

## Reflections on the Liturgical Revival

THERE can, I think, be no disputing the fact that the past twenty-five years have seen a tremendous increase of interest in the entire question of worship. Even if a person were utterly unacquainted with a single page of the vast amount of literature on the subject, his own experience in almost any breed of Protestant church would be sufficient to demonstrate the fact.

We have suddenly become aware that worship is something more than a religious lecture with warming up exercises to precede and a little cooling off period to follow. And the results are apparent on every hand. It would be difficult to find a denomination in the main stream of Protestantism that has escaped them. Nor are we alone in this development. The Reformed and Lutheran Churches on the continent of Europe have likewise experienced renewed interest in the liturgical question. The Kirk of Scotland which for long centuries saw no warrant for keeping either Pasche or Yule has become the centre of lively liturgical interest. And old mother Rome, which one would think was already the *ne plus ultra* of liturgy, has bestirred herself, especially in the Benedictine order, to a thorough re-investigation of the whole question of common worship.

Perhaps it would be useful at this point to mention briefly some of the work which has been going on so that the ecclesiastical and geographical extent of it may become more obvious. Clear and away the finest piece of Anglican work has been Dom Gregory Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy*. Many of its conclusions are open to question and at many points it can be regarded as a case of special pleading. Nevertheless it remains a work of enduring interest and merit. The most fruitful liturgical work in Scotland has been done by W. D. Maxwell, first in his *Outline of Christian Worship*, and more recently in his little book entitled *Concerning Worship*. His study of John Knox's Genevan Service Book still remains a model of liturgical investigation. Since I cannot read Swedish, I cannot speak with any authority about what has been done there. But in Holland a most active liturgical movement within the Dutch Church

has produced a work like *Liturgiek* by Professor van der Leeuw of Groningen. Switzerland has produced a series of studies in the set with the general title, *Eglise et Liturgie*. The Cluny community in France recently gave us Max Thurian's *Heavenly Joy on Earth*, an introduction to the study of the liturgical life. While just last year Horton Davies in his monumental study entitled, *The Worship of the English Puritans*, has explored, it would seem finally, the liturgical traditions of orthodox dissent.

These are all from the Protestant side. When one turns to the work done by Roman Catholics, the field is almost endless. One thinks of the specialized work done at Solemes and Maria Laach; one thinks of names like Michel, Parsch, Guardini, or in this country, Father Ellard. When you realize that in the city of New York it is possible to go to a High Mass at which the complete service is said audibly in English while it is being said secretly in Latin, while the ordinary of the Mass, the Kyrie, Gloria, Creed, Sanctus, etc., are sung by the entire congregation, you can begin to get some picture of the distance that Roman Catholic scholarship has travelled in this question.

Now when you begin to read this literature, one great fact begins to stand out very clearly. In spite of the enormous national and ecclesiastical differences out of which these investigations have come, in spite of the very real differences in outward ceremonial that remain, liturgically they all speak with an amazing unanimity. No one wishes to be over-optimistic or to minimize the very basic differences in tradition that remain. But at the same time, it can be said and it ought to be said that one of the great features of the liturgical revival has been the discovery by Protestants and Roman Catholics of a large ground of common agreement. It is a curious experience to find a Roman Catholic Church where the priest has liturgical leanings. Invariably you will hear the old-timers criticize him for his Protestant sympathies. There is in Philadelphia a large Roman Catholic parish which has been the subject of a very thorough liturgical revival. The altar has been made a very simple table, set in the midst of the chancel. The priest celebrates mass from behind it, facing the people like a Presbyterian minister. And the parish throughout the length and breadth of Philadelphia is sneeringly referred to as the Protestant Catholic Church! It becomes doubly curious when you put it alongside of the criticism usually aimed at a Protestant minister when he evidences some

liturgical interest, to wit, he is becoming a Roman Catholic ! Here then is one of the great hopeful signs of our time. The liturgical revival has actually begun to show us, at least in outline, the basis of a common form of Christian worship.

Now bearing all that in mind, I should like to sketch out four areas of common agreement which have emerged clearly from these liturgical studies, areas which to me at least seem to be no mere questions of academic or antiquarian interest, but lively and practical issues which each and every Christian congregation has to face. The first of them, perhaps, is not in quite the same category as the rest, but I include it because it is clearly implied and certainly needs to be said, especially in America.

