

"Minister. Into Thy hands I commend my spirit;
Answer. For Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, Thou
God of truth.

Minister. Keep me as the apple of an eye;

Answer. Hide me under the shadow of Thy wings."

After the singing of the first four words of the antiphon, "Lord grant us Thy light, that being rid of the darkness of our hearts, we may come to the true Light, which is Christ," the Nunc Dimittis is sung with the antiphon repeated in full. The Office concludes with the collect for the day, to which is added, as of obligation, either the third collect at Evening, or another for light in the night, a sinless rest, a waking to God's service, and an eventual coming "in peace and safety to the waking of the great day."

Here may be added at the discretion of the minister any prayers from the Prayer Book, or "from this Book," the office concluding as follows:—

"Minister. Bless we the Lord.

Answer. Thanks be to God.

Minister. The Almighty Lord grant us a quiet night and a good end.

Answer. Amen."

The Apostolic benediction terminates the office than which nothing can be simpler or more fitting for the last service on Sunday or on any other day.

As a hint that the revival of the old hours of prayer is advisable the book provides services to be held "at Early Morning," "at noon" and at other hours, all very short and all very beautiful, but still lacking the compulsory use of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed—an objection which, of course, might be in part overruled by the discretion given the minister of adding the collects or prayers from the Prayer Book or "from this Book." These offices, however, will probably be issued as supplementary, and will either be bound up at the end of the Prayer Book, or with the Hymnal.

In the Litany a few verbal alterations have been made to bring it more into accord with the Anglican form, and the lately added suffrage for the increase of the ministry has been altered and incorporated with that for bishops, priests and deacons.

As to the occasional prayers and thanksgivings there have been added prayers for "Fruitful Seasons" at Rogationtide, for a "person, or persons on a journey," for the "unity of God's people," for "missions," for "those who labour in the Gospel," thanksgiving for a "child's recovery from sickness," for a "safe return from voyage or travel," that for a "safe return from sea" being omitted. "A penitential office for Ash Wednesday" is to be inserted "after the prayer and thanksgivings upon several occasions" there being said at the end the collect from the Anglican Prayer Book, "O God, whose nature and property," &c., and the benediction, "The Lord bless us and keep us" &c., omitting from the Prayer Book the second rubric after the collect for Ash Wednesday and the prayers at present following it.

The offices for the Sacrament of Baptism provides that, "instead of the question . . . 'Dost thou believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed?' with its answer, there be substituted 'the Creed in an interrogatory form, as in the Anglican office. It is also added that, 'the thanksgiving after the Lord's Prayer in the office for Adult Baptism be the same as in the office of Public Baptism of Infants, the word 'Infant' being changed to 'Persons' &c. In the second rubric, at the end of the Office of Adult Baptism, for the word "performed" is substituted the word "administered," and there are added to the rubric these words, "And in case of great necessity, the minister may begin with the questions addressed to the candidate and end with the thanksgiving following the baptism." An additional rubric has also been placed at the end of the Office of Adult Baptism, allowing for the hypothetical or conditional baptism of those who are in doubt concerning their baptism, the following words being prefixed to the ordinary form, "If thou art not already baptized, N. I baptize thee" &c.

In the Catechism, after the first answer "N. or M." there shall be added ["Here let the child distinctly pronounce his Christian name."]

In a future letter shall be noticed the alterations in the Offices for Confirmation, Holy Matrimony, the Ordinal, the Visitation of the Sick, the Communion Sick, the Burial of the Dead, the Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving, and the Institution of Ministers, a special Collect, Epistle (Eph. ii. 19), and Gospel (St. John xiv. 28) being added to be used at Ecclesiastical Conventions, the proper Preface being that for Whitsuntide, omitting the words "as at this time."

A LEVELLING UP TENDENCY.

