

# *Theology* on the *Web.org.uk*

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

bermere, Ripon, Sir John Hobhouse, Sir Robert Gordon, and Mr. Joseph Hume, testified to his deserving, but nothing more was done for him. The Government and the India House were as deaf now to his necessities as they had formerly been to his proposals and projects. The voice of the country now condemns unreservedly such national niggardliness, but it served its turn. With a constitution undermined by his constant and heroic exertions, with a heart broken by the wreck of his dearest hopes, and under the shadow of the awful fear which weighed him down, that "to the records and roll of the Insolvent Court would be added the story and name of the Pioneer of the Overland Route," he succumbed to circumstances, and died at Golden Square, Pentonville, early in January, 1850. He had then been in the receipt of his India House pension for about eighteen months; but of the Civil List pension he had only received one quarterly payment. We have already pointed out how his relatives have been treated by the country. Further comment is needless! But we must add, that it is doubtful whether figures could express the pecuniary gain to this country by means of the Overland Route. We have said enough to show why we should honour the memory of the great explorer, whose statue stands on Waghorn's Quay at Suez—a speaking monument of his services to civilization and commerce. And when we read the story of his life we are reminded once more of the well-worn, but immortal, words of the saddest of elegies:

Can storied urn or animated bust,  
 Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?  
 Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,  
 Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?

W. MORRIS COLLES.



### ART. III.—THOUGHTS ON LITTLE THINGS.

#### PART II.

THE subject of little things connected with the musical part of our service proved so fruitful in suggestions, that it occupied our space entirely in a former paper. Let us pass on now to consider other matters connected with the worship of God in our churches, of equal, if not of greater, importance.

To begin with these services themselves. I think I am right in saying that it is now very generally admitted that our morning service, when conducted in the old-fashioned method, and

consisting really of three distinct services welded into one, is too long—indeed, much too long. I fully believe that this witness is true, and I would even go so far as to affirm my conviction that this unduly protracted service is a real source of weakness to our Church. It may be as well to give reasons for this strong conviction; and I will mention four. The first shall be one about which, I dare say, opinions will greatly differ. I can but state my own. I notice in many churches a disposition to curtail the *morning* sermon (in consequence of the length of the service), which is, I think, much to be deprecated, if, indeed, the morning sermon is what it ought to be. It is in our Sunday morning addresses that our pastoral work has mainly to be done. Then it is that we seek to “feed the flock of God,” and it seems to me that he must be a very skilful feeder who can do his duty in this respect in less than thirty or thirty-five minutes. Morning sermons should be longer than evening ones, if these last are evangelizing, for it takes much less time to put the Gospel before the ungodly than it does to enter into the details of the spiritual life, or to illustrate the mysteries of Christian devotion. Careful exegesis of the passages considered, and practical elucidation of the doctrines or directions contained in them, our flocks have a right to expect at our hands, and good work of this kind requires time, both in preparation and in delivery.

But next, the long service would seem to be objectionable because there are few minds that can sustain their attention for so long a time, or keep their interest from flagging. There is no doubt or question about the very mischievous effect of an unduly long *extempore* effusion in a prayer-meeting; but is a protracted service less likely to produce an unwholesome effect just because it is Liturgical, and because the words are familiar? It seems to me that it might be difficult to show why we should not draw an exactly opposite conclusion.

But again, we have to consider the many young people who attend our churches, in whom a deep spirituality is not yet developed, and who therefore are specially liable to feelings of weariness and tedium. We have no business to inflict on those who are not fit to enter into it a prolonged religious function; and we have to consider, too, those who, though they are not young, are ignorant and unspiritual, who must needs have their place in the congregation until the harvest separation comes, and whom we encourage to attend in the hope that they may be led on to better things.

Two illustrations of the effect that our lengthy services actually have on such, may be offered here. On one occasion a little boy was asked by his mother to attend one of my weekday mission services. He looked very dubious for a few

moments, and then inquired, "If I do go, will they read that long thing about 'Good Lord, deliver us'?" Reassured on this point, he made no further difficulty. In the East of London a good friend of mine was pressing a woman to attend the church where he was going to preach, when he received the reply: "Well, you see, sir, it isn't the preaching that I mind, but it's *them preliminaries* that I can't do with. I really can't put up with *them*!"

If it be objected, are we to curtail the spiritual offerings of the devout, in order to meet the incapacities of the young and the ignorant and unspiritual? I reply that the devout have their own special function, from which others are excluded, and if they avail themselves of this as they should, their opportunities of public devotion will be ample, without their inflicting upon others a lengthened office which these are not in a condition to appreciate or enjoy.