I. Liturgy is concerned solely with what a congregation says and does in its act of worship. It is not at all concerned with the various decorations that accompany a service, the colour of the vestments which the choir wears, the number of candles on the altar, the position of the pulpit, or the presence of a rheostat on the light switches. All of these things have nothing to do with the subject whatever. They are secondary, and even irrelevant questions. A congregation that worships in the most starkly Puritan meeting-house can be strictly liturgical, while one that worships in a Gothic revival church that is correct in every detail may be as far away from the spirit of liturgical worship as night is from day. Liturgy concerns only what the congregation says and does in its act of worship.

Now if you will think that over, you will see that it has a number of immediate, and I fear sometimes embarrassing, applications. So much of our concern with worship has been nothing more than a fussy interest in details. We re-arrange the pulpit furniture, stick a few candles around the church, dim the lights, scatter choral responses through the service, reverse our collars, and presto—we have become liturgically minded ! The result is that a great many people have come to think of liturgy as nothing but an exaggerated concern with ecclesiastical architecture and millinery.

And if the truth must be told, a number of recent books on the subject of worship, not to mention most of the productions of the Federal Council's Commission on Worship, are written from just that point of view. They move entirely in the realm of psychological impression. To use the phrase to end all phrases which I found in one of these books, the hour of worship must be "Mood-moulding."

Evidently the congregation is expected to park its intellect in the vestibule as it enters the church to receive the dominant mood for the day, be it joy, sorrow, penitence, or whatever. I recall a certain Unitarian church in Boston where the minister once asked the choir to sing the Palestrina *Missa Brevis* with its original Latin text because he felt it would create the mood which he wished them to receive for that Sunday.

One cannot avoid the disquieting suspicion as one beholds all of this kind of thing going on, sometimes in the most amazing places, that this preoccupation with ways of saying things has come about because essentially we no longer have anything to say. Like the anæmic young lady who raddles her cheeks to hide their pallor, contemporary Protestantism has in large measure seized upon chancels and candles and vespers to compensate for its great embarrassment. When moral reformation has been replaced by psychological impression, you can be sure that something more is afoot than a passing liturgical interest. In one sense, the old-timers are right. Their suspicions of chancels and their objections to enriched orders of service are usually stupid, but by no means pointless. Very often when they come in, it means that something else has gone out, for which they are by no means an adequate replacement.

Now against all this kind of tinkering and fussing around, a genuine liturgical movement is the most effective protest that I can imagine. It insists that what the congregation says and does in that hour of worship is the thing that matters. And all of these other considerations are unhealthy if we allow them to deflect us from this. What is the Christian meaning of the things which we say and do between the hours of eleven and twelve on Sunday morning? That is the liturgical question. What act of witness, what testimony does our act of worship make? What kind of showing forth of the living glory of God happens there? Is this a showing forth of the holy love of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit or does it merely produce a kind of nebulous emotion? Liturgy would judge our acts of worship against the framework of the Christian revelation and by that test the meaning of everything we do or say. There is a difference between the humanistic religious sentiment that expresses itself by the community singing of *Abide With Me* at a candlelight service and a religion which tells of the Holy God Who wrestled with human sin on a cross. Liturgy

is concerned with bringing the congregation to a declaration of the whole glory of God.

When you look for that kind of meaning in our services, many of them are pretty meaningless. What a difference there is, for example, between the terse, sinewy English of liturgical prayer and the flaccid, turgid style of the prayers composed by the mood-moulding school. The one moves straight to its setting forth of the glory of God while the other wallows interminably in the ooze of psychological impressionism. Take for example, the collect for Good Friday :

Almighty God, we beseech thee graciously to behold this thy family, for which our Lord Jesus Christ was contented to be betrayed, and given up into the hands of wicked men, and to suffer death upon the cross ; who now liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end.

There is not one waste word in it. Compare it, if you will, with a Good Friday prayer taken from a modern service-book :

Eternal Father, henceforth as we journey life's pathway, let love be the charmed word in the dialect of our homes and hearts. Graciously give to us a true conception of the obligations which we assume as followers of Jesus that rising above the imprisoning walls of self-interest and escaping from the confining conventions of thought and spirit, we may come forth into larger places as champions of that love for all mankind.

