

# 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)

Puritanism. Hooker well weighed and considered what he wrote. It would be more to the purpose, if there be anything wrong in the writings of such great men, or in the Church's Articles and Homilies, to bravely try and refute them. Canon Blakeney said: "Far from being Puritanical in any degree, the Church, under the presidency of Bancroft, had begun to put forth very high notions of episcopal and kingly authority, and yet, even then, by a *synodical* act, she declared the Pope to be the man of sin. *It cannot be shown that any of the Reformers or Reformed Churches denied this truth.*" It is easy to assume that the Pope is not the man of sin, and to think it charitable and polite to abstain from the use of any such offensive title; but if it be true, real charity and love will and must proclaim it. It is easy to ignore this kind of "Church teaching," and to substitute something else for it; but, at least, those who give it must be esteemed the loyal sons of the Church and the truest guides of the people. It is easy to declare that the Church of Rome is not what she was; but is this the case? for she has not repented of her awful cruelties, nor modified her false doctrines, nor abolished the Holy Office of the Inquisition. It is easy to propose terms of union with her; but any serious attempt to effect it would ruin the Church of England, would produce national conflicts—bitter, continuous, disastrous—and would be a clear, unmistakable movement along the road of apostasy.

JOSEPH McCORMICK.



#### ART. IV.—THE HISTORY OF OUR PRAYER-BOOK AS BEARING ON PRESENT CONTROVERSIES.

##### PART VI.

(*Concluded.*)

IT was stated at the close of our last article on this subject that if the Act which authorized the second book of Edward speak true, it would be a serious retrogression to return to the use of the first book. It would, under present circumstances, be deserting a position of doctrinal perfection for the purpose of re-admitting doctrinal errors or doctrinal dangers, the exclusion of which had made perfect the second book.

This is a matter so essential to our argument that we must be permitted to bespeak for it careful and candid consideration. In approving and authorizing the second book, the Church of England has established herself on a firm doctrinal

position, and thereupon has set up her standard on high—a position from which it is impossible for her to recede without being false to the truth she has received. To allow the use of the first book, however *once* defensible, would be, under present circumstances, nothing less than a desertion of that position.<sup>1</sup>

At least we cannot but fear that, in the present state of the Church of England, it would become practically equivalent to

<sup>1</sup> While, however, we are bound jealously to guard the Reformed character of our Prayer-Book, and dare not, therefore, in our present surroundings, part with any fence of security which we may owe even to the excessive caution of our Reformers, it is well for us to be reminded that we may very well err in condemning (and even, it may be, in over-carefully shunning) all language which has been used to express doctrines which we reject. Thus we may be surrendering expressions which have been used in a sound sense by Christians of old time as well as by Reformed divines in more recent days, and virtually conceding (a very mistaken and disastrous concession) that they can only in fairness be used to signify the doctrines for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own.

And we might even find matter for congratulation in the divergent forms accepted by the Scottish and American Episcopal Churches, if only it be allowed that their interpretation should be governed by the doctrinal perfection of the English form. It was well said by Bishop Thirlwall concerning the Scotch and English services: "There is indeed a very considerable difference between the two offices, both in their structure and their language. But this I cannot consider as an evil in itself, still less as anything which ought to be a bar to the freest brotherly intercourse between two Churches which so closely agree with one another in doctrine and discipline" (Charge, 1856, p. 44).

And Bishop Charles Wordsworth, in his "Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office" (Edinburgh, 1859), says: "The existence of the three different offices in these three branches of the Reformed Church has the same effect in regard to doctrine as the existence of the three Creeds, which (though with very different degrees of fulness and precision of statement upon different Articles of the Faith) all harmonize together, all naturally tend to illustrate and confirm each other. And, in regard to practice, while the Church of England and the Church of America each keeps to the use of its own Formulary, and while we retain our own, as of 'primary authority,' but not so as to exclude the English where it may reasonably be desired, this course of action can have no proper effect to diminish the cordial unanimity or the actual communion which exists among us" (pp. 19, 20).