So far as the proposed revision goes, its tendency is, on the whole, towards levelling-up, and bringing the American Offices and Liturgy into line with the old Church traditions and forms. This tendency might have been shown with greater courage, if to the new occasional offices had been offered one for the blessing of oil for the anointing of the sick, and for use at Baptism, Confirmation, the ordination of priests

and the consecration of bishops, as well as special offices for the setting apart of deaconesses, lay-readers, and choir men and boys. There is no use in half-doing the business, and though it would be absurd to think that such an unprogressive body as the General Convention would dream of passing even in a decade, still there is every reason for letting it see what the great body of Churchmen expects in time and what before very long they will demand. The restoration of the union of the sick, and ofunction at the offices already spoken of, is already being clamorously called for, not so much, perhaps, in the East as in the West and North-West districts in which the Church is far more aggressive and zealous than she is in our more sober and our older dioceses. But in the West the people are sharper and see more quickly the logical outcome of doctrinal teaching. And seeing it, they demand that the teaching shall be at least as objective as it is subjective. Hence what is called advanced ritual is far more the rule out there than it is here. It is not too much to say that in the diocese of Springfield, for instance, there is only one church, and that only just founded and built, in which Low Church views are taught, and in which the altar is not furnished with cross and candles. In every other parish altar lights and eucharistic vestments are the rule. In the diocese of Chicago, it is doubtful if there is a Low Church parish—in the sense in which Canadians speak of Low Churchism. All of that school became "Reformed Episcopalians,"—a schism which is rapidly dying out in these United States. As to the interiors of our churches, except in Virginia where the bishop will not allow "even flowers upon the altar, and in West Virginia where altar crosses are quite the exception, even in districts where the sentiment is pronouncedly Protestant Episcopal—with Protestant emphasized, stone altars are by no means uncommon, altar crosses flanked by flower vases are the rule, and the black gown in the pulpit is a something unheard of. In the great majority of churches an altar proper, not a mere table, stands at the wall of the chancel,—often where there is a table the top consists of a marble slab. Sometimes, as in the wild of the Shawangunk Mountains, a spur of the Catskills in New York State, in the diocese of New York, the summer visitor finds himself worshipping in a church where the Eucharistic lights and vesper candles are lit, as a matter of course, without a word of remonstrance from the population; and this in a region where the Dutch Reformed Communion in all its blackest Calvinism holds absolute sway. In Georgia, whose bishop is a most thorough going, though a large hearted, genial, Protestant, you will see the colored people kneeling round an altar, high raised above the already elevated chancel, ornamented with a large cross, and decked with the richest flowers, while the priest, perhaps in full Eucharistic vestments, certainly with a stole of the proper color, celebrates facing Eastward and elevates the consecrated elements high above his head, while the negroes bow in worship. In fact, even the Virginians, the eastward position at the Altar, at least at and after the Prayer of Consecration, is that which is adopted by nearly every bishop and priest in the American Church; and this without any compromise, without any halfwayism at the north corner. The only exceptions to this rule are a few ultras who, looking on the Eastward position as Popish, adopt the papal practice of placing the Altar on a chord in the apse, or well out from the chancel wall, and then consecrating from behind it with their faces to the people, the plan pursued by the Pope of Rome and all who, with his permission, officiate at the high altar in any of the basilicas in Rome. Thus extremes meet. But, taken all round, the amount of tolerance in the American Church is amazing to strangers, who have seen how great stress is laid upon the observance or the non-observance of certain matters of ritual by those who elsewhere side with the Church Associationists or the extreme wing of the advanced ritualistic party. It will thus be seen that the lines fall to the American bishops in much pleasanter places than to those consecrated for England and her colonies. It is true some of the Episcopal and the General Convention half a generation ago fulminated against ritual development. But it is likewise true that of those very fulminators, some now adopt the very practices then complained of, and, as bishops willingly give permission to their priests to go much further ahead, if, thereby, the cause of Christ and his Church may be furthered. Such a persecution and prosecution as that of the Bishop of Lincoln would be an utter impossibility in the American Church, and, if attempted would very soon be squelched by the unextinguishable laughter of the whole community.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