But this brings me to my third and most important graven against our protracted morning service, namely, that it tends to exclude the Holy Communion from the proper position which it should hold in the system of Christian worship. When a point of theory or practice in religion is forced upon our notice from two opposite quarters, and is equally insisted upon by those who occupy severally the very poles of theological thought, it is surely high time that we should ask ourselves whether there is not probably something in it. If we find, upon further inquiry, that this view has been maintained by the Church Catholic, apparently throughout its entire history, and certainly seems to derive a *prima facie* support from various utterances of Scripture, we shall scarcely be justified in declining to acquiesce in it.

Now we have the witness of Romans, Greeks, extreme Anglicans, and others of that class, on the one side, and the witness of Plymouth Brethren on the other, to the fact that the celebration of the Holy Communion is the central act of Christian worship, around which all other acts should cluster according to their own proper degree of importance. Both classes alike teach us that disciples of the Lord should come together on the first day of the week "to break bread," whatever else they do or leave undone.

But is this the view of the Holy Communion taken by ordinary Evangelical Churchmen? Is it not rather regarded as a special supplemental service, quite distinct from the ordinary forms of Christian worship, and therefore one to be only occasionally participated in? Now my contention is, that the customary arrangement of our morning service tends to foster this view of the case. When we have been already for nearly two hours engaged in religious exercises, we

are scarcely in a position to enjoy and fully enter into the service of a third hour. We have already attended *the* Church Service; only occasionally can it be expected of us that we should attend an *additional* service of a special character. Thus the sorrowful sight is presented of multitudes of Christian (*really* Christian) people turning their backs on the Table of their Lord, and leaving His feast untasted, perhaps four Sundays out of five, without the slightest feeling of regret or compunction. It is quite the natural or customary thing to do, and nothing else is looked for.

This feeling is strengthened by the custom, which I regret to find still prevalent in some churches, of making a formal conclusion of the Morning Service by pronouncing "The Grace," or some kind of benediction, after the sermon, or after the prayer for the Church Militant. This is usually followed by a voluntary on the organ, as if the clergy wished to say to their flock, "Now the principal service is over, and you may go your way; but if any of you *do happen* to wish to remain to an *extra* service, you can do so!" Is this the way to train our people to assign this Holy Ordinance its proper place?

Nor are we very much helped in this respect by our early Communion, very useful and desirable as they are. For being held at an unusual hour, and generally only attended by some of the most zealous and earnest-minded, they do not seem to show that this is the central act of Church worship. Rather such special gatherings seem to favour the idea that the Holy Communion is a supplemental service that may be thrust into any convenient corner, so as to make way for the greater function of the day, the regular gathering of "the great congregation."

It is not the object of this paper to point out possible improvements in the Prayer Book, or in the arrangement of the services in the Liturgy; but I cannot help expressing my regret that it is not permitted to us to proceed straight from the *Jubilate* to the Communion Service, thus avoiding the needless and almost absurd repetition of Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Collect.

I know of one church where this "use" is observed by a vicar who acts upon the principle, "*de minimis non curat lex*," and who thinks that intelligent worship is a more important thing than the niceties of rubrical observation. In that congregation the Holy Communion is looked upon as *the* service of the Church. The morning service up to the *Jubilate* forms an introduction to it, and this, with the Ante-Communion service, which immediately follows the *Jubilate*, will not occupy more than three-quarters of an hour. While the Nicene Creed is being sung, the preacher ascends the pulpit, and if he preach

for half an hour, there still remain three-quarters of an hour for the celebration of the Holy Communion, without the limit of two hours, which would seem to be a reasonable one, being exceeded. And what is the consequence? That vicar has often told me that he never presses his people to come to Holy Communion; he simply spreads the feast before them, and leaves it to their spiritual appetite to bring them to it. Yet I doubt whether there is another church in England where the proportion of communicants to attendants is so large. And yet the congregation is mainly composed of poor or humble folk, who, as a rule, are least disposed to participate in this ordinance as a matter of form and decency. I think I am right in saying that from 600 to 700 have been known to communicate there in a single day, while the church only seats about 900 to 1,000.