The words of Bishop Horsley's letter to Skinner have often been quoted: "I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in my private judgment more edifying than that which we now use" (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184). They should be read, however, in connection with the near context: "Nevertheless, I think our present office is very good, our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient."

Similar words quoted from Archbishop Sharp (see Bishop Jolly, "On the Eucharist," p. 123) should be set beside the teaching of his sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 (Works, vol. v., p. 190, *et seq.*; Oxford, 1829), and it will then plainly appear that he had no desire whatever to return to the doctrines which in the ambiguities of the first book seek a shelter. See especially pp. 197, 201.

such a desertion. Wherein consists the perfection which the Act claims as the characteristic of the second book? It is impossible, as we maintain, to doubt the answer. Its perfection consists in its strictly and unmistakably Reformed character.<sup>1</sup> The work of its perfecting was the revision which manifests the scrupulous care—the perhaps even excessive carefulness—to eliminate whatever could be understood as having anything like a doubtful sound as favouring or allowing the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.

The *first* book was, in comparison of *former* services, an excellent liturgy. It was a great gain to have a Communion Office which the Reformed might well use without offence. And, taking into account that it was for the use of a National Church, it was a very wonderful step towards that perfecting of the Prayer-Book which our Reformers had in view. But, while it lopped off the topmost boughs of pernicious doctrines and made a very conspicuous change in a reforming direction, it is unquestionable that it still left some room for possible misunderstanding, some room for serious or dangerous error, and thus stood in need of a further revision which should make it, in view of these present dangers and present needs, “fully perfect.” And this revision is just what it received in the second book.

But let it be well observed that this doctrinal perfection was accompanied, we may say by the sacrifice<sup>2</sup> (in some sense),

<sup>1</sup> See “Eucharistic Presence,” pp. 517, 521.

<sup>2</sup> Even Waterland would willingly have had retained the “memorial.” He says: “It is very certain that the *commemoration, memorial* or *annunciation* of our Lord’s *Passion*, with an address to God for His *propitious* favour thereupon, has been a very ancient, eminent and solemn part of the Communion Service. There is now no direct formal application of that kind in our liturgies. There was in King Edward’s Liturgy of 1549, in these words: ‘We, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the *memorial*,’ etc. . . . Why this part was struck out in the *review*, I know not, unless it was owing to some scruple (which, however, was needless) about making the memorial *before God*, which at that time might appear to give some umbrage to the Popish *sacrifice*, among such as knew not how to distinguish” (“Works,” vol. iv., p. 607; Oxford, 1843. See also p. 486, and vol. v., p. 295).

Probably Waterland may not have observed (as Mr. Scudamore has, “Not. Euch.,” p. 647, 2nd edit.) that the ancient Ambrosian Canon seems to have had no such “direct formal application” (see Muratori, “Liturgia Romana Vetus,” tom. i., cc. 131-134).

It may be very readily admitted that some of the omissions in the second book might be restored with far less doctrinal danger than others. But as regards this quotation from Waterland, it should be observed (1) that the *memorial* in his view is altogether without the “Real Objective Presence.” This, in view of *our* controversies, is most important. (2) That (although he elsewhere—vol. iv., p. 509—rather labours to give to *ἀνάμνησις* a fulness of meaning beyond what it seems to us naturally to

of somewhat which we should naturally have expected our Reformers to have been very slow, and even loath, to part with. The generally conservative character of the English Reformation<sup>1</sup> might almost make us marvel at some of the changes introduced into the second book.<sup>2</sup> In view of the characteristic tendencies of our Reformers in the matter of their liturgical services, those changes are some<sup>3</sup> of them unaccountable upon any other principle than this, that arguments based on what may be called liturgical precedents must yield to cogent reasons having to do with securing and safeguarding doctrinal purity.

