

alike met death by the headsman's stroke, the ecclesiastical history of North America would have been written on other lines and from a different standing-point than is now the case. In the triumph in England of the Commonwealth, in the proscription of the Church and Common Prayer by the Long Parliament, and in the ascendancy, first of Presbyterianism and then of Independency and every variant form of dissent and fanaticism, the Church in the Colonies—save in the "Old Dominion," which held out longest against Parliament and the Protector,—shared the fate of the Mother Church of England. On both sides of the Atlantic, outside of Virginia, Church and Crown fell together.

With the Restoration there came at once the re-establishment of the Church in Virginia and Maryland; and directly on the conquest of New York, where the English Crown, basing its claim to a share of the North American continent on the discovery of the mainland by Cabot in 1497, had never acknowledged the Dutch occupancy as having any basis of law or right, the recognition of the English Crown was followed by the introduction of the Church service in the chapel of the fort. Almost simultaneously with these beginnings of the Church in New York, there came to Boston the surpliced priest and the services of the Prayer Book, where each had been disallowed by law before. The Church awoke at once to a new life. As the seventeenth century drew near its close there were found numbers even in Puritan New England ready to welcome the introduction into the Colonies of their father's faith and the forms of prayer their sires had used in the old home across the sea.

In 1693 Trinity, New York, was founded, the few Churchmen of the Province having been earlier cared for by the chaplains at the fort. Churchmen, or "Protestant Catholics," as they styled themselves, had accompanied the Romanist "Pilgrims of Maryland" on Lord Baltimore's first expedition, and the first house of worship erected at St. Mary's, the seat of the Proprietary Government and the residence of the Roman Catholic authorities of the Province, appears to have been a Church of England chapel. In Virginia the Church had grown with the growth of the commonwealth, and the century's close had witnessed the inauguration of William and Mary College, the lineal successor after nearly four score years of the ill-starred University of Henrico. Maryland Churchmen had founded in 1694, as a "feeder" to the Virginia College, the first English free school on the continent. Bearing for nearly a century the name of King William's School, it has, as St. John's College, Annapolis, weathered another hundred years, and under its present efficient management enters upon its third century of life with good promise for the future. In Charleston a church, built of black cypress on a brick foundation, described in the old records as "large and stately," occupied the site of the St. Philip's church of to-day. Elsewhere there were occasional ministrations of the Church, and everywhere in the American colonies there was a readiness for its planting and growth.

Such was the state of the Church when in the rising city of Penn on the Delaware, and in the year of grace 1695, Christ church, Philadelphia, was founded,—the mother church of province and commonwealth.—*American Church S.S. Magazine.*

God has given us four books; the book of grace, the book of nature, the book of the world, and the book of providence. Every occurrence is a leaf in one of these books; it does not become us to be negligent in the use of any of them.—*Richard Cecil.*

#### WHAT CONFIRMATION IS NOT, AND IS.

We condense from the *Parish Record*, of the Church of the Advent, Nashville, Tenn., the following admirable paragraphs on Confirmation:

There seems to be an unaccountable reluctance among people in this community about coming to Confirmation. And we think that this has been to a certain extent due to wrong teaching about Confirmation. People have been urged at such times to "join the Church," to "confess Christ," to "declare themselves on the Lord's side," to "take upon themselves the responsibility of their baptismal vows," etc. Confirmation does not stand for any of the things above named. It is somewhat inconsistent to teach a child that at his Baptism he was made a member of Christ, a child of God, an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven, and then treat him as if he were a child of the devil and urge him to come into the kingdom as if he were yet outside of it; to tell him that at the font he confessed the faith of Christ crucified, and then ask him to make that confession as if he had never made it at all; to instruct him that he is already bound to do and believe as his sponsors promised for him, and then entreat him to assume those responsibilities as if he were not bound by them. Such contradictory teaching is naturally perplexing to the child's mind. He is made to believe that his baptism did not really amount to anything, and he shrinks from assuming the dread weight of responsibilities which he can just as well leave to his sponsors to carry for him. And in the case of those whom we call "outsiders," persons who have not been reared from infancy in the Church's fold, it is even more difficult to make any impression by such teaching as this.