Until the day arrives when our authorities, whoever they be (and that seems *the* question), can see their way to some such adjustment of our services, I have high Episcopal authority for saying that there is nothing to prevent our passing from the hymn after the Third Collect directly to the Ante-Communion Service, provided the Litany be read at another time. This involves a somewhat irrational repetition of the Lord's Prayer and Collect; but as this has to be submitted to in any case, it need not weigh against the proposal. If it be thought desirable that the Litany should sometimes be read at morning prayer, an opportunity would be offered on those Sundays in which an early morning or an evening celebration occurs; and on such occasions the Ante-Communion Service might be omitted after the Litany, so as to avoid undue lengthiness.

It may be pointed out that the subject-matter of the prayers after the Third Collect is dealt with by the prayer for the Church militant, so that little or nothing would be lost in this respect by the change.

Let us now pass on to that service of which I have spoken as the central act in Christian worship, the Liturgical accompaniments of which in our own Church are so singularly well chosen and impressive that they seem from first to last a continuous inspiration. Does it not offer a sad indication of the spiritual condition of our churches that the introduction of this service is usually signalized by the formal withdrawal from the scene of those who in other offices act as the leaders of the praise of the congregation? That the younger members of the choir who are not yet confirmed should withdraw is only right and proper; but that a whole surpliced choir should, acting as a choir in its official capacity, formally head the exodus of the Lord's people from the Lord's House, where He

is spreading the feast for His disciples, does seem as strange as it is sad.

But we have got so accustomed to this, that it does not seem to us at all an anomaly that music should be wholly banished from our Eucharistic "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," although it was only at the institution of this feast that we hear of a hymn being *sung* by the Master and His disciples. They manage things better in America, where, I believe, every Churchman who can sing at all can sing the *Gloria*. The music they have set to it is but a poor composition in my judgment, but little worthy of the words to which it is arranged: it is simple, however, and it is universally known, and those are great merits. Will not some of our many Church-musicians try to produce a *Sanctus* and a *Gloria* that all may sing, and feel, while they sing it, that the music helps their hearts to adore? Might we not hope for something sufficiently popular and sufficiently classical from the gifted composer of "Christ and His Soldiers"?

At such a solemn service we must all feel that distraction is specially to be deprecated; and the least desirable of all distractions surely are those which recall to our minds the divisions and party strifes and distinctions of a very contentious period. Is it not, then, a pity that we cannot arrive at something like uniformity of practice in some of the most impressive parts of the service? Yet I have hardly ever, in all my wanderings, visited a church in which all the communicants adopted the same modes of procedure. At the short exhortation I observe that some stand while others kneel. At the *Sanctus* some insist on joining in the opening words, "Therefore with angels," etc.; while others with marked emphasis, as if they were performing an act of protest as much as of worship, strike in at the "Tris-hagion." Some receive with crossed palms, and some seem to make equally a point of grasping with the fingers. This is perhaps a matter in which variation of practice is not so objectionable, because it in no way interferes with the feelings of your fellow-worshippers. But it is otherwise with regard to the uncertainty that seems to prevail as to the proper attitude to be assumed at the *Gloria*. It surely must be a distraction when one finds one's self standing when all around are kneeling, or kneeling when all around are standing. Perhaps if we sang our *Sanctus* we might arrive at uniformity, so far as it is concerned, for no well-instructed Church-composer would think of beginning his music earlier than the "Tris-hagion;" and perhaps, too, the very act of singing our *Gloria* might dispose us to rise to our feet, though whether this is the preferable attitude is open to discussion.

It is desirable, and it would become more desirable still if

the numbers of our communicants were what they should be, that the administration should not be unnecessarily protracted. I have witnessed, as may be supposed, a considerable variety of usage in this part of the service, and have formed definite conclusions upon some points. I observe that not a few Evangelical clergymen repeat the appointed words to a whole railful of communicants. Inasmuch as such a mode of procedure is out of keeping with the individuality which seems specially aimed at in the words spoken, it would seem reasonable to conclude that this method is only adopted in order to save time. It is, however, my firm conviction that, unless under very exceptionally favourable circumstances, this idea is a delusion. The time that is lost in approaching and withdrawing from the Holy Table, when some forty or fifty persons are all in motion together in opposite directions, is a great set-off against whatever time may be gained by the non-repetition of the words. And besides this, it must be borne in mind that none are receiving while the words are being (usually solemnly and slowly) uttered. If there be two clergymen officiating, I am persuaded that less than half the time is occupied when the words are said to two communicants at a time, and when those who have received immediately retire and are succeeded by others. And even when one only officiates, no time will be lost. It is difficult to see why there should be any objection to administering to two persons while the words are being repeated. The words, even if uttered in a very low tone, are equally audible to both; and by this very slight modification of the regular usage, the time occupied in administration is reduced by one half, and there is this clear gain to the administrator, that he has to repeat the words only half as often. None but clergymen can know how difficult it is to avoid becoming mechanical in the repetition of these words, which our service must always render necessary. To minimize this danger, without sacrificing the sympathetic effect induced by addressing the individual as an individual, should certainly be our object; and by adopting the course I have indicated—the course, I mean, of administering to two or even more persons while the words are being uttered—this object would seem to be gained.

