

they contribute to regularity of attendance, to reverential behaviour and to the beauty of the sanctuary." In reading this, I am tempted to exclaim with Dominie Sampson, "Wonderful," but that sounds sarcastic, so I refrain and prefer to thank God, in all sincerity, that the veil has been lifted from the eyes of the Evangelical clergy of Sheffield in regard to surpliced choirs. Twenty-eight years ago, I was in the only surpliced choir in Sheffield, that of St. Philips, and I well remember that a perfect furor of bigoted excitement raged in the low Church ranks because we at St. Philips wore surplices like clergymen. However, we went quietly on, never replied to gross attacks or platform thunders, or pulpit fulminations, but just sang away as though no storm raged around us. We were most helpful in filling a Church which had been deserted; we rallied round the Church the young men of the town, we gave Churchmen to know how beautiful, how joyous the service of the Sanctuary is when ordered aright, and opened their eyes to the miserable dullness and meanness, and irreverence of puritanic forms which kill out all the poetry of worship. Our teaching fell upon very stony ground, but the very stones it seems have softened into good soil, and Mr. Milton, Evangelical as he is, can now testify by "experience" how serviceable are the surplices which excited such indignation only a few years ago. So the world moves; 'tis an old tale. I hope Mr. Milton's teacher, "Experience," will find pupils in Toronto, and then every Church here would echo his eulogy of a value and the charm of a surpliced choir.

AN OLD CHORISTER BOY.

CHURCH SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS.

DEAR SIR,—Your remarks on Church Schools, in the CHURCHMAN of the 18th instant, are worthy of the serious consideration of all protestants, for in these days it is most important that our daughters should be well trained and also well educated. The establishment of Church Schools in all the cities and towns of Canada is much to be desired. Such schools should at all events inspire confidence, for whatever may be thought on matters liturgical, the Church of England is generally regarded as embracing within her borders students of the highest culture and teachers of the widest learning. The education given at such schools may be expected to be "ex grave" rather than "viewy"—thorough rather than superficial; polished by industry and hard work, and not patched and varnished by idle hands and simpering lips. The aim of our girls should be to attain to something better than the "namby pamby" status of young ladies; they should strive to arrive at the higher condition of young gentlewomen, for that is a title of excellence that no monarch can confer and no legislature can take away. The noble order of gentlewomen is so suggestive of purity and truth, so inseparable from delicacy of thought and ingenuousness of manner that none who become enrolled as members of that order would ever so forget their obligations to a gentle life as rudely to offend in word or thought or deed.

I had the good fortune to be present and to make the acquaintance of the Lady Principal of the Bishop Strachan School on the 26th ultimo, when the "break-up" for the holidays took place. We were invited to a concert and to a distribution of prizes. We also heard from those who were entitled to speak, as well as who were competent to judge, very satisfactory statements indeed of the excellent headway made by the pupils during the school year then about to close. Some change in the "breaking up" arrangements might be made with advantage alike to the girls and the guests, and on this point I am glad to know that the Lady Principal is fully conscious. There is, too, a matter "of ritual" that I have seen observed on similar occasions elsewhere that might, I think, form part of "the use" at Wykeham Hall. The medallists on receiving their medals from the distributor of prizes hand them one by one to the Lady Principal, who, standing on the dias, places a ribbon in the loop of the medal made to receive it, and then putting the ribbon round the neck of the owner, drops a kiss on her forehead and smilingly hands her a seat. As it struck one on the occasion to which I refer the special ceremony was alike pretty and fitting, as well as a

mark of special distinction to those who had been declared worthy of receiving it.

As an evidence of the thorough character of the education given in Church schools, I was informed that the young lady who won Lord Dufferin's silver medal for Literature, and the young lady who carried off the highest prizes for Languages, had been pupils of the Church School at Ottawa, which was commenced under the valuable direction of Miss Machin, and was continued under the able superintendence of Miss Mann. It was, of course, highly creditable to the young ladies themselves, but, at the same time, their success was complementary to their former school and their former teachers. The school buildings and grounds are admirable. Such grand old trees almost suggest study, and such ample space affords abundant opportunity for recreation. The Bishop Strachan School needs only to be visited and known to be appreciated. For my part, I am glad to be able to say that my daughter was educated there.

Your observations, already referred to, are my excuse for
July 23rd, 1878.

THIS GOSSIP.

THE SO-CALLED "EVANGELICAL INTERPRETATION" OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

DEAR SIR,—As all the clergy of the Church of England have accepted *Ex animo* the Liturgy, Creeds, Articles and Homilies, and made and signed certain declarations to that effect, it would appear that our differences arise, in a great measure, from many putting their "own sense or comment to be the meaning" of the language of our formularies, rather than to take it in its "literal and grammatical sense," as we are required to do. Language in the Prayer Book has to bear far more straining, in its interpretation, to bring it into harmony with our own pre-conceived ideas, than the same language would be desired to bear elsewhere.

