

Gospel of His Kingdom to every sinning, half-believing, half taught creature in all 'the region round about.'

The evil that presses upon us, however, is sore, and the more afflicting because it is need-loss, being aggravated and propagated by uneasy spirits who can accomplish nothing that is not better done on lines and by methods settled before they were born. The realm of inquiry is shut to no man. The realm of united and effective action must be regulated by binding obligations. Steady as the growth of the Church in this country has been and still is, it would have been far swifter during the last quarter of the century but for law breaking of one sort or another with its scandals and alarms. Whatever little gains these jars may yield, the mischiefs and hindrances overbalance them. The chief attractions the Church offers to thoughtful people outside, apart from its Scriptural and Apostolical constitution as the Body of Christ, are its doctrinal stability, the orderliness of its administration and its measure of internal peace. Improvements of the beauty of worship, in mutual forbearance, in a reasonable diversity of practical work, could not fail to come by instruction and legislation. The Providence that can never be hurried may be waited for without impatience or fear.

Meanwhile self-conceit and disloyalty may well look with dismay on the wanton wrong they inflict on piety and obarity alike. Any clergyman, no matter what his abilities or influence, may well stand aghast at the fresh distractions he thrusts in upon the Household of the Faithful by scattering his denials or his apologies for deniers, by using a fraudulent foothold in the Church to exhibit her as a traitor to herself. Not being a Presbyterian, a Baptist, or a Congregationalist, I believe I ought to wish that every minister in any sect should hold himself true to such standards as it may have, and to his own engagements till he is released from them. I think I can understand the arguments or apologies for one or another deviation from the Catholic Faith. What I find it impossible to understand is that anybody can fail to see that these divergencies each and all take sure steps towards a common end,—the breaking up of the Kingdom of Christ on the earth and the destruction of what has been known as His Religion from His Ascension to this day. To these restless agitators one can recommend no better counsel than that which John Kehle gave in one of his letters to Mr. Justice Coleridge for a latitudinarian pupil of Dr. Arnold in the Diaconate,—'a course of treatment not by physis, *i. e.*, reading and controversy, but by regimen, *i. e.*, holy living.'

Few things that I can think of would do as much to make the learning, the worship, the whole life of this People noble, as to stamp on the souls of its youth the words of that old formula which for more than three hundred years has passed down the successive generations of our ancestors, making our English fathers wiser than the Grecian men, and our mothers purer than the Roman women: 'My duty is to honor and obey the civil authority, to submit myself to all my governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters; to order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters.' Sink that sentence into the heart and will of what is sometimes called Young America and it will be churchmanship and statesmanship, it will be patriotism and peace, it will be better than banners and trumpets for the advancing army of the Lord, it will be wisdom and glory for all the land.—*The Church Eclectic.*

#### BEING, WELL-BEING, AND EXPEDIENCY.

We are reminded in certain quarters that there are two views of the Episcopate; first, that it is necessary to the *being* of a Church, that it is only necessary to its *well-being*. It is to be observed that in either case the 'neces-

sity' is admitted, though the object to which the necessity applies is slightly different. But it has often been seen when the advocates of these two views have been brought together in friendly conference, that they are found not to vary much after all. It is the old story over again of the gold and silver shield. They first look at the Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church as it is spoken of in the Creeds, and are therefore led to assert upon grounds of Scripture and history that that Church is, in its very constitution, episcopal, and that to eliminate episcopacy from it is to destroy it, or turn it into something else, the work of man, no longer divine or apostolic. The other school has been led to consider exceptional cases, and to enquire whether some section of Christian people who may have been providentially deprived of episcopacy therefore cease to be of the Church. The best example would be a case like that of the crew of the Bounty who took refuge on an uninhabited island, intermarried with the natives, and became permanent inhabitants of the place. A penitent sailor, the last survivor of the original crew, undertook the religious training of the children of this isolated race, with the aid of his Bible and Prayer Book, and raised up a generation of baptized and well-instructed people. As he was neither priest nor bishop, he did not usurp the functions which belong to those offices in the Church. His people, therefore, were not confirmed, nor did they receive the Holy Communion. No one would say that these people were not of the Church, but it is evident that the Church as it existed among them lacked much that is necessary to well being. Again, the American Church, before the Revolution had no resident bishops. Its members, therefore, lived and died unconfirmed, and many abuses sprang up which were clearly traceable to the want of spiritual rulers. Here, again, it was not the 'being,' but the 'well-being' of the Church which was effected. In the cases thus cited there was no thought of substituting a new order for that of which these communicants were by the providence of God deprived. It is only when that attempt is made that any question arises. Our old evangelists like Bishop Chase and Bishop McIlvaine did not question the apostolic and hence divine origin of Episcopacy. The only question was whether or not some, at least, of the sects which arose out of the Reformation, were not justified by circumstances in substituting another order for that of which they were providentially deprived.

