, the Apostles' Creed, the old, glorious oriflamb of Christ's sacramental host from the beginning? Where, among unliturgical churches, do we find it lifted up as a standard, from Sabbath to Sabbath, in the name of the Lord? In such churches the Creed is never brought into use at all as a part of worship. Its introduction in this way would be regarded generally, indeed, as an exceptionable singularity, a novelty not to be admired or approved. Thus practically disowned in the sanctuary, the devotional symbol finds no home either in the family. It is a most significant fact,

well worthy to be noted and laid to heart. Unliturgical denominations are without the Creed, as an educational form of faith and piety. It is not recited in their households, nor taught to their children. For the most part, indeed, the power even of repeating it is lost. With the great body of the people it is gone out of memory and out of knowledge. Let this be taken as of itself an overwhelming example to show how poorly qualified all such denominations are to care properly for what we have seen to be the true idea of educational religion.

Here, then, altogether is a most grave defect, which might well be urged against the system of extemporary prayer, as a full offset at least to its claim of superior life and spirituality, even if this were allowed to be valid. But the claim itself is disputed. There may be indeed more semblance of life, where the mind is thus put upon the task of producing both the matter and form of prayer on the spur of the moment; but it is a mistake to assume at once that this proceeds from the true spirit of devotion. To a large extent, it must be referred to the mere mental working that is engaged in the exercise, which is no index or measure whatever of the working of the heart. It would seem to be plain rather that the immediate, natural effect of such a strain upon thought, must be a diversion of vital energy from the function of feeling. The two processes are entirely different. The activity of invention is one thing, the activity of devotion

is another thing altogether. In this view, it is not unreasonable to say that prepared, long familiar forms offer on the whole a better solicitation and a more favorable outlet for the spirit of devotion, than any possible utterances extemporized for the purpose. Where the devotional mind is wanting, they become, of course, forms only, and nothing more; like the wheels in Ezekiel's vision, that had no proper motion except by the power of the living spirit that was in them. But where the devotional mind is wanting, extemporaneous prayer is itself only another phase of formality, more offensive, we may say, than that of the prayer book; even as the spasmodic workings of a galvanized corpse are more unsightly and hideous than the features of the same corpse in a state of repose. Better at any time for a worshipping congregation, if to such mournful masking it must come, the mummery of ritualistic forms, in themselves decent and well composed, than the mummery of prayers that mouth the heavens without either form or life. But this is not the alternative on which to base any proper comparison of the two systems of worship. Let the devotional spirit, the inward fitness for worship, be at hand. Then, we say, it will flow into easy, vigorous exercise by the use of liturgical forms—the wonted and well-worn channels of previous devotional thought—much more readily, as a general thing, than by the aid of any extemporaneous inspirations whatever.

Finally, the argument against free worship boldly attacks also the plausible assumption, that it is better suited than the use of a liturgy to the manifold exigencies of public prayer, more full and comprehensive, and more capable of adapting itself to passing occasions and particular wants. The assumption, we say, is plausible; because that which is altogether unbound would seem at once to be of wider use and application than that which is held within fixed metes and limits. But we must be governed here, not by theoretical possibilities, but by the actualities of real life; and looking only to these, it soon becomes manifest enough that this imaginary fullness and variety of free public prayer exists only in the fancy of those who seek to make capital out of it against liturgical forms. At times, indeed, the order of the comparison is reversed for the same end; liturgies, we are told, are apt to be too full, even to tediousness, while it is the privilege of free prayer to be general and short. But there is no room in truth for the disparaging contrast in either view. Liturgies may be, of course, too long, or they may be too short; and the gift of free prayer may be so exercised in certain cases, as to make the service all that it ought to be in comprehensiveness and variety, and nothing more; but what we are concerned with now is the relative suitableness of the two systems, as systems, in any whole view, and as tested by actual use, for reaching and securing in these respects what the idea of

public prayer is felt to require. Instituting our comparison in this broad, practical way, we can come only to one conclusion. It is not in the nature of free prayer, in general practice, to be any thing like as full, as various, and at the same time solidly compact, as it is possible to have a good liturgy. How should it be expected that off-hand services of this sort, or services approaching to such character, should to any general extent be able to match at all, in this respect the well-digested forms of a prayer book, which, to be worthy of the name, must embody in itself the results of long devotional experience, reaching back, in part, at least, to the earliest Christian times? This is confirmed abundantly by actual observation. Free pulpit prayers, as a general thing, however full they may be of verbiage, move in a comparatively narrow circle of topics and thoughts. You miss in them almost always much that is sure to meet you in any respectable liturgy. At the same time, their topics are managed in a loose and desultory way, with much unmeaning common-place, and many changes rung on the same themes, making the whole tedious; so that in the end you have neither fullness nor variety nor concentration, but only a sort of treadmill movement that involves no progress, but lets you down in the end pretty much where it took you up in the beginning. We speak not, of course, of all such free public prayers, but only of what they are prevailingly, and as it would seem constitutionally, among unliturgical denominations in general. Their natural character is to be jejune, confused, prosy, not sapid, not satisfying nor nourishing for the soul. An ordinarily good liturgy, over against them, deserves to be considered at any time a welcome enlargement and relief. It makes public worship every way more ample, more particular, more succinct, more nervous, and strange as it may sound, more positively free. For the misery of the extemporaneous system is, that its liberty is not joined with the strength that is needed for its whole work; so that it proves to be too generally the form only without the real substance of freedom—the liberty, in other words, of being weak, and of doing in a weak way what there is no power of doing in a way that is strong.

In such general style may the argument for liturgical worship be conducted, where the conception of a liturgy after all is nothing more than that of a collection of prayers and other offices, thrown together in a common book. It may be questioned, indeed, as we shall see hereafter, whether the spirit of the controversy at least, even in this form, does not necessarily refer itself to something deeper than such outward view, as being necessary to give such worship its full advantage over the system of free prayer. But this we let pass for the present.

As far now as this first notion of a liturgy goes, our own Church, if we understand the matter rightly, is mainly of one mind, being well satisfied

that it is desirable to have the worship of the sanctuary guided and supported at least, if not absolutely ruled, by a book of forms. However it might have been some years since, it seems to be agreed now all round that the license of extemporaneous prayer, as it prevails so widely among our American sects, is not a good license; that it is not, on the whole, to edification; and that it needs, therefore, the restraint of some wholesome ecclesiastical prescription in the form of a liturgy. We do not sympathize as a Church with the common Puritanic prejudice against this mode of worship. We know better than to stigmatize it as necessarily formal, or cold, or flat. We are, in one word, with open acknowledgment, in favor of liturgical services; and for years now we have been endeavoring, under full Synodical sanction, to provide a proper liturgy for ourselves. We have not been able yet, it is true, to accomplish our purpose; but this has not changed at all our prevailing sense of its necessity and importance. The pains we have bestowed upon the subject have served only to convince us more and more that we need a liturgy, and that the ideas of Christian worship which are growing upon us can never be satisfied without one. We are already largely committed in our views and feelings to this order of worship, as being the most decent and becoming for the house of God; so that it is no longer in our power easily to recede from these convictions, and to fall back again to what we have learned to

regard as a lower level of thought. As a denomnation, we honestly wish to have a liturgy. For the Eastern Synod, at least, of the German Reformed Church, this has come to be a *desideratum*, a sort of crying want that will not be hushed or put down.

How does it happen then, we may well ask, that we find it so difficult after all to produce a liturgy of a character suited to satisfy the general mind of the Church? To reach the proper answer to this question, we must go on to consider that other conception of a liturgy, which needs, as we have said in the beginning, to be carefully distinguished from the notion of a mere Prayer Book—the view we have had under consideration thus far. The chief ground of our difficulty, there is good reason to believe, will be found to hold in a difference of mind among us with regard to this second theory or doctrine of what a liturgy means.

