

The *Church Review* has the following:—“The recent movements in favour of lay help in the Church are beginning to show some signs of practical result. In several instances stately laymen have been asked to take part and even to deliver discourses in connection with flower services in mission rooms. And now we hear that the Rev. G. W. Reynolds, rector of St. Mark's, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, has arranged for a shortened service (which has received the sanction of the Bishop), and an address to be given in one of his school-rooms at half past ten on Sunday mornings. The service will be entirely in the hands of laymen, and will last only about three quarters of an hour. It is intended for mothers and families and other persons who are not able to attend the larger services in church, and likewise for those who are unwilling to enter the sacred edifice from compunction or prejudice. Such an arrangement is so obviously in accordance with common sense and good judgment, and so much hope does it raise of reaching classes hitherto unnoticed, that it will be a matter for surprise if it is not adopted in many of our crowded town parishes.”

THE GRAHAMSTOWN DECISION.

THE Privy Council Judicial Committee has just given a very important decision seriously affecting the Church in South Africa. The suit had been brought by the Bishop to restrain the Dean from performing any ecclesiastical functions in the cathedral or elsewhere in his diocese, he having been suspended from his office as priest, according to the canons of the Church in South Africa. The judgment of the Court was adverse to the cause of the Bishop. In the decision read by Sir ARTHUR HOBHOUSE it was stated:—“In determining the question of the identity of the Church in South Africa with the Church of England as by law established, their lordships must consider the substantial identity of the standards of the two Churches. Their lordships were not prepared to say that the general acts of the Synod were such as to disconnect the South African Church from the Church of England; and those which seemed most to do so were attributable to difference of circumstances, and not to divergence of views. But the constitution of the South African Church contained a proviso declaring that in the interpretation of the Church's formularies it would be bound by its own tribunals.” Their lordships therefore advised her Majesty to dismiss the appeal with costs. They also recommended, as the Court below had already done, that further legislation would be the best and, in fact, the only remedy for the grievance complained of.

THE SITUATION IN EGYPT.

THE land of the Pharaohs is now occupying a full share of the world's attention, and events are taking place in connection with that celebrated country, which may at any moment set a great many nations at war with each other. England, with a “peace at any price” prime minister, is making preparations for war on a scale she has never made before. The “situation” is, therefore, sufficiently alarming, and the crisis is imminent. It is known to every one that Egypt is a province of Turkey, and owes to her a certain amount of allegiance. MEHEMET ALI, some years ago, with his son IBRAHIM PASHA, under the special patronage of France, pretty nearly made Egypt independent; and, indeed, carried on the war against

Turkey so vigorously and so successfully that, had it not been for England's interference at St. Jean d'Acre, under Admiral NAPIER, Turkey would doubtless long before this have been blotted from the list of nations. MEHEMET ALI was, however, established in a considerable amount of practical independence, which was accomplished by several firmans of the Sultan. These firmans were consolidated in one dated June 8th, 1878, by which it is declared that the Khedivate is to be hereditary according to the law of promogeniture; that the civil and financial administration of the country is to belong absolutely to the Khedive; that he shall have power to contract loans, make conventions with foreign powers, as to customs, trade, and treatment of aliens (without interfering) with the political treaties of the Sublime Porte), to increase or diminish at pleasure the number of Egyptian troops, and to appoint all military and civil officers up to the rank of “Colonel” and “Raubei-Sanik.” Ironclads were not to be constructed without special permission from the Sultan. The firman closes with the admonition:—“Thou wilt also pay great attention to remitting to my Imperial Treasury every year without delay, and in its entirety, the fixed tribute of 150,000 purses.”

