

Yes! We honor the clergyman who sternly refuses to do this thing; who says, "You can come into my parish, I'll tell you where I lived and labored, you can go to my Bishop and my clerical brethren, you may take any and every honorable way to know me and my work, but not one step will I take to supply your vacant parish."

And we believe that more parishes call clergymen who take this dignified stand than call the candidating ministers. The people who take this course know in their hearts that it is an utter sacrifice of dignity in the man and the minister by whom it is accepted.

The *Living Church* says:—

It is simply amazing,—the unreasonable expectations and demands of some parents as to what the school shall do for their children. They practically take it to be a mere reformatory,—a sort of morals and manners laundry for the soiled products of the home training. They misgovern the children or leave them ungoverned, until they can do nothing with them, and then turn them over to the school, and fault that bitterly if it does not accomplish what they themselves neglected or failed to do. They condemn in particular the corrective severity which is the only cure for the prior evil of home laxity.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—Permit me to ask through your valuable paper, what is the rationale of reading two lessons from the Old Testament together in the Church services, and calling the latter a continuation of the 1st lesson?—e.g., the 5th Sunday after Trinity was also the festival of St. James the Apostle, why not select either, instead of reading both? Again, is any priest justified in only using Morning Prayer without either the Litany or the Ante Communion office? Or is it considered admissible at Evening Prayer to omit such important parts of the service as the Prayer for all conditions of men and the General Thanksgiving. Trusting some reply may be given to the above enquiries.

Yours sincerely,

A LOVER OF ORDER AND DECENCY.

## THE GENERAL THANKSGIVING AND AMFN.

SIR,—The well-known passage you quote from Wheatley about the *Amen* is scarcely more conclusive than the author thought it to be, when he says: "The reason I take to be this," and "I suppose"; evidently showing that in this, as in some other matters, Wheatley felt bound to give a reason, though hardly believing it to be very satisfactory. Granting, however, the rule to be a general one, there are several important exceptions, and all I contend is, the *type used* does not prove any particular case, where anything can be said on the contrary; and as the General Thanksgiving is a special Collect, the absence of any rubrical direction can hardly be decisive. It has not been considered so in other well-known decisions, and as the custom of priest and people repeating it together is by no means a new one, we must be content to let the old customs remain as a "matter of taste."

It is very noticeable that Wheatley's rule is broken by, I think, *universal* consent in the Ter Sanctus and Gloria in Excelsis, and by very general consent in the Collect after the exhortation in the Baptismal office, which is usually said by sponsors and people.

My own study of the Prayer Book has con-

vinced me, and experience confirms the opinion that grandly beautiful as it is, there are literal imperfections, (see the Collects for Easter Day and Monday), and perhaps wise indefiniteness, which allows slight differences even of taste, whilst retaining essential unity and uniformity, so that really all that can be said about the recitation of the General Thanksgiving by the congregation is *I do*, or *I do not* that it should be.

Y. D.

P.S.—By the way the most peculiar custom arising from absence of rubrical direction is where the priest remains standing during the Collects at Evensong, because the words, "all kneeling" are omitted.

SIR,—In regard to what your correspondent says of the General Thanksgiving, I beg to remark, that what he avers of the absence of ritual correctness in the non-recital of it by the congregation with the minister, he is entirely wrong. What he says of the printing of the "Amen," has, in our view, little to do with it. The *title or heading* of the Thanksgiving is of far more consequence. You will please observe then, that the term "general," as found defining the Thanksgiving in question, is employed in contra-distinction to that of *special*, which refers to other forms which follow; the term "general" there prefixed, or the word in question, has evidently this signification, and was so intended by the framers of the Liturgy—as is quite manifest. And then there is this consideration, that it is the summing up as it were of the minor objects included in the foregoing petitions.

As to what your correspondent says of its use in England forty years ago I know nothing; I only know that it was not the custom in that part of England where I lived several years since.