II. According to this second view, we may say in general terms, a liturgy is not just a collection of prayers and other single forms of devotion, but a *whole order or scheme rather of public worship, in which all the parts are inwardly bound together by their having a common relation to the idea of a Christian altar, and by their referring themselves through this always to what must be considered the last ground of all true Christian worship, the mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.* Here, however, are several things that call for separate consideration.

1. First of all, the conception requires that a liturgy should be ruled throughout by what we may call a sense of the *sacramental* in religion.

A sacrament is the presence of the supernatural, in a mystery, under a natural and sensible form. Christianity in this way has its central significance for faith in the Lord's Supper, the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; and around this, accordingly, the worship of the church has revolved from the beginning. The old idea of a liturgy, indeed, as we know, was nothing more nor less than the celebration of this holy sacrament itself; which formed then the regular sanctuary service from week to week. It is easy to see how, in this case, every part of the service, every act, whether of prayer or praise, was necessarily conditioned by the immediate connection in which it stood with that which formed the innermost theme of the whole transaction. Our modern worship is differently ordered. Instead of these frequent and constant communions, we have only occasional celebrations of the sacramental mystery, with long intervals between of worship in a different way. But we are not authorized, for this reason, to sunder the one kind of service, in our minds, from the other; so as to make the Holy Eucharist a particular office only, among other offices of like separate character and sense. The true idea of Christian worship requires that it should still hold under its old view, as a harmony of services meeting together in the solemnity of the Lord's Supper; and that what has been disjoined in time for our modern worship, and thus spread out as it were over weeks and months, instead of being kept together as a whole transaction on each single occasion, should be for us, notwithstanding, in spirit and in power, a single, grand system, as before, revolving around this glorious centre continually from one end of the year to the other. In accommodating itself to our changed circumstances, in other words, the old liturgical conception must so stretch itself over our ordinary services at other times, that they shall be felt to be still part and parcel always of what is transacted, at certain seasons, in the celebration of the Eucharist.

But now to preserve any proper regard for this order, it is plain that the church needs the help of a liturgy; and this not in the sense merely of a collection of precomposed offices and forms, but in the sense of an organic scheme of worship based throughout on the central significance of the Lord's Supper, and so constructed as to teach and enforce the power of this thought in all its parts. There is a great interest here, which can never be effectually maintained, either by the system of free worship, or by the use of mere miscellaneous forms. The difference between the unliturgical, and what we may call in such view the quasi-liturgical, would seem to be in this case of no material account. The services of the sanctuary must ever have a tendency

under both characters, to fall away from the true idea of Christian worship altogether, and to lose themselves in mere spiritualities that carry in them at last no sacramental force whatever. To uphold the power of a truly sacramental worship, we need the use of a truly sacramental liturgy. No liturgy, then, can be worthy of its name, which is not framed in such way as to make the sacrament of the Lord's Supper its cardinal office, while all its other offices and parts are so ordered as, silently at least, to come under some inward relation to this, and to take from it their key note and reigning tone.

2. Then, in the next place, such a liturgy must bear a certain *priestly* character, determined by a proper regard throughout to the idea of a Christian altar.

There is a style of religious thinking, we know, to which the very mention of any thing like this is always unpalatable. It is willing to allow a priestly character and function to Christ in heaven, but will hear of nothing of the sort in the services of the church here below. There is a necessary connection between this style of thinking always and the unsacramental spirit already noticed. Where there is no sense of the mystical element in worship, growing forth from its universal centre in the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, there can be no power to sympathize with the priestly element, with its conceptions of altar and sacrifice drawn from the same source. Such a habit of mind, it is

hardly necessary to say, is in either view equally unliturgical. It leads naturally to free worship, or at best, to what may be called the liturgy of the pulpit, that sort of unbound book service of which we have spoken before; as it is unquestionably the natural tendency also of both these sorts of worship, on the other hand, to produce and encourage the unhappy habit here in question. In opposition to this, a true liturgy, in the theory with which we are now concerned, may be denominated emphatically a liturgy of the altar. It has no disposition to disparage the reading-desk or pulpit, as being the proper organs of address from the side of God to the people. It is willing to do all honor to the prophetical office, as well as to the kingly office of the church, in their proper times and places. But it demands that, in full analogy with these, the priestly office of the church shall also be recognized as something more than a metaphorical fancy or fiction; and that the declaration, "*We have an altar*," shall not be stultified to mean, *We have a table only, and nothing more.* Seeing the root and foundation of all Christian worship to be in the mystical presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Holy Supper; and seeing in this again the exhibition of his broken body and shed blood as the actually present virtue of his one offering of himself, "made once, but of force always, to put away sin;" it requires that some earnest be made with these sacrificial ideas, so that they shall be felt to carry with them the power of a real transaction

at the time with God, based on something beyond the minds of the worshippers themselves.

We feel at once what the liturgical means, in this view, in the old priestly services of the Jewish temple, where the transaction of the altar served to mediate objectively, as we may say, between the Hearer of prayer and his worshipping people. In the same way, it is held, the true Christian *leitourgia*—the substance of which that older service was only the symbol and type—must ever circle, as a system of offices, round the Christian altar, as something always mystically present in the Christian church. Without this, worship ceases to be distinctively Christian, and becomes necessarily more or less Gnostically spiritualistic only, ending at last, indeed, in mere humanitarian deism.

It belongs to the full conception of a liturgy, then, that it be in the fullest sense of the word an altar service. There must be that in its whole tone and spirit, which causes the congregation to feel that the distinction between pulpit and altar is not an idle distinction; that it is not enough to say all depends on the mind of the worshipper here, without any regard to outward object or place; that the idea of a Christian sanctuary requires the actual localization in some way of the thought of the altar, as much as the localization of a Moses' seat for the purposes of religious instruction; and that being so determined to its own proper location, the altar, and not the pulpit, is to be regarded as the central

object of the sanctuary—the place of the Christian shekinah, forth from which must radiate continually the entire glory of God's house. No liturgy of this sort can bear to be used from the pulpit; and no people in sympathy with the genius of worship under such priestly view, can ever be satisfied with mere pulpit prayers in any form.

3. In the third place, the idea of a liturgy, as we are now considering it, involves an active correspondence with the movement of the Christian life, in the form of what is known commonly as the *Church year*.

We will not stop now to analyze closely the nature of the connection between this spirit and what we have been trying thus far to describe, as the sense of the sacramental and priestly joined together in the sense of the Christian altar. Enough to say in general terms, that it grows out of the way in which the great truths of Christianity are apprehended in both cases, as having the character not just of theological doctrines, but of facts, rather, objectively real and historical facts, of perennial power and force in the world. What lives for us in this way has a tendency always to enshrine itself for our thoughts, in outward forms both of space and time. Thus it is that the Creed, moving in the very process of the Christological mystery itself, will not, where it prevails, suffer the sense of that everlasting fact to die out of the mind of the church, but secures for it, we may say, an abiding sacra-

mental presence in every Christian temple, and upon every Christian altar. And where this feeling of historical faith prevails, it is only in keeping with it that the circle of the year, the natural measure of existence for us in time, is made also to take up into itself commemoratively the great phenomenal facts of redemption, causing them to roll round us in perpetual cycles like "lights in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth." Account for it as we may, nothing at all events is more undeniably true than that there is an inward connection, in some way, between the sense for the sacramental in worship, and what may be termed a sense for church festivals, and the idea of a church year; and it is no less certain that this latter feeling enters, then, as truly as the other into the conception of the liturgical, as we have it here in hand.

In the system of free worship, there can never be any hearty sympathy with the Christian year, and it will be sure, with the progress of time, to fall into universal neglect. Even such cardinal seasons as Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, will not be able to command any religious observance; and much less, of course, will this be the case with any subordinate festivals. It is felt to be a bringing down of Christianity from its proper spiritual elevation, to think of binding it in this way to the conditions of our purely mundane life. St. Paul's reproach to the Galatians, "ye observe days, and months, and times, and years," is applied at once to

the whole case; all such worship is set down as a "turning again to the weak and beggarly elements" of Judaism; and so the entire scheme of it is swept away as a "relic of popery," to make room for a system in which the only sacred day is the Sabbath, and all Sabbaths are monotonously the same from one end of the year to the other.