We do not wonder at all that wise, and learned, and faithful, and holy men, liturgical scholars, in after-days, when all danger of such false doctrine seemed far away, and the Reformed character of the Church of England was universally recognised, should have sometimes expressed something like a

---

convey) his memorial is the memorial of *ἀνάμνησις* not of a *μνημόσυλον* (i.e., in the sense in which it includes a sacrificial offering). It may suffice, in evidence of this, to quote these words: "The Archetypal sacrifice itself is what no one but Christ Himself could offer, whether really or symbolically. We represent it, we do not offer it in the Eucharist" (vol. iv., p. 750). But other evidence may be seen in "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 217, 218. It should also be noted that, although *μνημόσυλον* is translated "memorial," it is not, in its *technical* meaning, to be understood in a *commemorative* sense as a calling to mind of a *past* event (which is the very sense in which Waterland advocates the *memorial*, and which is also the sense in which the words of the Liturgy might more fairly be understood). The *azkârâh* (as Professor Abhatt has observed) was a present calling to mind of the worshipper before God by the real offering on the altar of a part for the whole (see Abhatt's Essays, pp. 123, 127. It should be remembered, however, that the Greek *μνημόσυλον* has also in the LXX. a wider meaning, admitting a relation to a past event, as, e.g., in Josh. iv. 7). (3) That the language of the liturgies generally (as well as of many of the Fathers) may be pleaded as against the *μνημόσυλον* sense of the memorial (see "Recent Teachings concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10-14). (4) That in our own days, as well as at the time of the Reformation, there are those who know not "how to distinguish," and that our present dangers seem to witness that the *scruple* of our Reformers was not so *needless* as Waterland seems to have supposed.

It is also to be observed that (to use the words of Mr. Scudamore, "Not. Euch.," p. 651) "in none of the most ancient memorials does the priest profess to make an oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, much less of Christ Himself. They are strictly commemorative."

<sup>1</sup> See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 443-446, 508-511.

<sup>2</sup> Canon Dixon has justly observed—speaking of the first book of Edward—"that the conservative spirit of the compilers was more manifest in the Breviary and the Offices than in the Missal" ("History of Church of England," vol. iii., p. 16).

<sup>3</sup> Possibly some of them may be accounted for by the influence of the Mozarabic Rite. See Mr. Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," pp. 175-177, 199-201, as well as his paper in *Guardian* of March 12, 1890, and Mr. Warren's letter of March 22. But see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 185, 186.

wish for the restoration, in part, of that which the second book had cast away. We could even sympathize with a desire for somewhat to be added to our present book which is to be found in the first<sup>1</sup> if only we could be quite sure that there would be no danger in the change—no danger of its seeming to open a door for the inroads of superstition and the bringing back of false doctrine.

We do not marvel at all that the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America made adventures in the direction of undoing somewhat of that which the extreme caution of our Reformers had done in the reign of Edward VI. Nor are we much surprised that the impetus given of late to the study of liturgical lore should have moved some among them to the desire for a yet further revision, and perhaps a nearer approach to ancient liturgical models. But we do not feel sure that their history does not supply a warning, if warning were needed—a lesson of danger which we should learn to avoid, a teaching which should justify the action of our Reformers, and make us thankful that they had the wisdom to bid their liturgical preferences all give precedence to a supreme regard for incorruptness of doctrine.

And our approval of the Liturgical changes made in their service for the Holy Communion must ever be limited by the proviso that it should always be well understood that the Liturgical *doctrine* should be interpreted according to the standard of the *full perfection* (doctrinally) of the English Office.

And for ourselves, we are quite sure that the present is no time for us to be thinking of change. The question of liturgical precedents is the question of that which the highest liturgical authorities will testify to be only a matter of following the lead in that which, for the most part (even though probably framed, in part, on ancient Jewish forms<sup>2</sup>) is

---

<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that there may be an agreement in expressing approval of the first book among those whose agreement can carry them no further.

Those who highly approved of the first book as a most laudable and courageous step forward in the progress of Reformation, and as a most godly form of service in comparison of that which it was meant to supersede, but who regarded it as made perfect by the second book, stood on a doctrinal standpoint entirely different from that of those who can endure the use of the second book only as a fallen representative of the first, and therefore appeal to the Act's approval of the first in order to make the first appear more perfect than the second.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Probst has argued that the Clementine Liturgy was the oldest form of Liturgical service, and was used in the Church of Antioch till superseded by that of St. Basil. And Bickell has endeavoured to show that of all ancient Liturgies the Clementine is the one in which can be traced the nearest correspondence with the Jewish forms. See Dr.

merely human in origin.<sup>1</sup> The halo of venerable antiquity (and that antiquity sometimes rather doubtful) is the most that can be claimed for that, the rejection of which some will still lament as our loss.

