and impiously proclaim,—none but a scholar and a gentleman for the ministry even in its humblest duties, must tend to perpetuate the false impressions of the masses, that the Church of England is but the Church of the aristocracy and of respectable worldly men—not the Church of Jesus Ohrist, which desires to preach the Gospel to the poor, and to recognize them lovingly. But for our farmers and tradespeople to see members of their own families wearing the honoured and sacred surplice' and ministering in our Desks and Chancels, could not but be a moving argument to the contrary, could not but gave them a deeper and warmer interest in the Church and all that pertained to her.

And, above all, the endeavour to maintain in its fulness of development and operation, in each and every part, that threefold Ministry which is the gift of the Blessed Trinity for the perfecting of the Church, could not but secure the approbatiou of the Almighty, and bring upon us His grace, according to the "fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ."

I would again repeat, in conclusion, that in

these remarks I have but *touched* a few noticeable points, a full discussion being both beyond my power and beyond my time. Enough, however, has been said to invite discussion; and I have entertained no more ambitions aim.

N. B.—Since the above Essay was written, the writer has met with an important Review article, which furnishes no mean confirmation of the views of the Essay.

The following is an extract :---

"With us, indeed, the true Diaconate may be said to be almost in abeyance; and it is perhaps, represented more exactly by the Scripture Reader in some of our parishes, than by the Clergyman in his first year of ordination. The primative Deacons were half laymen, and such was the position of primitive deaconnesses.

Epiphanius says that they were broadly distinguished from the Presbyters, in that they were not allowed to officiate liturgically."— London Quarterly Review, Oct. 1860, on Deaconnesses.

16