It should be remembered, however, if this method be adopted, that a most unseemly and painfully distracting effect is produced if the clergy engaged in the administration speak above their breath. The words are addressed to the individual, not to the congregation; and when this is forgotten, the effect of say four loud voices all speaking together, is scarcely to be outdone by the extravagance of a "Ranters' " prayer-meeting.

There has been, as we all know, a good deal of acrimonious



discussion as to the position of the celebrant during the consecration prayer. As a mere matter of order and decency the process of dragging all the sacred vessels over to the extreme end of the Holy Table, does not seem to commend itself to one's feelings. If the Eastward position be supposed to symbolize doctrines that Evangelical theology condemns, would it not be possible, while still standing before the Holy Table, to turn right round and perform the act of consecration, looking towards, and therefore certainly "in the presence of," the people? It seems to me that this practice (adopted by the venerable incumbent of the church I have already referred to) tends to make the solemn act of commemoration much more impressive. Such a marked change of attitude particularly well becomes the act by which, according to St. Paul, we *preach* the Lord's death until His coming again.

But here it occurs to me to point out, that although Evangelical clergymen are not unfrequently credited with Zwinglian views, and although they certainly are strong upon the commemorative aspects of the Eucharist, it is by no means an unfrequent thing to find the accessories of this ordinance so arranged as to render the commemorative act all but impossible. Am I wrong in saying that, as a matter of fact, in a very large number of Evangelical churches the bread is never broken at all? Again and again I have had to officiate in churches where the sacramental bread being all cut up into small pieces, it was impossible to do more than break one very small piece such as would be administered to one individual; and when this is the "use," I very much question where the symbolical act ever, as a rule, takes place at all. Certainly it does not so take place as to appeal by its eloquent symbolism to the hearts of the spectators. Surely this ought not to be!

Another little matter connected with the administration of the Holy Communion seems to me of very considerable importance. I notice in many Evangelical churches that but little advantage *seems* to be taken of the time that must necessarily elapse, where there are many communicants, before or after communication. In churches that bear the name of "High" this is otherwise, and this seems to me one of many little things in which "Low" might do well to learn of "High." It goes to my heart when I hear, the moment the last minister has communicated, a bustle all over the church as of people rising from their knees to their seats. It seems to me that if there is one time more than another in which we ought to be able to pray, and thankful for an opportunity of praying, it is then, when we are being brought so near to a great blessing, and when the enjoyment of that blessing depends so much upon our spiritual attitude and condition. And here seems to be the justifica-

tion of the method of administration ordained in our Church which might otherwise be justly censured as needlessly and even tediously protracted. These precious moments of spiritual communion with the Master of the feast are the best possible preparation for our sacramental communion, where listlessness, distraction, or loss of a devotional attitude of soul must needs mean a loss of the special benefit of the occasion.

But there are other things about which I want to speak, and lest space should fail me I will waste no words in apologies for being discursive. It is indeed impossible to be anything else when one has to touch upon so many details. We have been approaching the Penetralia of the Christian temple; let us now withdraw to the outer court—verily the court of the Gentiles, if you will! Believing, as I firmly do, that “pews” were never invented in heaven, wherever else the idea of them may have originated, I will not enter upon a discussion which is still far from closed, but simply admit that there are grave difficulties in the way of their wholesale abolition, though some of us may regard that as a consummation devoutly to be desired. But, if it be necessary for the sake of domestic considerations that certain pews should be set apart for the use of certain households, does it follow that these should be looked upon as if they were the private property of the persons to whom they are assigned? What can be more monstrous than the spectacle that may be witnessed any day in numerous West-End churches, where it is an understood thing that “strangers” remain patiently standing in the aisles until some arbitrarily selected point in the service is reached, when they may regard themselves as free to scramble for a seat. Surely it is nothing short of an indecency that such interruptions of the quietude and order of Divine service should be not only permitted but actually ordained, and that by the officers of order, the Church-wardens.