Here again, also, it is plain that a mere pulpit liturgy—a collection simply of written prayers—offers of itself no help for this undervaluation of church festivals; but is most likely rather, on the whole, to show itself as indifferent toward the true spirit of them, in the end, as the system of free prayer itself.

But no true altar liturgy can be thus indifferent; and it may be taken universally as a distinctive criterion of such a liturgy, that the sense of the old ecclesiastical year finds in it its natural and proper home. It belongs to such a liturgy to be an echo and response to the religious sentiment in this form; while it serves at the same time, by its whole construction, powerfully to awaken the sentiment, and to strengthen it in the way of education, from infancy on to old age.

4. Finally, it belongs to the conception of a liturgy, in the sense now under consideration, that it should engage, to some considerable extent, the active *co-operation of the people*, along with the officiating minister, in its services.

The theory of all public worship of course is, that

the people should join in what is going forward, in some way. But in the case of free prayer, this participation is expected to be more inward than outward, and passive, we may say, rather than active. The system, in its very nature, is unfavorable to any sort of demonstrative interruption on the part of the congregation; it will not suffer either man or woman to speak in the Church; and is hardly willing to tolerate, at last, so much as a simple audible *Amen* from "him that occupieth the room of the unlearned." So as regards outward postures, the tendency of it at least is to become indifferent to them altogether, knowing no good reason finally why the people should not be able to worship God "in spirit and in truth" quite as well sitting comfortably in their pews, as either standing on their feet or bowing upon their knees.

Almost any liturgy, it would seem, should exercise a conservative influence over against the licentiousness of free worship carried to such extreme as this. It must be confessed, however, that mere forms of prayer are not enough of themselves to make the services of the sanctuary what they ought to be, in the view now brought into notice. Here, on the contrary, as before, the mere pulpit liturgy is found to be only too much of one spirit with the free system itself, having no feeling of dependence on the co-working activity of the congregation, and not summoning this at all to its help, but discouraging it rather as something superfluous at least, if

not actually unbecoming, for the proper notion of public worship.

In opposition now, however, to all this, such a liturgy as we are speaking of invokes and calls into requisition necessarily the active assistance of the people. Its language to the congregation is practically always: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." No simply passive concurrence will answer its purpose; no merely silent thought is enough for it; it must have the outward demonstration of both act and word. It is a transaction, the doing of a work, to which the people are expected to lay hand, and that cannot go forward rightly without their assisting cooperation. Where the sense of the liturgical prevails in this sort, the imagination of forms for the minister, without corresponding forms for the worshipping congregation, is felt to be absurd. The people must so join in what is going forward, that this shall seem to be for them plainly a real objective work then and there taking place, in which they are themselves not spectators or hearers only, but participant actors. There must be gestures and postures significant of faith in what the service thus means, acts of bodily worship fitly suited to corresponding acts of the spirit, responses of the tongue to seal and confirm the silent responses of the heart.

It will not do to call these things the idle mum-

mery of superstition. If they seem mummery to any, it can only be most assuredly because they have themselves no lively sense of the true nature of Christian worship in the view just described. What causes the use of such externalizing forms to be felt as formal only, and nothing more, is not the mere outwardness of the forms themselves, but the want of the inward soul they are required to express. Then, indeed, the service becomes mummery; but the mummery is in the inward habit of the worshipper at the time, more than in his outward habit. A worship that pretends to pass itself off as purely inward and spiritual, and that has in itself no need for any outward word or act, carries in it the nature of mockery quite as much, to say the least, as a worship that holds in outward forms altogether. Beyond all question, the true idea of worship requires the union of both. Such is the relation everywhere of inward and outward, in our human constitution. Soul and body, thought and word, are the natural and necessary complements of each other, in every sphere of our existence. Devotional forms, then, the outward actings and utterings of worship on the part of the people, are not only to be tolerated in the services of the sanctuary, they are to be prescribed and enjoined as the necessary condition of worship in a truly spiritual form—without which it must ever be in danger of lapsing into mere spectacular show of the very worst kind. Let the outward and the inward here go hand in

hand together. Let it be considered a part of religion to do bodily reverence, in all proper ways, to the sacramental holiness which is felt to inhabit the house of God. Let all faces, in the time of prayer, be turned toward the altar. Let there be risings and bowings, where it may seem to be meet, in token of the consenting adorations of the people. Let there be hymns, and psalms, and anthems, and chants, choral songs and antiphonal concerts of praise. In the language of David: "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee." Let them also not keep silence entirely in the offices of public confession and prayer. On fit occasions, "let all the people say, *Amen;*" say it not mentally alone, but aloud with their lips; and let it be their privilege to join also, when proper, in other vocal responses, helpful alike to the spirit of the officiating liturgist and to themselves. Let "young men and maidens, old men and children," learn to worship the God of Israel in this way; for such life-like worship is comely, and most becoming at the same time to the Lord's house.

It is the kind of worship especially that suits the wants of children and plain people. For however it may be with others, having more education, *they* at least have no power whatever to get along with mere thinking in their devotions; word and act, and outward symbol, are as necessary to their spiritual exercises as the breath of their nostrils; and it would seem to be very certain, therefore, that

they can never be effectually edified or educated by any religious services, in which all depends on mental processes merely, without any such outward help. For that interest of educational religion of which we have spoken before, it is in this form above all that a liturgy deserves to be considered of indispensable account.

Such, altogether, is the idea of a liturgy, in that second view which we have now been trying to explain. It stands related to the first conception, before noticed, not in the way of contrast merely, but in the way also of very considerable opposition. Those who have entered into the sense of the liturgical in this second form, can never be satisfied with what may claim to be the liturgical in the other form. To their mind all worship, which simply substitutes praying by book for extemporary prayer, without any farther difference, is only pseudo-liturgical at best, and ends in being, at the last, very much the same thing with that for which it is substituted. It is felt, indeed, that the argument for liturgical worship is to a great extent shorn of its force, where it is made to turn on this bastard conception of what a liturgy rightly means. Over against such merely outward fixation of forms, it is quite possible for free prayer to have the best of the comparison. Forms of this sort must almost necessarily seem to be formal only, and therefore slavish also and dead. The advocates of the free system, accordingly, contrive for the most part to

join issue with the cause of liturgies under this view only; and it is but too frequently the case, that the friends of the cause are not prepared to take any higher ground. Then the controversy, as a matter of course, becomes unequal and confused; for the reasons in favor of a liturgy, as we have given them before, even where they may seem to regard the use of forms only, always look farther than this in truth for those who feel their force, and never come to their full effect till they are made to refer themselves to the conception of a liturgy in its right sense; while the main strength of the argument, without such reference, can never come into view at all. For this reason it is believed also, that what is called liturgical worship, in that first character of which we have spoken, can never make head successfully, or even hold its own for any length of time, against the inroads of the free system. Be the matter as it may theoretically, the victory will always turn out to be practically at last on the unliturgical side. There is no case known in history, where it has been found possible to bring a liturgy of this unliturgical sort, into full, living, and abiding popular use; and there is no room to expect anything of the kind in time to come. In our own country, in particular, no such liturgy, however excellently composed, can ever come into general use with any religious denomination. Whatever sense there may be, in any quarter, of the evils belonging to the system of free worship, it will be felt always

that the harness of a purely outward service-book is something worse. It will prove irksome in the end, not only to those who are constitutionally opposed to all liturgies, but also to those whose hearts yearn for what they conceive to be the true spirit of Christian worship in this to them seemingly better way; and the result will be, accordingly, a sort of common consent on both sides to let the book pass into practical oblivion, as being in truth what neither class has been either seeking or wanting. No liturgical experiment in this form, it is believed, can ever succeed; and it can only be a waste of labor, therefore, for a church to bestow thought or pains on any such object.

