

paper speaks of the movement as "upward" in its tendencies. Our cotemporary would, we presume, call it "Romeward," or possibly a "Laudian retrogression." The Low Churchmen are obeying the injunction—"Go up higher."

EPISCOPACY IN AMERICA.

NEXT year will be the centenary of Episcopacy in America. In recalling the circumstances of the consecration of the first Bishop in 1781 and of the two next Bishops in 1787, I am only recalling a page of history. But as events, when they are chronicled in books, are sometimes put out of sight, it is well sometimes to bring them before the world in modern periodicals and newspapers. The Church in England was the original institution, from which all the offshoots of nonconformity have sprung—like slips from a parent stem. But in America, those who went out as colonials were naturally Puritans and people who sought greater freedom, than the laws, which were in force in the Mother Country, sanctioned. For those were the miserable days of penal enactments against any religion other than that prescribed by the dominant powers.

The *Mayflower* and other ships carried out men seeking freedom in religion—the Puritan Fathers. In some parts of America the Quakers prevailed, in others Roman Catholics were in the majority, in others the Presbyterian forms were adopted. The Church of England had to take its chance in that land of liberty, and it fared for a long time worse than other forms, because having no Bishops it had not the power of reproducing itself. Ordained ministers might go out on their own account, or be sent out by the venerable Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, but the supplies must be continually renewed from England, as Priests according to Anglican belief could not ordain successors to their own office, much less make a Bishop. This JOHN WESLEY, after his own notion, did at Bristol in 1784, sending out Dr. COKE to America from this country. As early as 1712 there are records of a Committee having been appointed to send out Bishops to America. It has always been supposed that all the Colonies (or Plantations, as it was the fashion to call them) were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. There was said to be an order of Council passed in CHARLES the Second's reign authorizing this. Bishop COMPTON, the Bishop of London, considered the American Churches as attached to his See in 1676. Later on, Bishop GIBSON, not being able to find any documents to support this claim, refused to appoint a Commissary, and afterward the Colonies of America were freed from any Episcopal control.

As it was in the nature of things that for an Episcopal Church Bishops must be appointed to receive and continue the succession, the appeals to England to send out an Episcopate became more and more urgent. As it was feared, in the state of feeling between England and America at that time, that the American Government might take offence at an English Church, connected with the English State, taking upon itself to consecrate Bishops, even though the hands of the Archbishop and Bishops might be laid upon American citizens coming over for consecration, it was thought wise to apply to the small body of the College of Bishops in Scotland (who were not connected with the English powers, and who, therefore, could act without offence), to consecrate a Bishop. And on the

14th of November, 1784, Bishop SEABURY was consecrated at Aberdeen by the then Bishops of ABERDEEN, ROSS and MORAY. This paved the way for the peaceable introduction of other Prelates, and accordingly at Lambeth, on February 4th, 1787, both the Archbishops and two Suffragans of the Southern Province laid their hands on Dr. WHITE and Dr. PROVOST at Lambeth, and they shortly after sailed for America. Thus the succession of that great continent, as regards Episcopacy, unites the strands of both ropes in one—the next generation of Bishops being consecrated by the laying on of hands of one Bishop ordained by the Scottish Episcopacy, and two Bishops deriving their title from the English Episcopalian Church.

The number of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America is stated in the Church Almanack for 1888 as having reached sixty-three. Readers of Dean Hook's "Biography" will remember that the second chapter contains the successful efforts of Hook (then his father's curate at Whippingham), in 1825, to obtain consecration from the Scottish Bishops for Dr. LUSCOMBE, to enable him to look after the interest of the English Episcopal clergy who were officiating in France. There was then the same hesitation on the part of the English ministry, fearing that offence might be taken at any movement on the part of the State Church; and on that account, by consent, the good offices of the small sister Church north of the Tweed—whose Bishops are the descendants of the Nonjurors—were called in, and the youthful Hook preached the consecration sermon very much to his heart's content. The Episcopal Church, which for a time looked languishing, is now making great strides, and will probably carry everything before it. The Pan-Anglican Conferences in 1867 and 1878, at the latter of which one hundred English-speaking Prelates attended, confirms this statement. The Episcopal Church in America is also strong in preachers, of whom Bishop HUNTINGDON, of Central New York, and the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, of Boston, are probably the best known by their printed sermons.