Or take another simple illustration. Study any of the historic liturgies of any branch of the Church and you will find that it moves to the heart of the matter in a straightforward and even blunt way. How that contrasts with the uncertainty with which most of our services begin. The other day I saw an order of service from another church in my communion. After the organ prelude, this was how it went on : *Choral Call to Worship ; Doxology ; Prayer of Invocation ; Salutation ; Hymn*. Any one of those things is amply sufficient for the beginning of a service, yet here is a service which begins *five* different times. You can find historic liturgies beginning virtually in any one of these five ways, yet here is a service, and not an unusual one at that, which is so uncertain that it has no fewer than five ample beginnings. And lurking in the back of my mind is the unhappy thought that if you asked the minister for an explanation, he would undoubtedly reply that all of these things helped to create the mood !

Well, this section has been allowed to go much too far. The liturgical revival should make us all keenly concerned

with content of our worship. What does this service say about God? Is it accurate and complete in what it says about him? Does every act in it really contribute to the showing forth of his glory in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit in the fellowship of his Church? If we were to look at our services from this standpoint, and not from the vantage point of psychological impression or aesthetic appeal, we should be in, I suspect, for some drastic changes, not in the chancel furniture but in the content of the service. This, as I see it, is one of the great things which the liturgical revival would force upon our attention.

II. The second great consideration that has developed from the liturgical revival is this—authentic Christian worship must be *corporate* worship, must be the expression of the priesthood of all believers. And I would remind you that this is being said just as forcibly by the Benedictines as it is by the Baptists! At this point we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God. We all need to recover the real meaning of corporate worship and that is precisely what the liturgical revival aims to help us do.

Again I can mention only certain of the specific places at which this affects us. I think of it most obviously, of course, in the case of public prayer. "I do observe," wrote Benjamin Whichcote, a 17th century Puritan, "a great deal of conceived prayer which is good, but may do better in the sermon." His observation is still very pertinent. What a melancholy thing to reflect on the number of ways in which the average Protestant service frustrates the practice of the priesthood of all believers. If ever there was a priestly kind of worship it is that which is conducted in the fashionable Protestant temple where the praise is a duet between the minister and the quartette and the prayer is a skilfully executed private meditation which the congregation overhears from its pews!

From its Greek etymology, "liturgy" means, of course, "the work of the people," and it still remains the best guarantee that worship shall remain an act of the people. At that solemn moment when the congregation is called upon to lift up its hearts in intercession and thanksgiving, how often is it left completely at the whim and fancy of an individual who rambles all over creation, wrestling with his private doubts and problems, planning a flank attack on the morning sermon, belabouring the sinners in the congregation over the Lord's back, winding the whole thing up with a mechanical, "and all this we ask, with the for-

givenness of our sins, for Jesus' sake." I once asked my mother who was at that time sitting under the ministry of a particularly bad offender whether she really could say that she prayed during the so-called long prayer, only to be met with the reply, " Yes, my son, often I pray that he will finish soon ! "

Common prayer need not necessarily be in words which the congregation knows, but it should certainly always be in ideas with which they are familiar. If the minister is not using a set form of words which they can follow, he should at least be using a pattern which is so clear that at any point they can make the intercessions or the thanksgivings their own. The minister is not called upon to put up a prayer so that the congregation may sit by admiring his wondrous precatory talents. He is called upon to voice the common prayers and supplications of his people. This is not the time for rhetorical displays or purple passages. It is time for the sober expression of the common need of the body of Christ.

That means, of course, that those of us who are charged with the responsibility ought to be much more careful than we are to sort out those things which belong in the private closet from those things which belong in the public congregation. To be sure, no one wants to play one off against the other. They belong together. But a confusion between the two can lead to a vitiation of this basic fact of worship ; it must be corporate ; it must never be individual.

There is something deeper here in this insistence upon the corporate nature of worship. In his book, *The High Church Tradition*, G. W. O. Addleshaw puts it this way :

" The liturgy is the voice of the Church, the Body of Christ. A people who think of the Church as a collection of individuals, as their parish, . . . a people who have never been accustomed to think of themselves as the Church, the new race, the community of the redeemed, are not likely to feel much of a desire to take their part in the prayer of the Church . . . . If society is divorced from the Church and its life not a reflection of the divine order, men will feel no inclination to join in what can only be an unreality and a sham owing to the circumstances under which they live and work."

In other words, in the deepest sense of the term, corporate worship is creative of the Church. It lifts people above the sense of their individuality, above the sense of their membership in a mere society for the propagation of religious principles and makes them aware of their place in the new community.