If it be asked now, on which of these two liturgical schemes the *Provisional Liturgy* of the German Reformed Church has been constructed, the answer must be of course, that it was intended to be prevailingly a liturgy for the altar, and not simply a pulpit liturgy. It aims at being churchly, sacramental, and in proper measure also priestly. It is formed to move round the sun of righteousness in the heavenly orbit of the church year. It seeks to make the people outwardly active, along with the minister, in the outward solemnities of public worship. In all this, it falls in with what may be considered the reigning genius of such worship in the first ages of the Church; and in doing so, has incorporated into itself largely, of course, those primitive forms, which

have been considered classical and sacred for all liturgical use from the beginning. This much is patent at once on the face of the new Liturgy; and it has never pretended to appear in any other character.

The Liturgy may be said to have worked itself into this form, with a kind of inward necessity, in the general mind of the Committee to whom it owes its preparation. Their studies, conferences, and experimental endeavors, shut them up in a very slow way to this finally, as the only proper conclusion of their work. They were themselves brought more and more under the power of an idea, which carried them with inexorable force its own way; so that they were compelled to change again and again what they had previously prepared, till all was brought to take at last its present shape.

The Committee knew, of course, that in carrying out their work in this way, they were proposing to themselves something more than the reproduction simply of any older liturgy of the Reformed Church —something more than a mere compilation of offices and forms, modelled on the plan of these liturgies generally. They had full regard to these, indeed, in their place; but they had no thought of being bound by them as the only rule and measure of their labors. They considered it their duty to take a wider range of observation; to survey the whole field of liturgical literature; and especially to study the genius and spirit of the liturgies that have come down to us from the first Christian ages, with the

view of maintaining, as much as might be, a true successional connection with the substance at least of their ancient life. So much seemed to be due to the claims of the subject itself, and to the general posture which the best Protestant thinking has come to hold with regard to it at the present time; and their own convictions of right, made it impossible for the Committee to go forward with their work in any other way.

It was supposed, that the old liturgies of the Reformed Church needed this manner of broad and comprehensive revision. With all our respect for the sixteenth century, there is no reason why we should be bound slavishly by all its opinions and judgments; no reason why we should not see and acknowledge its defects, where they may appear plainly to exist. The position occupied by the Churches of the Reformation was not in general favorable to the production of good liturgies. Attention was too much taken up with other interests; there was too little knowledge of liturgical antiquities; the subject was given up too much to mere particular fancy and taste, without any regard to necessary principles and laws. It is to be freely admitted, moreover, that there lay in the distinguishing spirit of the Reformed Confession, as such, from the beginning, a tendency in opposition to the constraint of fixed religious rites and ceremonies, which could hardly fail to exert an injurious influence on any work of this sort. It belongs, as we all know,

to the Reformed Church, to represent that side of the Christian life, in which the inward, the free, the spiritual in religion, are asserted against the authority of the merely outward in every view. Such is her historical vocation; such is her genius; and such of course, then, is the form also in which she is most exposed to the danger of falling into error and wrong. For it is with the constitution of Churches here as we find it to be with the temperament of individuals. As each temperament, the sanguine, the choleric, the melancholic, and the phlegmatic, has its own virtues and merits, but along with this also its own corresponding proclivities to faulty excess; which to take note of implies no want of respect for the goodness of the temperament itself; so in the case of Churches, or religious Confessions, it is the peculiarity of their constitutional mission precisely, if they have any, that may be said to determine for them always their nearest liability to error; and to acknowledge this, we say again, amounts not of itself to any censure whatever upon that which is thus made the occasion of abuse. While we honor then the constitutional character of the Reformed Church, in the general view of which we are now speaking, we ought to be willing to admit that it carried in it a tendency to what we may call extreme simplicity and spiritualism, over against the worship of the Catholic Church, and that this stood in the way of its producing a full liturgical cultus in the proper sense of the term. Liturgies, of course, were every-

where introduced; for no one thought then of a perfectly free worship. But the right auspices for their production were not at hand. The disposition to get away, as much as possible, from the outward usages of the Roman Church, was the cause of extreme views in the opposite direction. There was no proper insight into the true conception of a liturgy, regarded as an organic scheme of worship; and no active sympathy, therefore, with the idea of worship in any such form. Liturgies formed in such circumstances were, we may say, necessarily imperfect, and do not deserve to be regarded as binding models for the use of the church in all subsequent times.

So much is shown, indeed, by the actual practice of the Church in regard to them from the first. They were at best only of provincial and temporary authority. With the progress of time, new liturgies came in on all sides; which themselves, however, were no improvement on the old, but only a carrying out of what was defective in them rather to something worse. Then came the age of illumination, the triumph of the subjective principle in the form of pure rationalism, emasculating both the doctrine and the worship of the Church of all their earlier life and vigor. Here was an end, of course, of all right liturgical feeling. Liturgies there were still, both Lutheran and Reformed. But they were liturgies supremely unliturgical, just as the theology of the times was also in the highest degree untheological. They were at best frigid formularies of the purely pulpit sort, that breathed no sense whatever of either altar or sacrament, and chilled all active response on the side of the people. In the last third of the eighteenth century, as Daniel informs us in his article on the subject in Herzog's Encyclopedia, such wretchedly unliturgical *agenda*, "mere products of a sentimental subjectivity, without taste or tact, and with no sense for either Christianity or the Church, appear in very many Lutheran States;" and the same withering sirocco is allowed to have passed over the worship also of the Reformed Churches, "though perhaps in a less degree," both in Switzerland and Germany. To this iron age has happily succeeded the reactionary period, the age of restoration and reform, in which we now live. In the midst of other demands of the new religious era, there has come to prevail among the German Churches generally, a sense of want in the department of public worship, which refuses to be satisfied with anything less than the most thorough reconstruction of the whole interest. Never before has there been such a full ventilation of the universal subject; never, since the Reformation, the same study of liturgical principles, or the like mastery of liturgical resources. The result of all is thus far, not a disposition certainly to give up forms altogether in favor of free services, but the conviction, becoming always, if we understand the matter rightly, more and more general, that the true idea of a

liturgy requires much more than such a merely outward ordering of forms, as that which has grown to be so poor and tame in the later agenda; and that what is needed, therefore, is not a mere passive return to the formularies of the sixteenth century, but such a revision of the whole subject, as may involve a reproduction of the life and spirit of the primitive liturgies in forms stamped with the impress of the Reformation. It has come to be widely felt, that the great purposes of liturgical worship have never been effectually provided for by these external directories and handbooks. No liturgy in such form has been able to live like the service-book of the Church of England, by entering the religious life of a whole people. No wonder, then, that there should be, among thinking men now, a general despair of the liturgical interest under this view, and a general desire for something better.

The sense of all these things wrought actively in the mind of the Committee, whose studies and labors have produced our Provisional Liturgy. They found themselves embraced and borne along, as it were, by what may be called the deeper movement of the age in regard to the great subject of Christian worship; and they would have felt it to be great unfaithfulness on their part to the task placed in their hands, if they had not endeavored at least to meet it with some corresponding breadth of view. Still, they did not think it enough to be ruled in the matter simply by their own jndgment.

At an early stage of their work, they submitted to the Synod a report, which gave that body the opportunity of declaring its mind, more particularly than had been done in the beginning, concerning the plan and principles on which it was wished to have the new Liturgy constructed. This led, it will be remembered, to the famous Baltimore instructions of 1852; which *seem* to be so plain, that one who runs might read their sense. Here we have, in the first place, a general order of services, to be followed in the work; and then, in the next place, certain main rules or principles are laid down, by which the Committee were required to govern themselves in its preparation. Let us now hear how some of these read.