If you want an outsider to forsake the ways of sectarianism, you must first persuade him that the Church has something for him in Confirmation which he can obtain nowhere else. The same teaching is required for the child come to years of discretion and for the outsider, supposing the latter to have been baptised, except that the latter may need to be instructed as to the nature of baptism and enlightened as to his heavenly inheritance, of which he may have hitherto been kept in ignorance. The child will have learned all that in Sunday school. So long has the erroneous terminology referred to above prevailed, that even children of the Church will be more or less effected by it, and therefore before proceeding to positive instruction it will generally be necessary to clear away misapprehension by showing what Confirmation is not. Then show from the New Testament that Confirmation was practiced from the very earliest days of the Church. It is the appointed means of receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost, and no Christian life can be completed without this gift. Even the apostles waited for it before they began their work, and in that work it was uniformly insisted upon as the necessary complement of baptism. As it can only be administered by a Bishop, of course it cannot be had in those religious bodies which have no Bishops.

To be confirmed, then, is not to "join the Episcopal Church. That is only the civic title bestowed by the law of the land on the Catholic Church in this country, the church of the New Testament and of all ages. Your baptism, even though administered by a layman, made you a member of that Catholic Church. The question is, are you living up to the full measure of your duty, or of your privilege, as a member of the Church? You promised when you were baptised to renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, and to obey God's holy will and commandments all the days of your life. Are you keeping that promise? God's promises to you He has most faithfully kept, and He might hold you strictly to your

part of the contract, and on your failure to perform it might withdraw all the gifts which He then bestowed upon you. But He does not want you to be lost. Out of his great love for you, and an infinite condescension, He offers to help you in doing your part. He tenders the gracious assistance of His Holy Spirit to make you strong where you are weak, to open your eyes that you sleep not in death, to quicken your spiritual faculties into vigorous and healthy life. This is what confirmation is. The recipient does not make any new promises nor assume any new responsibilities. He does not come to confirm, but to be confirmed. He comes to receive a sacramental gift, the inward and spiritual grace of strengthening imparted through the outward and visible sign of the laying on of the Bishop's hands. Is it wise, knowing how much you need to be made stronger, is it indeed anything but churlish, to turn away from such a gift as this and say you do not want it, or that you will wait a little longer before you will accept it?—*Trinity Record.*

#### THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

St. Paul in a well-known passage, in which he is speaking of Christian assemblies for devotional purposes, commands that all things should be done in comely form (*euschemonos*) and according to order. The observance of Easter and Pentecost is spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles. These solemn anniversaries were an integral part in the fair and beautiful "form" which the earliest system of evangelization took in the Church of Christ. Yet those who in the post Reformation period refused adherence to the Church of England became non-conformists, because they professed to work against formalism. Nothing, perhaps, incurred their reprobation so completely as the observance of Christian anniversaries, and thus they unwittingly rejected not only the accidental formalism, but the essential form of the Church's worship and ordinances.

We are not surprised to find that intelligent Christians, not of our Communion, have begun to consider their position in this matter. The Congregationalists have always been remarkable for the thoughtfulness and scholarship which many of their ministers exhibit; and we are not surprised that the author of "A Plea for the Christian Year," a treatise of exceptional merit, calls himself a Congregationalist. This writer has admirably summarized what we may call the *rationale* of church anniversaries. He advocates the restoration among the denominations of the festivals and feasts of the Catholic Church on several grounds. The Christian year, he says in substance, fixes the attention upon the Master Himself, His life and work, rather than upon theories about Him. It promotes the spirit of reverence, as favorable to the enlargement of thought and sympathy. It is a perpetual object lesson to the young. One more argument for the Christian year lies in its influence in the direction of unity. These are wise and thoughtful words, and come with singular appropriateness at the present moment. To these arguments may be added that of Bishop Coxe: "Look at this majestic system of claiming all time for Jesus Christ, and filling every day in every year with His name, and His worship! See how vast and rich the scheme, as a token of, and a provision for, the Second Advent!" We are glad to see "A Congregationalist" turning his attention to this subject. As a review of the past, a devotional occupation for the present, a preparation for the future, the Christian system of anniversary commemorations, the Prayer Book and Bible system, as we may call it, has a just claim on the observance of Christians of every name, and