But the question of preserving the purity of our Reformed faith is the question of the hour—is the question (we fear) of imminent danger, the question assuredly of tremendous responsibility. What we might think of doing, if there were no peril, is a question which must wait, at least, till the peril is gone. We have now a religious atmosphere charged with those very dangerous elements (and even in far more dangerous conditions) which made that careful revision of our Communion Service essential to the making fully perfect of our Book of Common Prayer.

Language which might be piously and safely used in a time when words were interpreted according to the limitations required by common-sense, becomes full of danger in an age when the merit of faith is measured by its capacity of believing contradictions (see "Lectures on Lord's Supper," pp. 29-31). And ambiguous expressions, which may convey only a sound sense in the surroundings of sound teaching, may need to be carefully avoided or distinctly guarded when minds are being as waves tossed to and fro, and carried about with new winds of doctrine. And especially should the introduction of such ambiguities be avoided where there is reason to fear that the change is desired in the interest of false or dangerous doctrine.

The point we have to insist upon—and we cannot too strongly insist upon it—is this: Our Communion Service is a distinctly "Reformed" Office, and we are bound to be defenders of its "Reformed" character. Can we be faithful to our charge if we allow doctrinal *distinctness* to be changed into doctrinal *indistinctness* for the sake of sheltering dangerous doctrinal error, and making our Church to be no longer numbered among the Churches of the "Reformed" ?<sup>2</sup>

---

Skene's "The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual," pp. xi and 183-194, 209-215, 217. On the antiquity of the Jewish Passover Ritual, see pp. 129-141. Some strictures on the theories of these writers will be found in the *Guardian* of July 27, 1892.

<sup>1</sup> See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., pp. 553, 560.

<sup>2</sup> Let the reader be asked to compare with modern (so-called) "Catholic doctrine" the *Catholic* teaching contained in the following extract, with its faithful witness (albeit, a Laudian witness) to the true principles of the English Reformation and of our Reformed Prayer-Book: "Confirmation is by the Church of Rome, that now is corrupted with many errors and novelties in religion, held to be a Sacrament. But we, who by the grace of God are numbered among the Reformed Churches, whereof this Church of England is, both for doctrine and discipline, the most

It is impossible to ignore the fact that we have around us the felt influences of that new Church of England as we now know it, and as we know it to have been (in some sense) founded by Cardinal Newman, and built upon by those who are no friends to the faith of the "Reformed."

We can express approbation of the first book, in the sense in which our Reformers approved it, and can acknowledge that its depravers were "mistakers" in fastening on its ambiguities a sense which did not of necessity belong to them, and which they were not intended to bear. It is the first book, as explained by the second, and perfected by that explanation, which was "the very godly order," "agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church," in the view of our Reformers, and of the Act of Uniformity. And as so explained it is not less a very godly order in our view still. But it is just this explanation which our new Theologians would have us reject.

We are alluding, of course, not to any school of true Anglo-Catholic theology, faithful to the principles of our Reformation and the doctrine of our Articles, such as the Church of England has delighted to honour, but to a new Romanizing party, which can never fairly be identified with it.

Who are they—the leaders in the party of attack—who are now knocking at the doors, eager in their demands to have restored to us the usages disallowed in the perfecting of our Liturgy, in the revision of the second book of Edward? Are they men with views in harmony with the doctrine of our Reformers? Are they not those who would sacrifice what we know to be Protestant truth for the sake of attaining some sort of corporate union with Rome, or some sort of recognition by the Papacy?