This is how we appear to disinterested onlookers. Mr. Wilson is reported to have said in a speech on Hymnology before the General Assembly of the Presbyterians lately held at Hamilton: "That some of the hymns—one of which he quoted as saying, 'My broken body, this I give for you; for all take it and live'—taught Sacramentarianism (Cries of No, no). If that hymn did not teach Sacramentarianism, he did not know what Sacramentarianism was. (Expressions of dissent.) Those who hissed reminded him of his very good friends the *Evangelical Episcopalians* who could say that Baptism made them 'a child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, and who at the same time protested that they did not teach baptismal regeneration!' Mr. Wilson's position is much strengthened when we add to this the fact that we are required to pray in five different forms of expression in the Baptismal Service before the child is baptised that it "may be regenerated." We are required also to assure those presenting the child for Baptism that our Lord Jesus Christ would grant all the things they had prayed for, namely, that He would "vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life." After he is baptised we are required to thank God that he is regenerated. The xxvii. Article declares that Baptism is that which, "as by an instrument they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church," &c. In the office for the "Private Baptism of children," it is said "that this child is by baptism regenerated." In the Latin copy of the IX. Article, which is of equal authority with the English, the word *renatus* is used interchangeably for "baptized" and "regenerated." Our Catechism, which the Rubric requires every clergyman to teach the children of his parish, declares in almost the words of Holy Scripture that "being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby (that is by baptism) made the children of grace." Baptism is never mentioned in Scripture except in connection with some benefit or advantage to be derived from it. Nearly twenty passages might be pointed out in which salvation, or remission of sins, union with Christ, or being grafted into Christ's body, are connected with Baptism. It not only appears to me

as clear as day that the Church of England teaches Baptismal Regeneration, if language has any definite meaning, but that she does so upon the strongest possible expressions of Holy Scripture. The effect of Baptism has never appeared to me to be a proper subject of dispute. I am persuaded that to those who, as the article expresses it, "receive baptism rightly" it will have that effect, and no other, however we may wrangle about it, that Christ intends it to have, nor would there be any dispute were it not that baptismal grace—being placed in a state of salvation by baptism—militates against the Calvinistic doctrine of "Elect infants."

The non-conformists of two hundred years ago justified their non-conformity and consequent separation from the Church of England on the ground that they believed, and in fact knew, that she taught those very doctrines which "High Churchmen" (I only use the expression in order to be understood—not of choice) now teach, and which has lately been denounced as "rank popery." The Act of Uniformity, passed in the reign of Charles II., re-establishing the Book of Common Prayer, in which those doctrines are taught, drove 2,000 of the most conscientious ministers out of the Church of England, rather than debase their consciences by accepting doctrines they did not believe. It is true that they had come in as Presbyterians during the time of the Commonwealth, under the supposition that the "Solemn League and Covenant" had accomplished its object, namely, the making the form of religion "one in the three kingdoms," and that one form Presbyterian. The Book of Common Prayer was the same then that it is now, but the "Evangelical" interpretation now put upon it was then unknown.

The so called "evangelical" interpretation put upon the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer is beginning to lose its effect. Many intelligent men who have now formed themselves into what they call the "Reformed Episcopal Church," have acted as if they felt that they had been deceived by it. They read the Prayer Book as the old Non-Conformists read it—and as the so-called "High Churchmen" read it understand it, and teach it. There is this difference however, the Non-Conformists disbelieve the doctrines, the "high Churchman" believes them because he is persuaded that they are scriptural, and therefore he teaches them. The "evangelical interpretation," on the contrary, tells us that the doctrines complained of and denounced as "rank popery" are not to be found in the Prayer Book.

The "evangelical interpretation" did long and faithful service in the Irish Church, and is now about to be superannuated. It was only after the Church was disestablished and disendowed, and the commutation paid over to the clergy that it suddenly gave out. We now find those who strenuously asserted fifteen years ago that no such doctrine as "baptismal regeneration" was to be found in the Prayer Book, actively engaged at the present moment in endeavouring to eliminate that doctrine from the Prayer Book.

The "evangelical interpretation" with its best intentions, and its most persuasive eloquence has never succeeded in making the Preface to the Ordinal acceptable to those most concerned—those who would desire to minister in the Church of England without "episcopal ordination." The learned Mr. John Corbet, late of Chichester, in his Remains published 1684, thus expresses his disapprobation: "I am in no way satisfied in the disabling or degrading of so many ministers as are ordained only by presbyters." Those who accept the evangelical interpretation generally balk at its attempt in this particular. I generally put the question in this way: "Do you know it to be the practice of that part of the Church of England against which you have said nothing ('evangelical') to admit Protestant Dissenters when they come over to the Church, which is daily the case, to exercise the 'functions' of the ministry without first having received episcopal ordination? If they do not what is the difference between them and the part you have spoken against—the High Church—in this particular?"

Yours,
WM. LOGAN.