The Church press of the United States is much more exercised over the doubtful and despotic power—quite papal in its consequences and assumptions, given to the Archbishop of Canterbury, than over the alleged ritual exercises of the Bishop of Lincoln. It is so common here to see the benediction given by the

bishops of the Church with the accompanying sign of the cross, to kneel while the Agnus Dei is being sung or the absolutions taken at the conclusion of the service: that none trouble to think whether such practices are rubrical or not. As for the Eastward position it is the exception not to adopt it, while the last General Convention authorized the mixed chalice. One paper, the *Living Church*, of Chicago, says that supposing the Bishop of Lincoln suspended or deposed, the sentence would have to be sent round to all the bishops in communion with the Church of England, any of whom, though, of course, unable to restore the prelate to his forfeited see, might refuse to acknowledge the validity of his sentence, might protest against it, and in their own relations with him ignore that sentence. It adds that "the precedents of the ancient Church afford abundant examples of the working of this principle, and it is one which no amount of purely English precedent could possibly annul. How could it? The Bishop of Lincoln has been guilty of no crime against faith or morals; nor has he, argue some Churchmen on this side of the Atlantic, done anything more than return to ancient Catholic practice in ritual. Others while disagreeing with Dr. King's methods fail to see how such matters can possibly be construed into breaches of the law sufficiently grave as to involve suspension or deposition. The intervention of the Archbishop of Canterbury, they regarded as the employment of a monster gun to demolish a butterfly.

WHO REALLY OPPOSE CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The real opponents of Christian Unity are not the bishops, the clergy, and the laity of the American Church, who have so long held out the olive branch to the sects, even to the extent of appearing somewhat to compromise the Church's position. The obstacles come from the sectarians themselves, who do not wish to go back on their old hard sayings against the Church as a narrow bigoted body. The latest evidence of this spirit comes from the State of Missouri, whose Normal institute, a purely secular and non-religious establishment is at Kirksville. It has been the custom there, as elsewhere, for ministers of the denominations to preach the graduating sermon. Up to this year the Church had never been invited to do so, but the other-day a St. Louis priest, the Rev. S. H. Green, was called upon to perform this duty. In order that those assembled might take an intelligent part in the religious proceedings, he had leaflet copies of a shortened form of Morning Prayer brought for distribution among them. The ministers of the sects got mad, and insisted that this would shut them out from participating in the "religious exercises," which they claimed they had the right to do. Mr. Green, forgetting how impossible it is to pretend to please all parties, so arranged it that they should do something. This something was not sufficient for the many headed monster thing whose virulence exceeded that of Cerberus. They positively declined to allow that, in a distinctively non-religious institution, any distinctively religious service should be held; though hitherto such services, according to the distinctively religious forms and doctrines of Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregationalist, or Universalist had been held without one word of complaint. Mr. Green weakly consented to modify his proposed service in such a way as to preserve only such features as the reading of the Scripture lessons and the Psalms for the day. He took nothing by his motion; however, as the preachers refused with vehemence to either to read or to be present to hear read any parts at all of the Church's service or any "form" whatever that was not theirs. Under such circumstances Mr. Green most properly refused to officiate, and the denominations had it all their own way. Strike high, strike low, there's no pleasing them. Like Rome they must have everything or nothing.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear, over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

DR. CHANNING AS AN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—I read with great pleasure your article (taken from *Scottish Guardian*) under above heading in the *DOMINION CHURCHMAN* of July 4th. After reading "Robert Elsmere" and "John Ward, Preacher," we have a great need to remind ourselves every now and then not only of the persons named in the article itself, but of such an one as Newman, brother to the Cardinal, and author of "The Crimes of the Houses of Hapsburg." If there are any of your clerical readers who have a desire to peruse a good book on the false position of "Rena" and of the "Tubingen" school

of German personal Evidence shall & knew who was neither "Churchman" can Liter for God." "The Ch the studie bring this I extract "Channing a man like tian like a taken for he been s idea of rec have prese majesty. the Unitar States, an When i great plea known U al Portlan remember my friend "a few Pa and I do n ing, that as "again cal doctri desire to n now borne Palace," l which I b carefully. to do this. of all of ou Theologice Cambridge and the "e we ought those who

Mich. D

PER

SIR,—W attention c tolerated b fraught wi In order go slightly Having tion with 4 for obvious notice. A ten request on the chu the 11th M when I w Usual gree himself as of my with mind of an tended, and thought I b the case. I gregation t favourable recent disc The attes distinctly r my informa tissement w Now, Mr tion I claim gent. Whe ciple is adv Church. It in this "ci of Christian unesemly b gence in th public pres instance oth have to cul munion. V acknowledge Note wha ject:— "I would that can be rendering y and levell tion. This party for w shame, but