The first rule of all, and that which is made plainly to underlie and condition all the rest, utters itself with no uncertain sound, as follows: "The liturgical worship of the Primitive Church, as far as it can be ascertained from the Holy Scriptures, the oldest ecclesiastical writers, and the Liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches of the third and fourth centuries, ought to be made, as much as possible, the *general basis* of the proposed Liturgy; the more so, as they are in fact also the source from which the best portions of the Liturgies of the sixteenth century were derived—such as the forms of confession and absolution, the litanies, the creeds, the Te Deum, the Gloria in Excelsis, the collects, the doxologies, &c."

Then it follows in the next rule: "Among the latest Liturgies special reference ought to be had to the old *Palatinate* and other *Reformed Liturgies* of the sixteenth century."

It is added, however, in the third rule: "Neither the ancient Catholic nor the old Reformed Liturgies ought to be copied slavishly, but reproduced rather in a free, evangelical spirit, and adapted to the peculiar wants of our own age and denomination; inasmuch as these Liturgies themselves exhibit to us a considerable variety with essential unity, and as every age of the Church has the promise of the Spirit, and a peculiar mission to fulfill. For the same reason, new forms may be prepared also, but in keeping, also, with the devotional spirit of the Church in her purest days."

How, in the face of all this, any one should be so bold as to say that the business of the Liturgical Committee was only to put forth a new edition of the old Palatinate Liturgy, or at most a compilation of forms, not going beyond the range and manner of the Reformed Liturgies generally of the sixteenth century—unless it might be in the way merely of such watery dilutions of their doctrinal life and spirit as had come to prevail in the eighteenth century, when the Church had its first transplantation to this country—may well, indeed, appear surpassingly strange. Beyond all controversy, these instructions mean, if they have any meaning at all, that the Committee was *not* expected to go to work in any

such narrow way. They were *not* to feel themselves slavishly bound by the practice of the fathers of the Reformed Church in Switzerland and Germany, and much less, of course, by the practice of the younger fathers in this country. They were to have reference, it is said, to the Liturgies of the sixteenth century; but they were not to stop short with these, by any means, in their work. They must fall back on the sources from which the best portions of these modern formularies were derived; and they must do this in such manner as to make the ancient worship, "as much as possible, the *general basis* of the proposed Liturgy." This ancient worship, it is said, moreover, is to be ascertained not simply from the Bible, but from "the oldest ecclesiastical writers and the Liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches of the third and fourth centuries." This amounts to the same here, as if in the department of doctrine it had been ordered to produce a new system of theology, having due regard to the Reformed Confessions of the sixteenth century, but looking through these to the early Christian Creeds, as being, after all, the general basis of all right confessional faith, to the end of time. No one would think of taking that to mean that the old creeds should hold a merely subordinate and secondary relation to the modern confessions; it would mean just the reverse—that the old creeds are to be considered, as far as they reach, of principial and normative authority for these modern

formularies. And now, when we hear the Church ordering a new Liturgy, which, with due regard to the worship of the sixteenth century, shall yet so reach back through this to the beginnings and foundations of all Christian worship in the early Church, as to find there its *general basis*, and to be thus a revision and reconstruction of the old Reformed system from this ground upwards—is it not plain that the words must be taken in substantially the same sense? In neither view, however, must the new work be a mere outward putting together of old forms. It must be the reproduction of the past, under a character of evangelical freedom, "adapted to the peculiar wants of our age and denomination." But this only goes to show, again, how little thought there was of narrowing the sphere of its preparation to the liturgical productions of the sixteenth century.

The new Liturgy, it appears at once from the spirit and tenor of these instructions, was to be more than a mere pulpit service book, a directory for the minister simply, in the use of which the people were to have no part. "A Liturgy," we are told, "will never fully answer its purpose, and be sufficiently appreciated by the congregations, if it is confined to the hands of the minister. Like the Bible, the Catechism and the Hymn Book, it ought to be the common property and manual of every member of the Church. The laymen will take a far deeper interest in the devotional exercises, if they

can follow the minister by their book, and respond at least with an audible *Amen* at the end of each prayer." The plan proposed for the work requires, at the same time, that regard be had to the course of the Church year, and to the old Christian festival seasons, "especially Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday." Of the same general significance is the assumption that the proposed Liturgy must include not only forms of confession and absolutions, but litanies also, the creeds, the Te Deum, the Gloria in Excelsis, collects, doxologies, and other such liturgical material borrowed from the worship of ancient times. These are things which look beyond the notion of a mere pulpit manual. They belong properly only to that second conception of a liturgy, by which it is made to be a joint service for minister and people, revolving throughout around the idea of the altar.

"If these principles," say the Synod, "be wisely and conscientiously carried out, it is hoped that by the blessing of God, a Liturgy might be produced at last which will be a bond of union both with the ancient Catholic Church and the Reformation, and yet be the product of the religious life of our denomination in its present state."

The general sense of the whole, we say again, is abundantly clear. What the Synod wanted and ordered in 1852, was a Liturgy which should not follow mechanically any past formulary of the Reformed Church, whether in Europe or in this country,

but should be a free reproduction rather of the Reformed cultus, on the general basis and ground of the original Christian worship, and in the spirit of our own denominational position at the present time. Under this character, accordingly, the Provisional Liturgy in 1857 made its appearance, and submitted itself, under synodical sanction, to the trial of the Church. It has never pretended to appear in any other character. It has not professed at all to be of one order simply with the liturgical practice of the German Reformed Church in the sixteenth century; and much less of one order with what had come to be its liturgical practice in the eighteenth century, when it was first transplanted into this country. That practice from the beginning is believed to have been too naked and bald; running naturally into the theory which makes a liturgy to be a book of outward forms and nothing more. The new Liturgy was constructed throughout on another theory altogether—the theory of an altar service, as we have endeavored to explain it before, in distinction from what may be called a service simply of the pulpit. It has aimed to be liturgical in the full sense of the term. There is no room for any mistake with regard to either its purpose or its profession, in this respect. It makes common cause with the Liturgies of the ancient Church, by laying its hand from the start on such "primitive forms" as not only the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Apostles' Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*, but also the *Nicene* and

Athanasian Creeds, the *Magnificat*, the *Benedictus*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, the *Trisagion*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Ambrosian Hymn;* appropriating them as elementary matter for its own use, and so announcing at once the sphere in which it seeks to move. Here, too, we have a full *Litany*, on the basis of the "ancient Latin Litanies," responses and all. Next in order we have the *Church Year*, with *Scripture Lessons* and *Collects*, also of old authority, running from the First Sunday in *Advent* to the Twenty-seventh Sunday after *Trinity*, and having due regard throughout to the leading Church *Festivals*. Then, again, we have special canticles and prayers for these special times and seasons, all designed to keep the sense of them fresh and green in the mind of the Church. These, altogether are such peculiarities and characteristics as go of themselves to show to what order of worship the new Liturgy belongs, and from the first intended to belong. In its offices of the *Holy Sacraments* this comes into full view. The Liturgy rests on the sacramental principle throughout. It breathes throughout a sacrificial spirit. It is a service everywhere for the people, in active concert with the minister. Its whole character in this view, we say again, is openly manifest and clear; so that there has never been any reason for making it the subject of a moment's question or doubt.

Such as it is, however, the Provisional Liturgy has not come thus far, as we know, into any gene-

ral use in the Church. We cannot say, indeed, that there has been any general trial of its merits; for this could be only by some full congregational transaction of its offices themselves, in their own form; whereas, for the most part, they have been scanned only in an outside way, or at best experimented upon in broken parcels, sundered from their proper adjuncts, and tinkered at pleasure into other connections and other shapes. No such abstract judgment upon the forms of such a liturgy, exercised from the stand-point of common pulpit prayer, with or without forms, can ever deserve much consideration. A true liturgy, in this respect, is like a piece of music; it must be judged from within; it must be actually sung or performed, in order that it may be rightly understood. But let this pass. We will not stop now to inquire why the new Liturgy has failed to get into any wide use. Enough to know that such is the fact; and that on the strength of it now, it has been considered necessary to have the work revised and altered, in order to make it what the Church is still supposed to want and to wish. With this view it was placed in the hands of the old Liturgical Committee again, by the Synod which met last fall at Easton.