Is their aim only liturgical improvement for liturgical reasons' sake? Have they not avowed, will they not acknowledge, that their desire is to supply what they regard as deficiencies, only or mainly for doctrine's sake?<sup>1</sup> Have we

---

eminent and the most pure, the most agreeable to Scripture and antiquity of all others, we hold it to be none" (MS. notes of "Preface" to Confirmation Service, inserted in Cosin's corrected copy of the Book of Common Prayer; see Parker's "Introduction," p. cclx).

<sup>1</sup> We venture to quote the following words, and to ask for them renewed attention:

"It is impossible to view the changes made in the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. apart from their doctrinal significance. The First Prayer-Book might have been used in a Communion which rejected the Real Objective Presence. But it certainly would not have borne witness, as the Second does, and still more as the *change* from the First to the Second does, that this Church of England *hath* (to use Whitgift's words) refused the Real Presence.

"And the question of restoring the use, or the permission to use the



not here the new Church of England, as founded by the new Oxford School, seeking to put its new wine into the old bottles of a Reformed Communion? And what shall we think of this attempt to put the new wine of a developed mediævalism—a

First Communion Service instead of the Second, cannot now be entertained apart from views of doctrinal significance. Upon merely liturgical grounds, some might regret that the changes made in Edward's days were so thorough and sweeping, who yet must be deeply thankful that those changes were made, and still stand, to testify to our Reformers' sense of the danger, and wise determination, as far as might be, to exclude the possibility of the growing up again of the doctrine they rejected. So, again, opinions may be quoted of preference for the First Book from some eminent divines (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's 'First Book of Edward VI.,' p. xvi, *sqq.*); and if we saw no danger and no possibility of the bringing in again the doctrine, for rejecting which many of our Reformers died, those opinions might be entitled to considerable liturgical weight. But if anything be wanting to justify the wisdom of our Reformers, and to make us grateful for having the *Second* Prayer-Book instead of the *First*, surely it may be found in the shelter which such expressions of opinion seem to afford for those who in our days (when the danger is realized) would desire to undo the work of the Reformers, and therefore on doctrinal grounds would bring in the First Book to crush out the very truth, to which the Second bears such important testimony.

"Moreover, when it is pleaded that the Act of Uniformity, which authorized Edward's *Second* Book, speaks with approval of the *First*, it must be observed (1) that such approval is modified by the words which speak of the Second as made *more perfect*, and (2) that such approval is clearly given to the *First* as *explained* by the Second (see the words 'As well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof as for the more perfection of the said order of common service . . . the King's most excellent Majesty . . . hath caused the foresaid order of common service to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect')—that is to say, that expressions in the First Book being capable of two senses, the Second Book takes away from it one, and stamping clearly the other sense, so approves it.

"This being so, it must be obvious that it is quite vain for those who now dislike the *Second* Book, and desire to return to the *First*, to bring forward in their support from the Act of Uniformity, or from the writings of our Reformers, expressions of approval of the *First* Book (see 'The Church and the World,' 1866, 3rd edit., pp. 323, 476; and Cooke's letter to Perry, 'Of Ceremonies,' etc., p. 113). What they want, to give any real support to their position, and what we ask them (in no captious spirit) to produce *if they can*, is an expression (either in the Act or in the writings of our Reformers) of distinct and decided *preference* for the *First*, or *regret* for the changes made in the *Second*, and in particular an expression of adherence to that *doctrinal sense* admissible (or apparently admissible) in the *First*, which finds no place in the explanation of the *Second* Book of Edward. We have no quarrel with our Reformers, nor with the Act of Uniformity for speaking well of the *First* Book. Even the Westminster Assembly say of the Prayer-Book that 'it occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in it at that time it was set forth, because the Mass and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our own tongue' (Preface to Directory)."—"Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 517-519.

revived unscriptural sacerdotalism teaching for doctrines the commandments of men—into the old bottles of a Liturgy revised to receive only the doctrine of the old faith<sup>1</sup>—the faith once for all delivered to the saints? Shall we willingly consent to have the perfection of our Liturgy destroyed—our bottles burst by this insidious design of forcing the new into the old?