And here, I think, the liturgical revival has a magnificent contribution to make in this twentieth century. On all sides we are triumphantly told that this is the century of the Church. Everywhere, it is said, the Ecumenical Movement is bringing about a rediscovery of the fact of the Church. What is not so often said is that this rediscovery of the fact of the Church can be a vice just as easily as it can be a virtue. If the results of this rediscovery are simply a revived institutionalism, the concentration of power into the hands of ecclesiastical authorities, be they bishops or secretaries, the emergence of a Protestant kingdom to compete with the other kingdoms of this world, then we ought not to welcome it. And unhappily signs are not wanting that this is at least a possible destination of the modern Ecumenical movement.

But if, on the other hand, this rediscovery of the Church should produce a deep sense of the Church's mission as God's new community, as God's new Israel, a colony of heaven even though it lives and works and witnesses in the midst of time, then we shall have come a long step forward. And it is just here that the liturgical movement, with its emphasis upon the corporate character of worship, can make a significant contribution. We may preach, teach and expound this rediscovered Church until the crack of doom, but in the corporate, worshipping community, a man can have a living experience of what it means. That, I take it, is the meaning of the phrase which is so often on the lips of liturgical leaders, "The liturgy is creative of the Church."

Here again we need to be very critical of our present practice. We need to ask ourselves whether our worship has not moved too exclusively on an individual level. We tend to think of our congregations as an aggregate of individuals, hoping that their individual needs will be more or less satisfied by the general pattern of our services. The liturgical movement would have us re-think our worship with the objective of making Christ's community in our congregation conscious of itself as a community, with distinctive patterns and qualities, distinctive needs and tasks. Protestant worship very often slips to an almost secular level, replete with musical numbers, programmes, and all the paraphernalia of the concert hall. And this is the reason. We think of our worship merely as a ministry to the religious needs of the individual, and not as the distinctive act of a community by which the community becomes aware of itself and of its tasks.

This is not to say that the religious needs of the individual are unimportant, or that they should be lost and submerged in a kind of ecclesiastical totalitarianism. But it is to say that in the Christian scheme of things, the needs of the individual are met in community, the personality of the individual is fulfilled in community, and of that basic fact our worship should be a continual sign and symbol. Dr W. D. Maxwell has some very wise words on this point :

“ In Christian worship, as in the Christian society, the individual is never absorbed or submerged, but is nourished and perfected as a person, and given his function to perform in the priesthood of all believers. And the society to which he belongs is not an end in itself, but is consciously directed to the service of God. Yet he is never merely an individual, but is part of a divine society. He is a member of the family of God, and of the body of Christ. He is not a cog in a machine, a cipher in a sum total, but an essential and self-conscious person in the divine society.”

III. The third consideration that has arisen out of the liturgical movement is the close relation between liturgy and dogma. This fact will bear a good deal of thinking because so much of our interest in worship has arisen from a desire to escape dogma. Wearied of theological strife and combat, or perhaps more accurately, famished from the thin diet of undogmatic liberalism, contemporary Protestantism has retreated into an enriched worship as a safe haven where no troubles come. It is certainly worthy of comment that those Protestant churches which have gone the furthest in tinkering with the psychology of worship are precisely those which a generation ago were in the vanguard of the crusade for theological liberalism. I am not trying to deplore what they have done at all. I am merely saying that the only thing that can rescue what they have done from spineless aestheticism, the only thing that can clothe what they have done with religious meaning and purpose is a genuine liturgical movement.

For this modern liturgical movement would protest that it is utterly futile to try to escape from dogma into liturgy, for the two are as intimately bound up as Siamese twins. This is of course no new discovery. We have known about the *lex orandi lex credendi* for a long time. But the liturgical movement nowadays is somewhat working in reverse. It used to be thought that we need believe only those things which we could pray. Now we are beginning to see that our worship must be the fullest possible expression of what we believe.

