

sistible that everything else was forgotten. An earnest heart, thirsting for the bread of life and fellowship of the living God, will forget the musty smell of an unwashed, undusted barn, if the fragrance of heaven regales the soul. Still we grant that in Presbyterian Churches there often are things to which a cultivated taste may quite properly take grave exception. The appearance of the place, the manners of the people, (especially during prayer), the unskilful singing, the uncouth reading of the scriptures, the absence of a subdued, reverential tone in the whole service, will be so many thorns in the side of the cultivated worshipper, creating an uneasy feeling not easily to be suppressed, and very undesirable in the house of prayer. Besides that class, who, while intent on real worship, profess themselves unable to worship with comfort where good taste does not prevail, there is of course another class who go to church not for the sake of worshipping the great God, but to have their taste for music gratified. Whatever may be the numerical force of this section, it is of great importance to keep in view that it does not exhaust the class who are attracted to Episcopal worship by considerations of good taste. It is common enough to speak as if it did—as if the whole of this æsthetic class went to church merely for the sake of æsthetic pleasure. This is not according to fact; and the importance of the distinction will be seen when we come to treat of remedies; for while Presbyterian worship never can, or never should be conducted on the principle of gratifying the lust of the ear, it may and it should be conducted so that the most fastidious taste should find nothing to offend it, in any of its details.

Another attraction of Episcopalian worship for some minds arises from the less degree of importance which attaches to the officiating clergyman under that system, than under the Presbyterian. In the Presbyterian Church every thing hangs on the man that fills the pulpit, and the worshipper requires in every thought and feeling to adapt, or rather subordinate himself to the thoughts and feelings of that single individual. This is all very well, if he be a man of great gifts, and if he make it his study in his prayers not to convey his own private opinions as it were, but to embody in simple and scriptural language, the thoughts and feelings of the great body of the people. But suppose him a weak or incompetent man, and then the whole service becomes contemptible in his hands. Not so in the Episcopal Church. The clergyman is there much more the organ of the Church; his individuality is swamped to a large extent in his representative character; his personal defects are hid during the devotional part of the service; and if he be incompetent to compose a decent sermon of his own, there is no canon against his preaching another man's, and there is nothing in the common mode of delivery, likely to betray him if we do. With classes of worshippers whose besetting sin is either the pride of station or the pride of culture, this consideration weighs pretty strongly. We should add, too, that such persons seem constitutionally to prefer a service which is mainly devotional, and where the sermon holds a subordinate place to one where preaching is the great predominating exercise. It may be a question whether it always was so; there is little room to question that it is so now.

Still another cause of the preference given by the upper classes of Episcopacy is to be found in the difference in the *governing powers* of the two systems. The democratic government of Presbyterianism is not relished. Its controversies and its debates are not relished. There is an idea, too, that the reins of discipline are drawn too tightly in the Presbyterian Churches, and too little freedom allowed, especially in matters of belief. The tolerance—rather we should say the indifference of the Church of England, contrasts favourably in the eyes of many with the rigidity of the Presbyterian system. Perhaps they admit that there is a danger in either extreme. Still, they tell us for their part they prefer the extreme of universal tolerance, so the extreme of all but universal intolerance. Men of high education and inde-