Let it not be supposed for a moment that we would desire to draw too sharply the line of limitation which surrounds the teaching of the most Catholic Church in Christendom. Far be it from us to desire to make this Church of England the Church of any one narrow school of thought. We may not, indeed, remove our ancient landmarks, nor take down the fences which our forefathers have set up to defend for us the doctrines of the Reformation. But our wisdom, not less than our charity, demands of us that we should rather seek widely to stretch than tightly to strain the cord which marks the true comprehension of our Anglican Communion.

This is no question at all of severely pressing the limits of our boundaries, to restrain the freedom of thought of individual theologians. It is the question of going out of our way to make room for a party in whose view the doctrine of the English Reformation is only a heresy.

It is the question of loosing from our moorings in very uncertain weather, and hoisting up our mainsail to the wind to be carried whither we know not, only far away (as it seems) from the Church of our fathers, far away from the faith of the Reformed, far away (as we fear) from the teaching of Apostles and prophets, far away from the truth of Christ's Gospel.

If the view which has been presented in these papers of the History of our Prayer-Book be a true view, there is an urgent call to us to speak out. It is not a time for silence. It is time to speak the truth—albeit, to speak the truth in love.

Let our brethren be entreated to consider well that the question before us is one, the answer to which should be governed by a view of the present difficulties and dangers which surround us. In view of our new surroundings, in view of the oncoming force of a Church of England as founded by Cardinal Newman, shall we be willing to desert our position because of the doubtful or mistaken results of our liturgical studies? Shall we be willing to change our sides on the ground that some there have been—admirers of the first book of Edward—who were true to our Articles and faithful to the

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of what was then termed the *old* and the *new learning*, Cranmer said: "That which they call the old is the new, and that which they call the new is indeed the old" ("Letters," P.S., p. 450).

doctrine of the Reformed? Would *they* have been on the side of the new-founded Church of England? Would even Cosin himself have said a word in defence of this new claim? I am very confident he would have been among the first and foremost in resistance.<sup>1</sup>

We may be thankful that there are those whose eyes are being enlightened to see the dangers and the errors of the party in advance, and are turning back to be guided by truer and safer counsels.

And we may surely hope that, as time advances and increased light is thrown upon the subject from the by-paths of history and the study of English theology, many will be brought to see how strangely the new departure has departed from the theology of our English divines, and how urgent is the call to all true English Catholics to return to the old paths and the faith of our martyred Reformers.

Anyhow, let us beware of falling into the error of supposing that pleas for comprehension are to be listened to only on the side of the *new*-founded Church of England. Has there been no silent exodus of those who loved the old? Are there none among our faithful laity now beginning in sorrowful suspicion to look at the door—a door by which many from outside might quietly be coming in but for the dread of this inroad of the new?

At all events, if there be a danger—as we sometimes fear there may be—a danger approaching, and perhaps not very far off—the danger of making important concessions for the sake of maintaining a National Church<sup>2</sup>—the danger of liturgical changes for the very purpose of giving legal and legitimate standing-place to doctrines which the Church of England has rejected as errors, opening the door at the demand of those who would bring in again the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits for the rejection of which our forefathers laid down their lives—who desire above all things to set up again, clothed and adorned, and arrayed in gorgeous apparel, a doctrine—a doctrine which is the natural parent of a worship—a worship which, if the doctrine be not true (as we are convinced it is not), must (even by the teaching of its own

<sup>1</sup> "See *Missarum Sacrificia*," p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> We must confess to the feeling that some word of caution (if not of alarm) may be called for in view of some recent proposals for facilitating rubrical alterations.

That the Prayer-Book, with all the details of its rubrical directions, should be regarded as stereotyped for ever is an idea which the Prayer-Book itself distinctly condemns. That certain regulations might be made more elastic is, beyond reasonable question, a thing to be desired.