Worship is dogma come to life. The Creed states the Christian faith; the *Te Deum* sings it. *The Heidelberg Catechism* tells about the atoning death of Christ; the Lord's Supper shows it forth. A sermon proclaims the presence of Christ with His people; the Holy Communion actualizes it. A Confession of faith declares that God always takes the initiative in man's salvation; the Sacrament of Baptism demonstrates it. If the liturgical movement has anything to say it is this; Christian worship is a bringing near and an acting out of Christian faith and belief. Perhaps we ought to reconsider the significance of the fact that it was not until the eleventh century that the recitation of the Creed found a place in Christian worship. Certainly that did not happen because the Church during the first millenium of her life shared the modern aversion to creeds. Could it have been that the Church felt that her liturgy itself was a declaration of her faith, requiring no amplification or codification in the recitation of a fixed symbol of belief?

However that may be, surely the modern attempt to divorce worship and belief, or to substitute techniques and tricks of worship for dogma is completely wrong-headed. One sometimes wonders why the theological implications of the things that are done in the name of improvement in worship are not more apparent to those who do them. Whether you like it or not, you cannot shove the Holy Table back, fasten it against the east wall of the church, and take up your position facing it, without introducing an entire new set of dogmatic ideas to your congregation. It makes no difference that they do not have the wit to see them. They are there and will be picked up unconsciously if not consciously. I know a minister who could not get a passing grade on an elementary theological examination. Recently he installed one of these dummy altars in his church. At the offertory he stands before it, elevating the plates. But for the Lord's Supper he crawls around to one side of it, wedged between the end of the altar and a standing candelabrum like a sardine in a tin. He would tell you that theology had nothing to do with worship. And yet what else has prompted him to make these fine distinctions in position? The same thing applies to the recent epidemic of bowing to the Communion Table that has afflicted us recently, even in the Puritan citadels of New England. Perhaps those who have inaugurated the practice consider it a kind of courtesy due the Almighty, but bowing to the Table

implies a theology. If you know what the theology is, well and good. But if you don't, then your chancel becomes a kind of Mars Hill.

Now what I am trying to say is that all this kind of thing could not be done in the blithe way in which it is done were it not for the notion that worship and belief are two unrelated departments of the Christian life. The liturgical movement has made it one of its cardinal principles to say that they are not. Time was when the Protestant tradition tried to centre itself on dogma to the exclusion of liturgy. We are all well aware of that phase, for most of us were raised at the tag end of it. In its heyday, worship became nothing but a school of correct doctrine, with only such preliminaries as were necessary to launch the sermon. And to this day many people think that that is the classic tradition of Protestantism, even though it was as faithless to the intent of the Reformation as the Mass itself.

And now we are enjoying the full fruits of the other extreme in which worship has become everything and dogma nothing. Even in strict Anglo-Catholic circles the virus has eaten its way. I have been to high masses in Anglican Churches in which every last ceremonial detail was present and accounted for. And then the celebrant mounted the pulpit only to spend ten minutes implicitly denying the theological foundations of everything that had been done at the altar. We have become so fascinated with the sense of the numinous that we have forgotten that the numinous in the Old Testament always had a will and a purpose.

There can be worship without dogma, but it is not Christian worship, for Christian worship is centred in the holy love of the God Who stooped to become man for us men and for our salvation. Without that, it is meaningless, and that is theology. Liturgy and dogma are like the hen and the egg. It is useless to try to discover which is cause and which is effect, and it is fatal to try to fasten on one to the exclusion of the other. They belong together. Liturgy is the acting out of the dogma, but on the other hand the dogma is meaningless until it is enacted and brought to life in the Christian community.

The liturgical movement, then, summons us to a re-examination of our worship in the light of our beliefs, bidding us make certain that in the Christian community the faith of the Community is enacted in its worship and so strengthened and made real by that enactment.

IV. The liturgical movement has reminded us that all Christian worship is basically sacramental. Whether you come at it from the Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, or Roman tradition, this is its final intention and nature. It will be clothed in all kinds of forms, accompanied by the widest possible variety of ceremonial, but Christian worship has always found its summit in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To say that the Reformers sought to substitute the sermon for the mass is to betray a woeful ignorance of their basic intention. To John Calvin a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion was as basic as it was to Thomas Aquinas. The Eucharist was as much the norm of Christian worship for Martin Luther as it was for Ignatius Loyola. Modern liturgical research has completely demonstrated that fact, if indeed it needed any demonstrating.