The question, as it would seem, resolves itself into this: Is it rubrical, or is it not? We say most assuredly not. As a matter of expediency it may be adopted, as before intimated. And there seems to be no particular harm in the recital of this part of the service with the clergyman. Yet there is the assertion that it lacks rubrical authority. In regard to the printing of the "Amen" it undoubtedly is as you say. And Wheatley justly says, that wheresoever the people are to join aloud with the minister, there it is printed in Roman, i.e., in the same character with the confession and creed themselves, is a hint to the minister that he is still to go on, and by pronouncing the "Amen" himself to direct the people to do the same, &c.

This of itself, would seem to settle the matter, for Wheatley is deemed by everyone undoubted authority.

Yours,

B.

## PRAYERS FOR THE QUEEN IN U. S.

SIR,—Your otherwise accurate report of the Missionary meetings at Halifax (when the Bishop of Iowa spoke so effectively), errs in making Bishop Perry say that he obtained permission from the *President* to introduce a prayer for the Queen into the service of the Protestant Episcopal Church for the English and Irish settlers. Whatever the *dis-advantages* of an unestablished Church are, one advantage is, we can pray God for whom and what we please, without asking permission of the Executive Head of the Government.

P. E. C. U. S. A.

## THINGS NOT COMMONLY KNOWN ABOUT THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

I. The Episcopal Church of Scotland was once, like the Church of England, the "*Established Church*" of the country.

II. In 1688 it was disestablished and disendowed by William III., Prince of Orange, be-

cause its bishops and clergy refused to recognize him as their king, and remained firmly attached to their rightful monarch, James VII. (II. of England).

III. Shortly afterwards, William III., having swept all the incomes of the bishops and dignitaries into the exchequer, appropriated those of the parochial clergy to the ministers of a Presbyterian sect, and thus set up, on the ruins of the old church, what is now *legally* termed "The Church of Scotland;" which derives all its endowments from the plunder of the ancient Church.

IV. But the Episcopal Church, though in poverty and destitution, still continued to exist, and kept up with the most faithful and conscientious care the Episcopal succession to the Apostolic ministry, thus providing for the continuance of the due administration, in the Church, of Christ's Word and Sacrament.

V. From 1746 to 1792, the members of the Episcopal Church (having always warmly supported the cause of James, commonly called "the Pretender," and Prince Charles Edward against the usurping monarchs, and persisting in the refusal to recognize as king anyone not of the House of Stuart) were placed under the most severe Penal Statutes: it was made illegal for them to possess any churches or chapels; those which had remained in the country districts were ruthlessly burnt; those in towns were ordered to be pulled down at the expense, if not with the hands, of the Episcopalians themselves; all public service was forbidden; more than four persons, besides the family, were not permitted to meet for Divine worship in any house, the penalty incurred by the officiating priest for disregard of this prohibition being, for *first* offence, six months' imprisonment; for *second* offence, transportation for life.

VI. During all this time, the Church of England raised not a single voice of remonstrance against this cruel persecution; and thus, though herself in spiritual communion with the Episcopal Church of Scotland, tacitly approved of it all.

VII. Notwithstanding the malice of the enemies of our Church, and the indifference of those who should have been her friends, the Bishops in Scotland, in 1784, consecrated Dr. Seabury as the first Bishop of the American Church; the consecration took place secretly, in the upper room of a house in Aberdeen; and *through that act, done by the venerable Prelates of our Church in their hour of bitterest adversity*, the Episcopal Church of Scotland became the Mother-Church of the Episcopal Church of America, now the largest portion of the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic.

VIII. In 1792, the Penal Statutes were relaxed; but through the bitterness of the persecution, the clergy had been reduced to 40, and the bishops to 4; where, a century before, there had been 2 archbishops, 12 bishops, and 1,000 clergy. There are now 7 bishops and about 230 clergy.

IX. Thus the Episcopal Church of Scotland has continued to exist till this day; now (thanks be to God!) in freedom from persecution, but yet crippled on all sides by her poverty; sorely wanting men to labor in her fold; and (without which men cannot be maintained) money. She humbly asks, and gratefully receives, the offerings of the faithful to assist her in witnessing for the "one faith which was once delivered to the saints;" it is her *work*, under the Divine blessing, to win back the people of this country, from the various conflicting forms of Presbyterian and Calvinistic error, to the "faith of their fathers." The Episcopal Church is, therefore, what it claims to be, "The Old Church of Scotland." S. G.

—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*