Such a spectacle would be a barbarism even in a Pagan temple or in a Moslem mosque, but in a Christian church it is worse—it is an outrage upon the first principles of our faith, and a downright sin. Surely it is time that all right-feeling people should demand in the name of mere Christian decency that our churches, and every part of them, shall be free to all from the moment the organ voluntary begins; and it would be well if it could also be arranged that this should begin two or three minutes at least before the appointed time of service. If people cannot find their way into church in good time, let them put up with what accommodation they may get, whatever they pay for their seats; but to arrange for the interruption of the service of God, in order to suit man’s indolence or carelessness, is a refinement of man-pleasing that one cannot think of without indignation and shame.

But here is another view of the case. Have sextons, beadles and pew-openers souls, or are they automata incapable of discharging any functions of worship? If we answer the first of these questions as I suppose we all shall, then does it not follow that things should be so arranged as to remind them of the fact, instead of an inference to the contrary being constantly suggested to their minds? If these unfortunate persons are kept constantly "on the move" for the benefit of other people till about the beginning of the Litany, it is not very likely that they will be in a frame of mind for worship. Indeed, it will be difficult for them to avoid a sort of impression that the service is not intended for them. Indeed, when one considers their case, it is not difficult to understand the feelings of the author of recent advertisements having reference to another class of officials who are equally kept working while others are worshipping: "Wanted, two strong men to blow a large organ—*Heathen preferred.*" Clearly, however, the labours and distractions of these officials might be greatly diminished, if indeed their services were not rendered altogether superfluous, were the very simple and obvious arrangement which I have suggested generally carried out, and were all seats in every church known to be free as soon as the organ began to play.

I have noticed with satisfaction in not a few churches that I have visited, that there is a disposition to disestablish these functionaries altogether, so far as this can be done with due regard to "vested interests," and from some churches they have already disappeared, and no one regrets them. I hope that this class of officials may soon share the fate of the antique bespectacled and bewigged parish clerk of cherished "three-decker" memories, and that the defunct species may ere long find its place in the Museum of Ecclesiastical Curiosities.

Passing on to other things, it may be observed that we have heard perhaps a little too much of late about the "Ornaments Rubric;" but, while authorities in matters ecclesiastical are fighting over it, might it not be as well if all would remember that certainly our ornaments ought to be *ornamental*. I wish that the charge of slovenliness, so often brought by innovators against those who follow more old-fashioned ways, were altogether devoid of foundation. What amazing surplices have I beheld in my wanderings, and how little credit did they do to the laundress! (no fault of hers, poor thing!) Stoles I have seen that looked as if they had been rent off the skirt of some old and discarded silk gown, and some hoods so faded that it was dangerous to guess at their Academical significance. If we still must indulge in the black gown (to my mind a very superfluous piece of Ritualism), is it too much to demand that it shall at least be black, and not brown or green with antiquity?

These are all very small matters indeed, yet they have their significance. A gentleman is expected to wear clean linen and a coat that has not altogether lost its colour. He will usually have a respectable-looking carpet on his drawing-room floor, and a cloth that is not hopelessly faded on his table. Does it not then seem to argue some want of proper respect for the decencies of religion when we find everything otherwise in church? Do not the faded cloth, the thread-bare carpet, the ragged surplice, the shapeless stole, the ancient hood, all seem to say, anything is good enough for the service of God?

But it is time we should pass from the ornaments of our clergy to consider what more personally concerns them. I often wonder how much longer we are to go on without any attempt being made by our Bishops to teach aspirants to clerical dignity to *read*! It is expected by these dignitaries of our Church that those who present themselves for ordination shall know a good deal about all sorts of antiquated heresies that prevailed in the third and fourth centuries, but are not very likely to trouble us in the nineteenth. It is expected, rightly enough, that they should know a little Greek, and less Latin; but two things, that you would suppose to be absolutely necessary to the proper exercise of the ministerial functions, are never, so far as I am aware, insisted upon at all. The one is logic, and the other is elocution. On the importance of the first of these qualifications I will not now enlarge, as it does not belong to my subject; I will only say in passing that it is my firm conviction that a good course of John Stuart Mill would be found much more useful in these days, to a candidate for holy orders, than an equally severe training in St. Augustine or any of the fathers, either of antiquity or of the Anglican Church.

