

in herself the refinements which are the invariable result of long periods of organized social and religious life. Every thing about the Church indicates that the forces which have produced her have been operating for ages. Her architecture, her music, her vestments, her symbols, as well as her orders and her liturgy, are all part and parcel of her inheritance. To be outside of the line is to be deprived of the inheritance. It is by no means an arbitrary arrangement which consigns a member of a comparatively recent religious organization to a poor and mean religious estate. *Their line is not long enough.* However eminent some of their more noteworthy leaders may have been, they are necessarily few. They have not had time to accumulate an intellectual inheritance. Their writers suffer from standing and working alone.

Of all dreams none can be wilder than that which attempts to set a religious influence of one or two hundred years over against a re-influence of two thousand years. We might as well expect a cheap dwelling reared to-day to compare with the storied wealth of a castle of the Middle Ages. It is bad enough to be outside of this line, but to prefer to be outside of it, much more to repudiate and assail it, is like repudiating and assailing civilization itself. It is like boasting of the crudities of frontier life as contrasted with the polish and elegance of a New England or European community. Evidently, those who occupy this position are slaves to the illusions of a singularly inverted conception of things; there is no help for them. When any class of men deliberately exclude themselves from all the enriching influences of the ages of organized Christian sentiment and endeavour, and announce that they like better to be grounded on a platform of *yesterday*, they have reached a hopeless intellectual condition. —*Living Church*

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

The Book of Common Prayer was formed by a compilation of old materials and with a careful observance of the order of the several parts of the ancient services.

The component parts of it may be considered as coeval with the first ages of Christianity, and the greater portion of the prayers have been continually used by our Church for more than 1,300 years. Christian Liturgies were not at first committed to writing, but preserved by memory and practice. The period when they were first written was probably at the end of the third century.

Uses.—Before the Reformation every Christian Church had the liberty, and the Bishop of each Church had the power to improve his own Liturgy by the addition of new ideas, and in process of time different customs arose and became so established as to receive the names of their respective Churches.

These customs were called "uses;" hence the latest, which was set forth before any part we have the several "uses" of York, Lincoln, Exeter, etc., and the most important of all—that of Sarum, compiled by Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, about 1087.

Liturgy.—The word Liturgy denotes any public service, religious or secular. In the present day Liturgy is synonymous with the term Prayer Book.

The Prymer.—This was a manual of private devotions, containing the first lessons of religious belief and practice, or "the first book that the tender youth is instructed in."

For 150 years preceding the Reformation, and probably for a much longer period, the Prymer was the book authorised by the English Church for the private devotion of the people.

The earliest known dates from about 1400 A.D. of the Book of Common Prayer (except the

Litany), was published, was the Prymer of King Henry VIII. (1545). Edward the Sixth Prymer (1553) was only a reprint of this.

Rubrics.—Every religious body has its rules. There must be rules in every society, and the man who keeps to the rules he has solemnly promised to observe seems at least deserving of respect. The rules of our Church as contained in the Book of Common Prayer are called Rubrics, from a Latin word meaning "Red," because they used to be printed, as they often are now, in Red Letters.

They are framed to encourage reverence and attention, and so are not only a guide to our outward behaviour, but an heir to devotion of heart. We learn from these Rubrics and also from the custom of the Church when to stand, when to kneel, when to be silent before God and listen, and when to join the minister.—*Aid to the Book of Common Prayer.*

By R. A. ROGERS.

DIVIDING THE SERVICE.

Mr. Stone's famous hymn, 'The Church's One Foundation,' probably as good a hymn as we have, in two of its lines describes the Church as

"By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distressed."

These lines came into our minds the other day when by great surgical skill one small service was divided into seven parts, taken by clergymen in nearly as many different styles of surplices, most of which were not a fit. An old rule of rhetoric would do for divine service.

Observe the unity of the subject.