It seemed to be the mind of the Synod, that this revision was not to be radical at all, but conservative rather of the general form and spirit of the book as it now stands. That apparently was the thought of the different Classes also, in their previous separate action on the subject; for while they suggest different points of improvement, in a sufficiently loose and promiscuous way, they profess in general full satisfaction with the reigning plan of the Liturgy; all ready to join at least, it would seem, with the Classis of Philadelphia, in saying: "We approve of the Liturgy, which the Synod has submitted to the examination and provisional use of the Church, regarded as a whole, and believe that with such modifications and changes as it was allowed from the first issue of the book might be found necessary and expedient, it may be readily adapted to the views and wants of our Church at large." The resolution of reference, on the part of the Synod, passed unanimously after long and full discussion, is yet more decidedly conservative in its tone. It reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Provisional Liturgy be placed in the hands of the original Committee for final revision; and that the Committee be instructed to consider the suggestions of the Classes as given in the minutes of their late meetings, and use them in the revision of the work, as far as the general unity of the work will allow, and in a way that shall not be inconsistent either with established liturgical principles and usages, or with the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed Church."

Here was no thought certainly of any organic change in the work, but just the reverse. The general unity of the work, as it now stands, must

be maintained. Any alterations made must be circumstantial only, and not fundamental. The essential theory and scheme of the Liturgy must remain as they are—an order of worship based on the Christian cultus of the first ages, but representing, at the same time, the doctrinal and devotional genius of the modern German Reformed Church, in a freely reproduced way. The resolution amounts plainly to a re-affirmation, in brief terms, of the general sense of the Baltimore instructions of 1852, as we have had them already under consideration. These were not abrogated by the Synod of Easton. They continue in force still for the Liturgical Committee, as much as ever.

But has the Synod, after all, fully understood its own action, in the sense now explained; and is the Church prepared really to unite in adopting the present Liturgy, after any revision to which it may be subjected in this conservative way? It is not for us here to answer the question, grave as it is for the work with which we are charged; the answer must come finally from the Church itself. So much, however, is certain; there has not been a common understanding among the different members of the Committee themselves, in regard to either the nature of the revision the Liturgy calls for, or the meaning of the synodical instructions under which they are required to act. When they came together, accordingly, and entered into an

earnest interchange of views, it was found impossible for them to proceed at all with any sort of harmony and consent in their work, since it was apparent from the start, that their differences of opinion regarded not merely things of secondary account, but fundamental points affecting the very life and being of the Liturgy as it now stands.

The body of the Committee are, indeed, of one mind. They believe that the Liturgy needs revision, and only regret that there has been so little trial of it yet, in the way of actual practice, on which to base such revision with the best effect. They can see how in many things it is capable of being improved, and have themselves many alterations to suggest for this purpose. But they are not willing to give up the distinctive character of the Liturgy itself, or to admit changes that strike at its organic constitution. They are not willing to have it forced into the service of an order and manner of worship altogether different from its own. They wish to have it still a sacramental liturgy; a liturgy not for the pulpit but for the altar; a liturgy ruled by the spirit of the church year; a liturgy that shall be the natural home of the creeds, and chants, and grand old collects, that have come down to us hallowed by the use of the Church in past ages; a liturgy to be solemnly transacted by the people, along with the minister, in the courts of the Lord's house.

There is, however, a minority view in the Committee—claiming, nevertheless, to be altogether the

majority view of the Church at large—which refuses to be satisfied with any such revision as this. It may not call for any larger amount of change than is thought of on the other side; but the change it calls for is of another quality and kind, for it goes to destroy in fact what it proposes to preserve. According to the view in question, the Liturgy should have no responses. This implies, of course, that it should be in the main a service-book for the minister only, whom the people then are expected to follow in passive silence. Objection is made again to its strong sacramental tone at certain points; and a disposition is shown altogether to have it less after the altar pattern of the ancient Church, and more after the pulpit fashion of later times. The genius of the Reformed Church, we are told, has always been in favor of a free and plain worship, and we ought not now to think of varying our liturgical practice materially from this rule. Such, we are to assume, has been the view of the Church all along. In ordering the new Liturgy to be formed, as much as possible, on the general basis of the liturgical worship of the primitive Church, the Synod meant only that so much regard should be had to this, as might comport with the general practice of the Reformed Church in the 16th century. And what the Church now calls for, it is said, is such a revision of the work as may clear it of what is found not to agree with this rule. It has been weighed in its present form, and found

wanting. Our congregations generally have refused to go into the use of it; yet they like it on the whole, we hear, and would be glad to accept it, if only it were relieved from its "objectionable peculiarities;" and now to meet the exigency, the Synod, following the multifarious voice of the classes, has put it once more into the hands of the original Committee, for the express purpose of having it brought into such improved shape. No very broad alterations are supposed to be necessary for this purpose; the material of the Liturgy may remain much what it is now; only, the governing tone of it should be changed, and the parts ordered in such way, that it may not seem to be so much a ritual in the old church sense, as a mere directory rather for public worship in the sense of modern times.

In these circumstances, the Committee have felt that they could not proceed in their appointed work with any hope of success. How could they expect to agree in regard to particulars and details, where there was such difference in regard to first principles and general laws? It was in the power of the majority, it is true, to outvote the minority, and so carry things their own way. But they had no heart to go forward in that manner; knowing well that such divided action in the Committee was sure to be followed by a division of sentiment also in the Church, and that it must ever be worse than folly to think of carrying any measure of this sort with a religious denomination like ours, without its own

most general if not entirely universal consent. There could be no freedom, no spirit, no confidence or hope, with the work of revision carried forward in any such blind and uncertain way. It would be like going to sea without either compass, or rudder, or nautical chart. We have found ourselves, therefore, brought to a stand, as not knowing in what direction or manner to move. It seemed necessary, first of all, that there should be a fair and full understanding of what we were really expected to do in the business committed to our hands; and this required, of course, that we should bring the whole subject before the Church again, for the purpose of ascertaining its mind with regard to it beyond any possibility of mistake. No previous instructions for this purpose are enough; for it is made a question now how these themselves should be construed or understood; and whether they represent truly, after all, in what they seem to say, the reigning judgment of the Church at the present time. The Baltimore propositions appear to be very plain and explicit in setting forth the principles on which the new liturgy was to be formed; but it is maintained that the Synod did not mean at the time by any means as much as their language is now made to mean; that they did not see fully the bearing of their own action; and that now, at all events, we have the sense of the Church revealed very differently, in the general demand which has been made for having the Liturgy revised and changed.

It is not necessary to discuss these points. Whether the past action of the Church has been misunderstood, or whether we are to suppose that the Church, on more mature consideration, has changed its own mind, comes, for our present purpose and view, to the same thing in the end. What we have to do with is the actual mind of the Church at this time, however brought to pass. By that, this whole liturgical work must stand or fall. The Committee, then, in their great embarrassment, that they may not seem to run and labor in vain, find it necessary to call for new direction and instruction, more definite and full than any they have yet received, and such as may be sufficient to show, without room for question or doubt, what the actual views and wishes of the Church, at the present time, in regard to a liturgy are; and for this purpose they come now before the Synod with the present report or memorial, carefully prepared, on the whole subject, which it is hoped may serve to bring its necessities and difficulties fairly into view, and thus open the way at least for such conclusive action in regard to them, as the greatness of the interest is felt now on all sides to require.

Let it be decided, then, first of all, what order of liturgy the German Reformed Church in this country is supposed to need, as best suited to her present theological and historical position. This is a question which goes here necessarily before all other questions, and which we have no right to pass

in our circumstances, without a full and clear answer. Of the two conceptions of liturgical worship which have been explained, is it the first or the second that we are expected to be governed by, as a Church, in our present liturgical movement? Do we want a mere mechanical or an organic liturgy, a book of forms for the minister simply, or a scheme of devotional service for the whole congregation; a liturgy in the spirit of the pulpit only, or a sacramental liturgy breathing throughout the spirit of the altar?