But with respect to elocution, is it not too obvious to require demonstration that failure here must put a man at disadvantage all through his ministry, whatever his gifts in other respects may be. I meet with but few really good readers in my wanderings, and, alas! with a considerable number of clergymen who can only be called bad ones. I have a young man now before my eye whose reading always reminds me of the springing of a policeman's rattle. It would seem as if "When the wicked man," etc., had been compressed within his lips, like steam pressing against a safety-valve, during the last few notes of the organ; and then, as the pedal-note booms out a sonorous finale, the pent-up words rush forth in a way that brings the congregation to their feet with a start. But from this alarming outburst to the "evermore" at the end of the Grace, the good man betrays not the slightest sign of any sort of feeling whatever; it is simply one monotonous and unmiti-

gated rattle all the way through. Why does he do it? Well, I think I know. His Incumbent is the victim of an opposite fault, and the young man is, no doubt, under the influence of reaction. His soul resents, I dare say, the practice of his ecclesiastical superior, which is to accentuate every second or third word, and it is hard to say which of the two methods one likes least. Another I heard not long ago whose very unmusical sing-song was none the less so regular in its cadences that it would almost have been possible to express it in musical characters. Another, though free from affectation, is harsh and apparently devoid of heart and sympathy; another mumbles hopelessly; and yet another mounds his words in the most unnatural fashion, while another seems to regard it as either devotional or impressive to adopt a method of pronunciation that, to say the least of it, is abnormal. We want a professor of elocution, and one who understands his work too, at each of our Universities, backed by a rigid determination on the part of our Bishops to receive no candidate who has not passed under such instruction.

One other matter, and one only, will I venture to refer to ere I bring my remarks to a close. I have ventured to affirm that, in these party days, "Low" may learn a good deal from "High;" but is there not also a possibility that the former may be induced by the subtle and scarcely detected influence of the latter, to abandon some practices and customs which used to distinguish the best and most spiritual of the Evangelical fathers? I confess that I notice with unfeigned regret that the custom of extempore prayer, either before or after the sermon, is falling into general disuse. Much as I value our grand old Liturgy, it seems to me that it leaves ample scope for the pouring out of the heart in special supplications appropriate to the particular subject of the sermon. Is there not a danger of our binding ourselves afresh with grave-clothes when our fathers established a precedent of Christian liberty? and may not respect for the niceties of rubrical observance become a mischievous hobby, and be ridden to death? But if any are troubled with rubrical scrupulosity—a troublesome disease that might be called "the reds," and is scarcely more desirable than "the blues"—it may be pointed out that we put ourselves perfectly in order if we give the ascription after instead of before our extemporary prayer, for then, obviously, the prayer is ecclesiastically included in the sermon. None could object to an address to the Divine Being in the course of or at the end of the sermon; and if, while this is delivered, all kneel, surely the change of attitude could never be a matter for ecclesiastical censure. But the time is gone by for old-world rubrical stiffness; we have more important things to think

about, and whatever tends to increase the usefulness and deepen the spirituality of our ministry, should be jealously guarded and fully made use of.

I have "said my say." To many of my readers it may seem that space and time might better have been occupied with the weightier matters of the law or of the Gospel. It may be so; yet if, as the result of these lines of friendly criticism, some few dead flies, or even some microscopic animalculæ, be taken out of that ointment of spikenard, very precious, which from year to year the Church, from her broken box of alabaster, should pour at her Master's feet, they will not have been written in vain. Nor let us forget the lesson of one of our children's hymns:

Little drops of water,  
Little grains of sand,  
Make the mighty ocean,  
Make the boundless land.

W. HAY AITKEN.

---

#### ART. IV.—RELIGION UNDER THE STUARTS.

*History of England, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War.* By SAMUEL R. GARDINER, LL.D., etc., etc. In Ten Volumes. London: Longmans, 1884.

THE publication by Mr. Gardiner, "in a connected form, of the works which have been the labour of twenty years," puts the public within easy reach of a very valuable history of the times of the early Stuart Kings. Mr. Gardiner's patient researches have probably almost exhausted the materials available for the period, though he tells us that material is constantly accumulating, and that he has been obliged almost to rewrite the first portion of the book. General readers will, we think, be fully satisfied with the evidence of a complete examination of the sources of history which the book exhibits. Their complaints, if they have any to make, will probably be of another character. They will perhaps find themselves sometimes bewildered among the multiplicity of details, and the difficulty of detecting the principle of arrangement, and following the thread of the history. We do not propose in this article to attempt any survey of the general history contained in Mr. Gardiner's volumes. Our object simply is to extract from them such facts and statements as may serve to give some sort of picture of the religious life which had to be lived under the earlier Stuarts.