When there is no grand function to be carried out, the best rule to be followed in dividing a service is that it should be divided as little as possible, and that for a plain service, only the actual officiants should be vested, especially if more clergy cannot be decently surpliced. The clergyman is not primarily for spectacular purposes.

THE COMMUNION OFFICE.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, the intent of the Communion office is that it should be celebrated entire as to all essentials by one priest. If a Bishop be present in a sanctuary it is only necessary for him to pronounce the Absolution and the Benediction.

If assistance is present it is traditional that one clergyman may read the epistle and another the gospel, while still another may preach the sermon. The gospeller may suitably read the exhortation, and the epistoller may assist with the alms and oblations. The celebrant, however, should not commit the distribution of the elements entirely to his assistants. There is not a shadow of proper precedent for assigning the post communion office to another than the celebrant.—*The American Church Times.*

EDITORIAL NOTES.

ST. ANDREW'S BROTHERHOOD.—This is proving a most vigorous and rapidly increasing organization in the Sister Church of the United States, and we should like to see it more generally adopted by the Canadian Church. In large centres, such as town or city parishes, chapters would be found an invaluable aid. The organ of the Society, the *St. Andrew's Cross*, Chicago and New York, in its February number says:

"A decided interest in the Brotherhood has been aroused among Canadian Churchmen, and organizations having the name, object, and rules as the Brotherhood of St. Andrew have been organized in several parishes. It is hoped that these organizations may band themselves

together into a *Canadian Branch* of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, and that the order may spread throughout the Canadian Church as it has done in the Church of the United States."

We had the pleasure of receiving a call a short time ago from one of the active members of the Chicago Brotherhood (Mr. Oliver) who spoke most enthusiastically of the good results attending the work of the Society there, and who assured us that the officers of the Association in that city would be ready to give all necessary information to those desiring to organize similar societies in Canada. The Secretary is W. R. Stirling, Esq., 115 Dearborn street, Chicago, and the President, James L. Houghteling, Esq., Chicago, either of whom will we feel sure answer any enquiries. And to those who desire to be kept *en rapport* with the doings and progress of the Brotherhood in the United States, we recommend the *St. Andrew's Cross*, published weekly at 50c. per annum.

THE Spirit of 'party' after having been dormant for several years seems to have broken out with additional violence and virulence in the Dioceses of Niagara and Toronto; and both Church and secular papers appear to be doing "their level best" to foster and extend it by publishing every scrap of "news," and inserting every opinion which may be expressed. We feared that this result would follow the formation in this country of an association similar to the Church Defence Association (so called) in England; but we hardly looked for so early and violent a development of the persecuting and prosecuting spirit. We do not propose to enter into the merits of the controversy now being carried on in the Toronto secular papers regarding the opinions (or supposed opinions) of the Rev. Knox-Little on the subjects of Confession, Absolution and The Real Presence. Whatever such opinions be, they are only *his* opinions; and if they do not conform to the teaching of The Church so much the worse for the opinions. But we do deprecate the discussion of such subjects as these in the secular,—yes, even in the religious—papers; and believe that no good can result; nor will the cause of Truth and the interests of The Church be furthered by this course.

Nor will The Church be benefitted in our judgment by the action of the Church Defence Association of Niagara. *Bishop baiting* is being tried in England; but it has not met there with general favor, and will not, we believe, meet with approval here. There are few Bishops in Canada against whose administration the fault-finder might not raise his voice, and that with cause perhaps; and if one Diocesan is supposed to favour students from one Theological College and to exclude those of another, (which is one of the grounds of complaint against the Bishop of Niagara), others of different views favour those alleged to be excluded by his brother prelate. And there is a "compensation" even here. But the bandying back and forward of titles of "Ritualist," "Anti-ritualist," "Romanizer," "Romanizing tendencies," "Protestant and ultra Protestant" convinces none; affords pleasure to the enemies of the Church; and does her grave injury—retarding seriously her progress. There is room within her pale for "many men of many minds"; but there ought to be no room for the mere fault finding persecuting spirit.