

**POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER CONSIDERED, IN
FOUR SERMONS ON THE SUNDAY
LESSONS IN TENT, THE COMMINATION
SERVICE, AND THE ATHANASIAN CREED**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649676927

Popular Objections to the Book of Common Prayer Considered, in Four Sermons on the Sunday Lessons in Tent, the Communion Service, and the Athanasian Creed by Edward Meyrick Goulburn

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN

**POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER CONSIDERED, IN
FOUR SERMONS ON THE SUNDAY
LESSONS IN TENT, THE COMMINATION
SERVICE, AND THE ATHANASIAN CREED**

**POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER CONSIDERED**

RIVINGTONS

London	<i>Waterloo Place</i>
Oxford	<i>High Street</i>
Cambridge	<i>Trinity Street</i>

PREFACE.

A REVISION of the Lectionary of our Church, and a substitution for the present Lessons of others conceived to be more appropriate or more edifying, is a measure which would perhaps have a larger number of suffrages in its favour than any other reform of the Book of Common Prayer, which has been, or could be, suggested. It must have been no slight or merely impulsive pressure of public opinion on the subject, which could have made a prelate at once so judicious and so firm as our present Primate pledge himself in Parliament some years ago to a reconsideration of the arrangements of our Church on this point. And quite recently, the revision of the Calendar of Lessons, as well as of the Rubrics, is one of the subjects commended to the consi-

deration of the Ritualistic Commissioners—a circumstance which would seem to imply a prevailing impression that the Lessons present a vulnerable point in our Church system.

It is then with the fear of differing not only from superficial objectors to the Liturgy, but from wise and good Churchmen, who have really gone into the grounds of a popular complaint against the Prayer Book, and found them to be solid, that the writer ventures to put forth a word of apology for the old Lectionary, and at the same time to make a suggestion, which he conceives would meet current objections, if it could be satisfactorily carried into effect. With so many opinions worthy of all respect on the other side, he cannot but distrust his own judgment, and offer his conclusions with diffidence. And it is only in the hope of contributing to the fair discussion of the question, by saying what is to be said on the unpopular side, that he ventures to give publicity to his thoughts.

The first position which he would take up is, that the subject is really an important one,

and therefore not to be dealt with at all without grave consideration. *There is a very deep principle involved in the question before us.* Let no one take a merely utilitarian view of it, as if the question were merely which of several chapters of the Bible were most likely to profit an ordinary hearer in the congregation, or an ordinary reader in the closet. The office of the Church in this matter is not merely to appoint suitable Lessons, but to lay down *a principle for our guidance* in the study of God's Word,—to indicate to us how the Scriptures may be read with the greatest profit. Now the theory of reading the Holy Scriptures which is traced out in our Lectionary is surely unexceptionable. The theory of the *daily* Lessons is, that the Bible should be read through periodically, and indiscriminately. The Old Testament (with some exceptions, which shall be discussed presently) is read through once a year. The New Testament, with the single exception of the Revelation of St. John the Divine, is read through three times a year. On the other hand, the theory of the *Sunday* Lessons (as

also of the Epistles and Gospels) is that at special seasons passages shall be selected for reading, which are specially appropriate. It is with the Sunday Lessons that the first of the following Sermons professes to deal. I have been unable in a single Sermon to consider the Lessons for every season; but I have chosen that season, the Lessons of which (as far as my experience goes) are most usually complained of. The Lessons for Lent are certainly not the most agreeable in the Calendar; the stories of Jacob's deceit and of Dinah's fall are of course open to superficial objections; but if it should appear (as I hope I have made it appear) that the selection has been made by no means at haphazard, but on principle,—and that the topics brought before us are profoundly appropriate to a season of humiliation—it surely may be presumed that the rest of the Sunday Lectionary (which is comparatively seldom objected to) has been framed with equal care and discrimination. Indeed the writer must avow a peculiar faith in the Book of Common Prayer, arising from the fact that the super-

cial objections to it, which have from time to time struck his own mind, have vanished, one after another, as thought, reading, and experience, have been brought to bear upon them; and that often the passages or arrangements, which had formerly been a stumbling-block to him, have been seen eventually to have a large mass of thought and learning underlying them—an experience which has forced upon him the conviction that there is very little of haphazard in the Prayer Book—very little in that time-honoured compilation, which has been thrown in without cautious consideration. And he believes that this remark applies especially to the choice of the Sunday Lessons.

But the *daily* Lectionary is not referred to in the Sermon; and the writer therefore thinks it well to give completeness to the subject by undertaking the apology for it in this Preface. Is not, then, the principle on which it is framed—that of reading the Bible through indiscriminately—a good, godly, and edifying principle? Is it not most true that the mind of every man is one-sided, and that, because it