Do we wish, it may be asked again, to keep ourselves absolutely to the rule of such systems of worship as have prevailed heretofore in the Reformed Church, whether in Europe or in this country; or are we prepared still—in what seems to be the spirit of those Baltimore instructions of 1852—to exercise a wider freedom, by throwing ourselves back on the "general basis" of the Christian worship of the first ages, and thus aiming at a reconstruction of the Reformed worship, in which the ancient faith and the modern faith may be fitly exhibited in the power of a common life, answerable to the true genius of our Church at the present time? We have no desire to disguise the fact, that this is, under a different form, substantially the same question as before. The Reformed Confession, from the beginning, if we except the Episcopal portion of it in England, for reasons which it is not now necessary to consider, has not been favorable to much outward form or ritual action in worship; and its

liturgical productions, accordingly, have been all along more mechanical than organic, more in sympathy with the pulpit than with the altar. If these formularies then, with their reigning tendency, down to our own "Mayer Liturgy" of 1840, are to bound and circumscribe our liturgical movement at the present time, so that it shall not be allowed to go beyond them, or out of their sphere, in any way, this must of itself amount to a practical settling for us of the question, what order of liturgy we propose to have. Let this be well considered, then, in connection with what was asked before, and in full view of the entire subject, let the Synod now, in the name of the Church, make known its whole mind and will in regard to it, in such way that there shall be no room farther for any confusion or mistake. Must the past liturgical practice of the church, so far as there has been any such practice, control our universal worship now? Must our new Liturgy be of one kind in manner and form, in genius and spirit, with the reformed Liturgies of the sixteenth century, having these only for its basis, and following them as its rule? If such be, indeed, the general view and feeling of the Church, as it is assumed to be in much that is said about the Provisional Liturgy as it now stands, let it be at once known to ourselves and openly declared to the world. This would of itself settle much for the work with which we are engaged. We shall know then where we are, and what we are doing.

In that case, it is plain enough that the Provisional Liturgy, in its present form, is not what the Church wants or is at all prepared to accept. For as we have said before, it requires no argument to show that it is not after the pattern strictly of any system of worship which has prevailed hitherto in the German Reformed Church either in this country or in Europe. It makes no such profession or pretence. It aims to be an improvement upon this whole past cultus, by which it is to be made more thoroughly liturgical than ever before. All this it bears upon its face without any sort of concealment or disguise. If, then, we want no such innovation upon our old system, if our liturgical feeling, such as it is, can be still satisfied with that general type of worship, and has not become with us a want looking above it or beyond it in any way, it is most certain, without any farther question, that the new Liturgy, as it now stands, is not at all what we need or should be willing to receive. So much the issue before us really and truly involves. Let us be fully awake then to its whole meaning and sense. It is a question of very material change in our church practice, if not in our church life. The new Liturgy is for us, as a Church, in many respects, a new scheme of worship. It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshipped, either in these United States or elsewhere. If that be for us, the "pattern in the mount," from which we have no mind to make any change, let us say at once, "We want no worship in this new form. The Liturgy

may be good in its own order and kind; but it is not such a liturgy as suits the German Reformed Church; we will not have it, therefore, for our use."

So far all would seem to be sufficiently plain. Now, however, comes a new question, involving more difficulty. It appears to be a very general view, as we have already seen, that although the Provisional Liturgy is not yet exactly what the German Reformed Church in this country wants, it is this, notwithstanding, to a great extent, and only needs some few alterations and improvements to make it all that the case requires. Such is the judgment which we find expressed by all the Classes in their action on the subject last year, and finally by the Synod itself at Easton. In no quarter has there been a wish uttered to have the work condemned or rejected as a whole. The feeling appears to be every where, rather, that there is a real correspondence between its reigning plan and scope, and what has come to be the predominant spirit of our Church at the present time; so that although we are not prepared to go with it all the length of its liturgical scheme, we are yet not willing either to be parted from the scheme entirely, and given over hopelessly to an altogether different order of worship. There is at work among us an unmistakeable liturgical instinct here, which is of vast significance for our present church position. But we have seen already how far, for the thinking of many, at least, this idea of alteration extends;

amounting to nothing less, in fact, than a change in the distinguishing character of the Liturgy itself. There would appear to be in the case some vague notion of a sort of intermediate ground, as proper for us to occupy, between the two liturgical conceptions of which we have been speaking; where we might have something of both schemes of worship in one, retaining in the main the matter of the new Liturgy, but using it in the general style and manner of what our practice was before. This has been the ruling thought, probably, in the movement now made for a final revision of the Liturgy. But the thought, we are bound to say, is vain. The Liturgy can never be successfully revised in any such way as this. It may be revised and improved under its own character, and within its own sphere; but any attempt to change its constitutional nature itself can only result in destroying it as it now is, and giving us in place of it a mongrel production, which for all practical purposes will be sure to fall dead upon our hands from its very birth.

It would be in the first place, we say, to destroy the work in its present form. There is, as we have seen, a constitutional difference between the two schemes of worship, which it would be attempted to force together in this way; the difference is not in mere external particulars here and there, but in the whole inward life and spirit of the schemes; and there is no middle ground, properly speaking, in which they can come into any practical union. The

Provisional Liturgy, in its universal structure, belongs to one of these schemes, and not to the other. Like a work of art, it has in this view its own plan, and is governed throughout by its own reigning idea. To take such a work to pieces, or to mar and change its parts, with the view of turning it mechanically into something else, is necessarily to ruin it in its own order of existence altogether. We have no right to kill the Liturgy in any such vandal style as that. Least of all should it be required of the Committee that framed it, to lay violent hands thus on their own work. As a body, they would rather see it consigned at once to the flames, or in any manner buried in oblivion. The Synod has no right to make their labors absurd. As a work of literature at least, if nothing more, let the Liturgy live.

The idea of any such murderous revision, however, as that of which we are now speaking, becomes still more intolerable, when it is considered, in the second place, that it would most certainly fail to secure in the end what the Church is endeavoring to reach, a system of worship, namely, adapted to her present liturgical wants. If the mind of the Church be not in fact prepared for the order of worship to which the Provisional Liturgy belongs, it is not to be imagined that it can be satisfied with its forms, merely by having them shorn of some of their peculiarities, and forced to take their place in a different scheme of worship. Such a mixed formulary,

neither wholly for the altar nor yet fully for the pulpit, must prove unsatisfactory under both views, and would have no chance whatever of coming into general use. Take away the responses, and strike out a few strong expressions on the subject of sacramental grace; would that change the tone of thought and sentiment which now pervades the Liturgy as a whole? By no means. This would only have lost its right associations; but it would be felt still; and felt, unfortunately, as something incongruous with these new circumstances. It is easy to predict what course, in that case, things must take. The Liturgy revised in this style would probably never after all be adopted; for the changes made with it would only open the way for questions of new change. But suppose it adopted. There would be no hearty resolution in the measure, no spirit or vigor, but misgiving and hesitation rather on all sides; and we should have for the result finally of this whole liturgical movement, reaching through nearly twenty years, just about as much as we have already in the Mayer Liturgy—a book of forms, sanctioned by act of Synod, and published as for the use of the German Reformed Church, but allowed by the Church at the same time, with common silent consent, to pass into general neglect, as being after all not suited to its wants.