When the Act of 1786 was passed, authorizing the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate Bishops for America—without the usual oaths of supremacy and obedience—it was expressly stated that no one consecrated by virtue of that Act, or receiving Ordination under it, should officiate within the jurisdiction of the Church of England. This clause was repealed in the time of Archbishop HOWLEY, and the first use made of the enlarged liberty was the request of Dr. Hook that Bishop DOANE, of New Jersey, would preach the sermon at the opening of the new parish church of Leeds, which that American Prelate accepted, and preached the sermon on the 2nd of September, 1841. In Canon CARUS' "Life of Bishop McLLVAIN," we find that Prelate preaching to the Undergraduates at Cambridge in the room over the entrance to Trinity College, owing to his being excluded by the Act as it then stood from the University pulpit. Since that time the Churches have been drawn more and more together and interchanged all good offices, as when the Metropolitan of the Canadian Dominion, Bishop FULFORD of Montreal, joined with American Bishops in ordaining American presbyters to the ministry.—GEORGE J. DAVIES.

What could be better than the criticism of the boy who, while standing in front of Niagara and listening to the deafening rush of many waters, said, "Mother, I feel like taking off my hat to God?"

LENIENT THOUGHTS.

THE SECOND OBJECT OF MAN'S DEVOTION SHOULD BE HIS OWN SANCTIFICATION. THE REASONS WHY HE SHOULD SEEK IT.

THE second object of true devotion is man's own sanctification. He should desire it effectually, not as an embellishment and the perfection of his soul, but as something which God has commanded; which is agreeable to Him, and which contributes to His glory. He should not strive to acquire virtues merely to please himself in them, but to please God. Indeed, he should not even consider whether their acquisition be pleasing to himself or not; but he should act with honesty and simplicity, without seeking to bear witness to himself of the goodness of his actions. Furthermore, he should carefully avoid all sin and all imperfection, not merely because it would be a pollution and deformity of his soul, but because it is an offence to God; a disorder which wounds His infinite sanctity and purity; an object which is odious to Him, and which provokes His indignation. And, while the devoted Christian is sorry toward God for any fault he has committed, he should at the same time be glad of the feeling of shame and humiliation it has produced in himself. He should aspire to holiness, not to possess it and appropriate it as his own, but to offer it in homage to God; to render to God all the glory of it, because He is its only source. He should desire to be holy, not according to his own way or his own idea, but according to the way and the idea of God. He must not forget that his sanctification is much more the work of God than of himself; that, even if he should labour to attain it by himself, he would only spoil the work. The work of sanctification belongs to God to begin, to continue, and to finish. It must be left to Him to accomplish this great work. Man should place no obstacle in the way, but should second God's sanctifying work by his consent and co-operation. In short he should not aim at a sublime sanctity by a false elevation of sentiment, or by a jealous emulation of certain privileged souls; but he should wish only to fulfil the measure of holiness to which God calls him; to correspond with the grace he has received, and to be faithful according to his ability; content with having received only one talent, provided he may double it, as if he had received either five or ten talents.

THIRD OBJECT OF OUR DEVOTION. OUR HAPPINESS.

The third object of our devotion, that which interests us the most, is our happiness. It is inseparably attached to our devotion to God. To be happy is to be united to a sovereign Good, and devotion begins this union here in time to consummate it in eternity. Our happiness is an essential result of our sanctification; because it is a fixed principle, that whatever tends to make us better tends also to make us happier. Perfection and happiness are linked together as cause and effect. This is true, even with regard to God; for in Him felicity is not so much a perfection, as the result of all His infinite perfections. It is, then, unquestionably true, that devotion, rightly understood and rightly practised, is the source, the only source, of solid happiness that man can taste on earth. But this passing happiness is only a shadow when we compare it with the eternal beatitude promised by God to those who have been devoted to Him. God, in thinking of His own glory, has not neglected our interests, but has made the two a mutual dependence; so that in our submis-