But in more recent times another view has been industriously propagated. Its advocates endeavor to identify it with the second of those above described; but it is really quite distinct and far more radical. It does not admit that Episcopacy is *necessary* even to the well-being of the Church, but only that it is a venerable historic institution, of much importance, and 'in the highest degree expedient.' It insists, therefore, that any other ministry is as legitimate as that of bishops, priests, and deacons; and claims a right to affiliate with such ministers on equal terms, admitting them to chancel and pulpit, and taking a place upon their platforms. It says to Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and the rest: 'Your ministry is as good as ours.' Meanwhile, the world applauds, and says: 'How liberal,' 'How magnanimous!'

This is the view of the ministry which is just now being pressed upon us. But nothing can be more certain, if the language of our formularies means anything, and if history and tradition have any authority, than that such a view is contrary to the consistent teaching of The Church. It is contrary also to the position of the wisest evangelical leaders of former times, if not now; and it is contrary to the unanimous statement of our own bishops of the present day as set forth in their Declaration of Unity in 1886. In that document, Episcopacy is de-

clared to be *essential* to the unity of Christendom; not because it is venerable or expedient, but because it is a part of the sacred deposit entrusted to the Church by our Blessed Lord and His Apostles.—*Living Church.*

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

But, it may be asked—and the question has been asked—What authority is there for saying that the Book of Common Prayer was compiled from Sarum materials? To this we would reply with another question—What is there in the book of any other use than that of Sarum? This is capable of a categorical reply. There is *no trace whatever* of any other service books than those of Sarum having been used in the compilation of our Prayer Book, with the exceptions which follow: 1. The Mozarabic, revised by Cardinal Ximenes a few years before, was certainly used, and probably gave us the Prayer of Consecration and some prayers in the Baptismal service; 2. Quignon's Breviary and 3. Herman's 'Consultation' suggested some of the 'Dearly Beloveds,' and also the general arrangement of Morning and Evening Prayer, especially with regard to the division of the Psalter into daily portions, to ensure its being recited once a month. In a word, about nine-tenths of the Prayer Book may be traced to Sarum, the remaining tenth being either original or drawn from one of the three sources above named. Perhaps the revisers of the book had the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom before them while their work was proceeding. His 'prayer' at the end of Matins, Evensong, and the Litany, suggests this. One other important point—of Roman, York, or Hereford books *there is no trace whatever*, no peculiarity of any one of these uses having been preserved. Sarum peculiarities, on the other hand, abound on every page. The kalendar is Sarum, and Sarum only, without a single exception, save only those saints whose names were added in 1661, generally on the wrong days—St. Alban on June 17th, for example. The counting of the Sundays after Trinity is Sarum; York, Hereford and Rome all counted from Pentecost. The Collect for Purity in the Communion Office is Sarum, only in the connection which it occurs. The Communion Service is almost wholly and exclusively Sarum in origin. It is quite impossible in the course of a leading article to give anything like a complete list of such peculiarities. Indeed, were we to do so we should make the article pedantic and uninteresting to the general reader. Verbal coincidences are constant and minute. One example only will suffice. There is a Collect in the Sarum office of Prime which is idiomatically and almost literally translated in our Communion Service, being placed second of the Collects after the Blessing. The same Collect occurs in the Roman Breviary, but there it is addressed to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and is altogether fuller; the words 'King of heaven and earth' and 'Saviour of the World' appearing in this form, but not being found in either the Sarum Breviary or the Prayer Book. The form of this prayer in the Sarum Breviary is the same as that in the Prayer Book. A few hours spent in comparing the two books, without bias or prejudice, and then comparing the same with similar forms in a book of any other use would make what we have said abundantly clear to any one.

We have written this article, not for the sake of provoking a discussion, much less a controversy; but, fresh facts having been brought under our notice by a learned student of English Church history, in answer to an indirect appeal for our authority for certain statements made, we have thought it right, solely in the interests of historical truth, to place before our readers the foregoing facts which have been collected after years of patient study.—*Church Review.*