We deceive ourselves, if we imagine that we may change the distinguishing principle of the Liturgy in this way, and yet retain in vigorous use any con-

siderable part of its constituent matter as it now stands. Its primitive or elementary forms, of old ecclesiastical date, will become, with the loss of its sacramental character, but little more than a dead letter. They may be paraded still, with a certain kind of honor, in our Prayer Book; but they will have almost nothing at all to do with our actual worship. We shall have in living practice no Litany, no Te Deum, no Gloria in Excelsis, no Trisagion, no Gloria Patri, except as sung in one of Watts' metres, not so much even as the Apostles' Creed in any regular use. Account for it as we may, these old devotions will not prosper and thrive, either in the spiritualistic atmosphere of free worship, or in the *hortus siccus* of mere pulpit forms, with no responsive service on the part of the people. Nay, there is something palpably unnatural for all such worship, in the fixed use even of the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. They need the surroundings of a truly liturgical service to give effect to their constant repetition; and where these are wanting, the repetition never seems to sit easily on the worshipping habit of the congregation, but comes to be felt always as something mechanical and formal; a sort of stiff outward tradition, which it is well then if all be not content at last to have consigned to oblivion altogether. So as regards the Church Year and the Christian Festivals. Such a change in the constitutional character of the Liturgy as we are now supposing, must necessarily render worthless all that

large part of it which is taken up with the Scripture Lessons and Collects for the year, and with the Prayers and Canticles for the Festival Seasons. If retained at all, this whole apparatus can be for us no better afterwards than so much respectable lumber. It will never enter at all, we may be very sure, into any living congregational use. It is hard to see, indeed, how with such a change in its organic nature, even a single page of the Liturgy, as it now stands, could be retained, with any likelihood whatever of its giving either general or abiding satisfaction to the Church.

Here then, especially, it is of the utmost account, that we should know well what we want, and what we are proposing to reach. Are we sure that we want a Liturgy at all? That is the first question, to which all our action on the subject thus far stands before the world as an affirmative answer. Then comes the second question: What order or kind of Liturgy is it that we desire to have, as best suited to the circumstances of our Church; a Liturgy for the altar and the common use of the people, or a Liturgy for the pulpit and the special use only of the minister? Or, what is for us practically only the same question in another form: Do we wish a Liturgy on the basis of the primitive Christian Liturgies, and in the spirit of what was considered to be liturgical worship in the first ages; or must we hold ourselves strictly to the pattern of worship that has prevailed heretofore in our branch of the Reformed Church,

making the practice of the sixteenth century the beginning of our tradition, without any regard to the cultus of older times, and allowing no variation from it except in the direction of what we find to be the state of things in the Church two centuries later, both in Europe and in this country? Let the answer here be in favor of a new order of worship, more liturgical in the old sense of the term, than the Liturgies of the sixteenth century, and involving a reform of our past practice, answerable to the genius and spirit of our Church at the present time, and then the way will be open for going on to revise our Provisional Liturgy with some chance of success. For this is the character in which alone the Provisional Liturgy offers itself to our consideration; and a revision of it in this view might be as large and free as any could wish; its general plan and spirit would still remain unchanged. But let the answer to that main question just propounded fall the other way, as many are ready to assure us it must do on any full understanding of the subject; let it be settled once for all as the fixed judgment of our Church, that we want no material change in our manner of worship, no liturgy of the organic, patristic, sacramental sort, but only a manual of forms for the pulpit; then will it be settled at the same time, that the Provisional Liturgy, coming to us openly as it does in that other character, is in no way, as it now stands, fitted for our use. But more than this, it will be rendered certain, also, that it cannot pos-

sibly be so altered or amended, by any revision, as to become what we want; and that no such revision, therefore, should be thought of or attempted. The only proper course for us, in such case, must be to give up all talk of revision, to reject the present Liturgy as a whole, and then, if we still have the heart for it, to take steps as we best can for having another altogether new one prepared, after the fashion and pattern that we prefer. This will not spoil the work which is now on our hands, and it will give free opportunity for making the new work all that it ought to be in its own order and kind. If we are to have a pulpit Liturgy only, let us avoid, by all means, the monstrosity of having it made up to any extent of the *disjecta membra*, the dislocated fragments of an altar service. Let it be true to its own principle. Let it be constructed throughout on its own scheme of worship. Then may it be respectable, at least, in its sort; and though it should go the way afterwards of such formularies in general, passing into the shades of indifference and neglect, there will be no reason for remembering it with derision or scorn.

We may as well face at once, however, the ultimate issue on which, by our circumstances, we are now thrown. The question with us, as we stand at present, is not whether we shall have an altar liturgy or a pulpit liturgy—a liturgy with responses, or a liturgy without them—but whether we shall have a liturgy in any form or shape whatever. We do

not believe that, at the present time, and especially in this country, a mere book of forms, however excellently composed, could prove satisfying to any religious denomination; but least of all, is anything of this sort to be imagined in the case of our German Reformed Zion. Such liturgical feeling as there is at work among us, whether it may fully understand itself or not, looks unquestionably beyond this meagre conception, and is in truth a secret longing or yearning after the idea of worship in its original Christian sense. If it be not still strong enough to bring a cultus of this kind to the birth, it is at least too strong to be put off with what must ever be for it, a mere sham birth in the other form. Rather than that, it will be ready to say, let us remain as we are, free to make the best use we can of our present liberty. The day for such pulpit hand-books, with us at least, is over, as it seems to be, indeed, for Protestant churches generally, both in Europe and in this country. It must be now nothing short of full puritanic freedom in one direction, or nothing short of a full liturgical cultus in the other. No supposed middle ground can hold in actual church practice. We can never use the Mayer Liturgy, or anything like it. We can never be satisfied with the old Palatinate Liturgy, nor with any of the Helvetic Liturgies used in the sixteenth century, or since; and still less, of course, with any of the jejune formularies that were used by our ministerial fathers of the last century, here in America. No

reconstruction of any such order of worship will serve our purpose; and time and labor bestowed upon any work of that sort, will be only time and labor thrown away. If we are not prepared, then, to go beyond this in our liturgical aims and endeavors, it would seem to be our wisest course now to dismiss all farther action on the subject, and so to stand fast in the liberty wherewith we are already ecclesiastically free, allowing every minister and congregation to carry out a general scheme of worship in such way as to themselves may appear best.

may be constructed on different plans; may be more or less full; may have single prayers only, or a variety of prayers, for the several different occasions of worship; and may be made of more or less binding authority, or be considered a mere pulpit convenience for altogether optional use. But through all such modifications, the general conception remains the same. The Liturgy is a service book, a book of examples and forms, a mere collection of prayers.

Much of the controversy we hear concerning the use of liturgies, turns on this notion of them altogether. It is a question simply between book-prayers, as they are called, and prayers without book, the manner and spirit of the worship being supposed to be in both cases substantially the same. Public addresses to God, in the name of the congregation, are held to be a necessary part of the worship of the sanctuary; it is the business of the minister to lead the people in these acts of devotion, at such times as the order of service requires; and the matter of debate then is, whether in the discharge of this function he should be left to his own free power and pleasure at the time, or make use of forms previously prepared and printed for the purpose.

In favor of free supplications it is contended, on the one side, that they tend to encourage and assist the spirit of devotion, and the gift of prayer in the officiating minister; that being produced from within at the moment when they are offered, they may

be expected to carry with them proper heart and life; that being wholly unshackled, they have the power of suiting themselves easily to existing circumstances and wants. On all of which points then, counterpart objections are urged against prescribed forms of prayer. They are mechanical, we are told, and run naturally into formality and cold lip service; they are not born immediately from the heart, but are the repetition or rehearsal only of what others have wrought out from the brain; they are necessarily general, allowing no room for such freedom, variety, and particularity, as the idea of prayer seems to require; they prevent the proper cultivation of what has been rightly denominated the gift of prayer, being in this view, at best, crutches only for the lame, and helps for the incompetent, the general use of which cannot but serve to extend and confirm the very weakness for which it thus offers itself as an indulgent relief. The argument throughout is directed against liturgies, under the one single aspect of their being precomposed, fixed forms of prayer, in distinction from corresponding services of an extemporaneous and free character.

And so also on the other side, we have the cause of liturgies largely defended under precisely the same view. They are regarded as a security for the fitness, decency, and dignity of the public services of religion. If some ministers are well qualified to produce good prayers without any such outward help, it is certain that very many have not this quali-