Before long the Khedive had so far exercised his power to contract debts as to bring him into disagreeable relations with European capitalists generally. He became bankrupt, or something like it, and on examination it became evident that the “fellaheen” or poor land-cultivators were cruelly and wastefully plundered. The European money lenders made themselves heard. The Governments of France and England supported them with different degrees of urgency—France, as usual, asserting more energetically the rights of her bond-holders, and England laying greater stress on the oppression of the people and the mismanagement of the finances. The result was, that in accordance with the advice of a European Commission of Inquiry, the Khedive ISMAIL established a certain check on his own authority in the shape of a Council, presided over by NUBAR PASHA, an advanced Oriental, and comprising two Europeans, Mr. RIVERS WILSON as Minister of Finance, and M. DE BLIGNIERES as Minister of Public Works, the Khedive declaring in an official communication to NUBAR PASHA in August, 1870, that he wished to govern Egypt “with and by his council of ministers.” But the Khedive and the whole tribe of military and civil officers who had profited by the old system, soon became dissatisfied. A military tumult broke out; NUBAR PASHA was dismissed, Prince TEWFIK, son of ISMAIL, took his place as Prime Minister; the European ministers were dismissed by ISMAIL, and the old extortionate system was resumed.

On the 18th of June, 1878, England and France advised ISMAIL to abdicate in favour of his son TEWFIK. Their advice not being followed, they procured from the Sultan his deposition and the substitution of TEWFIK. This was done on the 26th—the whole proceedings of eight days having taken place by telegraph. The Sultan then announced his intention of revoking the firman of 1878. To this the English and especially the French objected, and he had to content himself with the issue of a firman modifying the charter of 1878, by requiring the Khedive to communicate to the Porte all conventions with foreign countries before they were promulgated, by limiting his army to 18,000 men, and by depriving him of the power of building ships of war or contracting new loans, except as part of an arrangement for setting straight his

present difficulties. The two European ex-Ministers were not replaced, but as Controllers of Finance, Major BARING and M. DE BLIGNIERES were placed in a position of commanding influence, and European officers continued a charge on Egyptian finance in numbers which may be guessed at from the fact that now their names occupy twenty columns of small print in a Foreign Office Blue Book.

Now then, in 1882, the Sultan and his Pashas are on the watch for recovering their former hold on Egypt—with its usual accompaniments, extortion and misgovernment. The same is the case with the bulk of civil and military officials. The bond-holders remain eager for their spoils. Then come the European officials, alleged by themselves and their friends to be engaged in improving the condition of the country, but represented by those who have the ear of the people, to be “infidel locusts.” Behind all these stands the army, now under the control of ARABI PASHA as representing Pan-Islamism, and naturally inclined to ally themselves with the official party in order to shake off Christian influence. Over against army, priests, and officials comes the Anglo-French alliance, an object of suspicion alike to Turk and Christian—France devoted to her bond-holders and keenly anxious that the power of the Sultan shall be warded off from Tripoli and Tunis—England not without care for the pecuniary interests of her subjects, anxious too about the Suez Canal and the road to India, professing a desire that the bond-holders shall be satisfied, not at the expense of the fellaheen, but at that of harpies in general, and not indisposed to make use of the Sultan. Out of these circumstances the present state of things has arisen.

IMPROVING OUR SERVICES.

THE VARIOUS REVISIONS.

A THIRD question meets us on the very threshold of our subject, viz.: in passing through the stage of the Reformation, from 1549 to 1661, has the Church of England (as to her use or principles) varied from one standard to another? The common impression certainly is that this is the case,—that the principles illustrated in the first Prayer Book of King EDWARD VI. are very different from those of the last revision. The celebrated “ornaments rubric,” referring as it does to the “Second Year of the Reign of King EDWARD the Sixth,” ought to have warned people from taking this view without limitation; for the “Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration,” cover so wide a range as practically to commit the Church, under this cover, to the principles of which these ornaments were the expression. Of late years, however, some degree of doubt has been strangely thrown upon the unbroken tradition of the binding authority of this rubric. *In vain*,—for we need go no further than the Preface of 1661 to learn that, however many alterations were made for convenience, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, “the main body and essentials of it, as well in the chiefest materials as in the frame and order thereof, have still continued the same unto this day.” Nay, more; that Preface goes on to say, “We are fully persuaded in our judgements (and we here profess it to the world) that the Book, as it stood before established by Law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to sound Doctrine,” &c. Even the Preface of 1552, the second Prayer Book of King EDWARD the Sixth, which changed most,