But permission of *such* change should be well safeguarded against possibility of *doctrinal* shifting.

teachers) be material idolatry ; in other words, a doctrine which, being false, can only be made non-idolatrous by being proved true—then we feel called upon to utter one word of most solemn warning (it is a solemn word, in the uttering of which we are persuaded we shall be discharging the true duty of the CHURCHMAN, and acting as the mouthpiece of thousands of the most faithful and attached members of our communion who are desiring to be led, not by any hasty impulse of party spirit, but by the force of the truest, deepest, most sacred convictions) : WE MUST BEWARE HOW, *for the sake of maintaining its national character (or giving it a more all-embracing position)*, WE SHAPE FOR OURSELVES, OR REFOUND FOR OURSELVES (*or recognise as refounded for us by Cardinal Newman*), A NATIONAL CHURCH, THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH WOULD BE A NATIONAL SIN.

The following words of the greatest of English divines cannot be too often quoted : “Tell us not that ye will sacrifice to the Lord our God, if we will sacrifice to Ashtaroth or Melcom ; that ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions ; that if ye may have a Mass by permission, we may have a Communion with good leave and liking ; that ye will admit the things that are spoken by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have his ordinances observed and his statutes kept. Solomon took it (as well he might) for an evident proof that she did not bear a motherly affection to her child which yielded to have it cut in divers parts. He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart which lendeth one ear to His Apostles and another to false apostles ; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures. No ; we have no Lord but Jesus ; no doctrine but the Gospel : no teachers but His Apostles. Were it reason to require at the hand of an English subject obedience to the laws and edicts of the Spaniard ? I do marvel that any man bearing the name of a servant of the servants of Jesus Christ will go about to draw us from our allegiance” (Hooker, Sermon I. on Jude 17-21 ; Works, vol. iii., p. 666, edit. Keble).

It is easy to say, as in answer to this, that times have changed since Hooker wrote. No change of times or circumstances can ever make it safe or right for a National Church to become the home of such a mingle-mangle as must come of the attempt to combine the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper with the doctrine of the Romish Mass. In the interest of comprehension we may well lift up our voice against any endeavours to break down our fences for the purpose of comprehending the teaching of essential and vital antagonisms.

One word may be permitted in conclusion. It is not only a time for speaking the truth in love. It is surely a time for calling upon our God, showing Him the helplessness of our great need, and spreading out before Him the causes of our sorrow and our shame. It is surely a time that those who have been taught to know the Gospel of Christ (the Gospel of free justification for the ungodly) as the power of God unto salvation, should unite in importunate prayer and continual supplication, that the Spirit of the Lord may lift up a standard against the on-coming waves and waters of error, that so men may see and acknowledge the good hand of our God upon us, and in lowly adoration may learn the lesson of Divine instruction—"Not by might or by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

N. DIMOCK.

---

## Notes and Queries.

---

### THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS AND THE FALL OF BABYLON.

I HAVE to thank Mr. Cuthbert Routh for the kind terms in which he has referred to my paper on the above subject; and as he seems to wish to know my views in regard to Darius the Mede, I shall briefly state them for whatever they may be worth. I may say, then, that the opinion which I hold is that the accession of Cyrus *did* take place on the night that Belshazzar died, but that Cyrus associated with himself in the kingdom of Babylon Darius the Mede, who was probably the Cyaxares of Xenophon.

When the Medes and Persians come before us after the overthrow of the Babylonian empire, we find them standing in a very peculiar position towards each other—almost on terms of equality, and yet the Persians somewhat superior to the Medes—owing, it would seem, chiefly to the pre-eminent genius and personality of Cyrus. How did this rather anomalous state of things come about? Three different accounts have come down to us from antiquity:

The first is that of Herodotus, who represents this fusion of the Medes and Persians as having taken place subsequent to a battle between Astyages, King of the Medes, and Cyrus, in the course of which the greater part of the Median army, with their commander Harpagus, went over to Cyrus; the remainder were put to flight, and Astyages and the crown of Media passed into the hands of the victor.

The second account is that of Ctesias, followed in a fragment of Nicolaus of Damascus, which represents the fusion of the two peoples as having occurred after several severe engagements, in the last of which Cyrus with his Persians completely defeated Astyages and the Median army, sixty thousand Medes having been left dead upon the field of battle.

The third is the account of Xenophon, which represents, not Astyages, but a son of Astyages, Cyaxares, as the last King of the Medes. It