But when that has been said, too often the point of it is lost in arguing about the advantages of frequent communions, the possibility of restoring them, and similar details which really obscure the main thrust of the argument. It is, of course, important to understand that Christian worship rightly culminates in the Lord's Supper. No doubt it is also important to realize that our usual practice is pretty deficient and that an early communion for a handful of devout maiden ladies is no real meeting of the issue. But the most vitally important thing of all is to see the significance of the fact, to see that it is not simply the fulfilment of tradition, but the clue to the basic meaning of Christian worship. Only from the vantage point of the Eucharist can you understand what Christian worship is really all about. Whether you celebrate it once a day or once a year, you must stand here at the summit in order to understand the whole line of march. For Christian worship is basically sacramental.

And by that, of course, I mean that Christian worship moves in two worlds at once. The church is a meeting-house. I love that term. I often wonder whether those who still use it in their tradition ever realize what it means. Do they think of it as simply referring to those stated occasions on which Mrs Jones meets Mrs Smith and Mr Brown meets Mr White in a social and religious gathering? Or do they think of it as that sacred place in which the beloved community of the Redeemed meets its Redeemer, in which the tabernacle of God is pitched among men that He may be their God and they may be His people? In such a meeting the Holy Communion becomes a deeply

meaningful demonstration of what is at all times an abiding reality, but it is the abiding reality with which we ought to be primarily concerned.

If your congregation is anything like mine, you cannot but be dismayed at the bland way in which the Church is in the minds of many people classified with the Lodge, the Service Club, the Red Cross and what not, as one of the benevolent societies to which they give time, attention, and money. We are forever complaining about the way in which the Church is treated as just another, even though somewhat nobler, society for religious and moral improvement. I cannot help thinking that this is nothing but the inevitable consequence of a kind of worship that has come to move on one plane, that has lost its sense of encounter with eternity. Poke fun at the mumbo-jumbo of the mass-house if you will. Play the Pharisee and thank God that you are not as other men are, even these ignorant Roman Catholics. But until Protestantism can recover an equal sense of the presence of God in the midst of his people, we shall continue to face a battery of empty pews, or try to fill them by a weekly exhibit of the attractiveness of our own personalities !

I trust we all realize the tremendous risk that Protestantism takes at this point. Our Roman friends channel the Presence through the dumb elements of bread and wine and in that they have a tremendous advantage. Bread and wine are stable and secure things. Protestantism channels it through a human tongue and a human brain, exceedingly unpredictable media ! And yet the Reformers, who were by no means stupid men, must have thought the gain worth the risk. Our churches can easily degenerate into talking shops, but they can also know the unsurpassable glory of human personalities touched and transformed by the living Spirit of God !

When worship begins to move in this sacramental plane, in a very real sense time ceases to be. Calvary, Easter, Pentecost are no longer dates in history, but living experiences in the soul. We become real spectators at these events. No longer are we looking at them as we look at a picture in an art gallery, or as we watch a play from the gallery. Now we are actually on stage, acting in the drama. We are there when they crucify the Lord ; we are there when he rises from the tomb. The Biblical event becomes personally appropriated in the present of the individual life.

In all this, whatever may be your understanding of them, the sacraments have their part to play. Calvin once said that they were like a handshake. You walk down the street and over the way someone says "Good morning! How are you?" But there is quite a crowd of people and you are not sure that he is speaking to you. But then the man crosses the street and shakes your hand, and you know that the greeting was meant for you. Just so in the pulpit the holy, redeeming love of God is proclaimed, but you are not certain that it is addressed to you. God's greeting does not really reach your heart. But then in Baptism your name is called, or in the Eucharist you must take and eat, and there can be no doubt in your mind that this is, so to speak, God's handshake, confirming his love to you personally.

But all our worship should be that way. It should not be just a succession of psalms, hymns, lessons, prayers, and a speech by the minister, moving in an absolute horizontal line. The congregation should not leave the church, buoyed up by the faith that you do not think that the atom bomb will drop this year. It should leave in the tremendous conviction that it is in the overshadowing Presence of the living God who in the confusing pattern of history is forging his purposes to final victory. Worship is sacramental; not a lecture, nor a concert, but a rendezvous with Eternity.

And that does not just happen. It cannot be effected by lights, music, or furniture. It happens only in the tremendous power of Him who has promised that where two or three are gathered together in His Name, there He will be in the midst of them.

HOWARD G. HAGEMAN.

*Note.*—The above article also appeared in the January, 1950, issue of *Theology Today* (Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.). It appears in our pages, in slightly condensed form, with the kind permission of the author, and of the Editor.