

The well-worn, but never failing cry of Romanism in relation to this subject is another of those objections which springs from supreme ignorance of the topic under discussion. It is an error to suppose that people should come to church in time of service to say their private prayers. That is a relic of Papistry, and is what Romanists practice now. Catholic usage distinguishes plainly between *public* worship and *private* prayer, and makes the distinction by the very *method* of saying. This peculiar voice of prayer is the outgrowth of men's natural instincts. It was heard before Rome was Christianized, and it will continue to be heard until that day when the wants and sorrows of earth shall be satisfied and soothed by the fullness and bliss of Heaven. It is used in the ancient Churches of the East, whose anti-Romanism is well known to every student of their history. It was adopted, subsequently to the Reformation, by the followers of Luther in Germany, although, with many other good things, it has there fallen into disuse; it prevails to this hour among the Lutherans of Sweden and Iceland; it has never ceased to be heard (except during the Great Rebellion) in the Cathedrals of England. We might as well refuse to eat and drink, because the Romanist in these particulars follows the laws and promptings of his nature, as denounce as peculiarly Romish a mode of prayer which springs inevitably from the laws and longings which our Heavenly Father has implanted within us. But there is nothing in the Service of the Church of Rome which can be likened to the full monotonic response of the Prayer Book. Indeed, any one who has ever attended a Romish Service will not be much at a loss to say where that Service finds imitators amongst the Churches of Canada. The Service of Rome is a *performance* confined, so far as action is concerned to a few—the priest, his attendants, and the choir; the people are not expected to respond. The half-whispered, half-muttered response common in many "Protestant" Churches is as close an imitation as circumstances allow of this private worship of Romanists in their Churches, while the "minister" and choir monopolize the Service, just as the Romish "priest" and his assistants do.

The objectors to a choral or monotonic response had better look at home for a very close imitation of Romish practice.

## EVANGELICAL CHURCHMANSHIP AND EVANGELICAL ECLECTICISM.

No. I.

We have lately received a pamphlet with the above title, written by the well known author of the Poem, "Yesterday, to-day, and forever," the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth; and we propose giving our readers some extracts from it, as it appears to us to be a remarkable sign of the times, and one of the many proofs of the readiness of the best men to adopt what is good without reference to party lines and prejudices. It is a Paper read at an Evangelical Conference, with a preface, which begins as follows:—

"Is Evangelical Churchmanship changing its front?

"If by this it is meant to ask, Are Evangelical Churchmen willing to surrender one foothold of that great platform of Catholic and Protestant truth which we have received from our fathers? I for one am confident that thousands of the

clergy of our Church and ten times ten thousands of the laity would answer, God forbid.

"But if it is meant, Are Evangelical Churchmen in non-essential matters of ritual—ritual which symbolizes no false doctrine—willing to use for the furtherance of the Gospel the prevalent aesthetic tastes of the age? Facts answer, Yes.

"The surplice in the pulpit, surpliced choirs, and weekly communions, are now to be found in a great number of congregations, which are shepherded by our most trusted Evangelical leaders, men whose fidelity to Protestant truth is as staunch and undeniable as theirs who still adhere to the black gown, the choir of school children and the monthly Communion.

Referring to "the decorations of our Churches with "flowers at Easter and other festivals, and with corn and fruit at Harvest thanksgivings" he says:—

"Herein no other principle seems involved than in Christmas decorations, which are universal. And if it is evidently the general wish of the people and if their pastors think it would legitimately express the joyousness especially of young hearts, I for one see no reason why we as Evangelical Churchmen should refuse to adopt the custom, and to esteem it not an evil but a good.

"I have named in the following paper the *Observance* of Church festivals other than Sundays. Is there any cause why, if our people desire it, we should refuse to include in such observance the celebration of the Lord's Supper on those days? Our Church has provided the Epistle and Gospel.

On the subject of retreats or quiet days, he has the following:—

"May I, however, venture to repeat here some words written by me five years ago: "I do not so much care for the name Retreat (though no other seems to me to express nearly so well the object in view, and I do not see why we should not redeem it as well as Mission), but I do earnestly care for the thing intended, viz. a season of seclusion from the world, and of communion with God and with our brethren, in the midst of the pressing and thronging work of these last days. Many of those who have been present with us have written to me that the time spent here has been to them as the days of heaven upon the earth, from which they have gone back strengthened and refreshed to their ministry, and for which they will thank God for ever. The want is real, and will be supplied. The movement is spreading more widely every month among sound, sober, thoughtful clergymen. If only all our Evangelical leaders and fathers in God will do, what many of them have done and are doing, namely, put themselves at its head, they will direct to a great good a power which will otherwise, in some neighborhoods, be perverted to a great evil. May God grant us to try things that differ, and approve things that are excellent!"

## CHANGE.

FAR be it from us to decry any wise and well-intentioned efforts in the direction of a more reverent and becoming rendering of our services, for we cannot be too particular or too reverent in all and every part of our worship, but let those who are introducing what may be looked upon by some as novelties beware that in their zeal they offend not the laity and drive them into indifference and, finally, into unbelief. Better, far better, to give up everything which is not of Faith than to wound the conscience of even one of the weaker brethren.

The number of "aggrieved parishioners" we are

glad, however, to know is growing less and less every year, while in their place are to be found men and women sympathizing with every honest effort, working in perfect accord with wise and judicious Rectors, who gladly forego matters simply of taste in order to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace. The time has passed when sympathy can be aroused on the one hand for persons who are chronic faultfinders and grumblers, opposed to everything which, to their extremely limited observation, it may be, is not familiar, and on the other, for clergymen who simply for the love of change, or to please their own fancies, and without due and careful consideration, disturb the friendly and Christian relations which should exist between pastor and people. It very frequently happens that the change is simply misunderstood, and a little explanation will set all right, where that fails, we are positive that in no case is it justifiable to cause divisions, and to arouse evil tempers, over matters purely of secondary importance, while souls are being lost for whom Christ died, and it will tax all the energies of the Church and her Clergy to save the world from drifting away from Christ altogether.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### The Vinegar Bible.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—As many of your readers may, like myself, be at a loss to know what the "Vinegar Bible" means, I send you a brief extract from Horne's Introduction in explanation:

"The splendid folio Bible, printed by Basketh, at Oxford, in 1717-16, is commonly termed the *Vinegar Bible*, from an error in the running title at Luke xx., where we read the "*parable of the Vinegar*," instead of the *parable of the Vineyard*."  
C. B.

### The Rubrics.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—In your issue of March 28th, a correspondent "J. E. W." asks—"Are the Rubrics of the Prayer Book the only law or guidance given to clergymen for conducting the Church of England Service?" And your answer is, "yes."

I cannot think you are correct. The Canons of the Provincial Synod of Canada are surely of authority within the Province of Canada, and therefore, if they contain any enactments concerning the Services to be used in Church, they are so far a "law or guidance given to clergymen for conducting the Church of England Service" within the said Province.

In Canon XII., we read—"Be it therefore enacted and declared . . . that the Litany may be said after the third Collect in the order for Evening Prayer, either in lieu of or in addition to the use of the Litany in the order for Morning Prayer." Also, by the same Canon, the clergy are allowed on the ordinary week day to omit from the order of Morning Prayer, the Exhortation, the *Venite*, one Lesson and Canticle, the Lord's Prayer after the Creed, and all the Prayers after the third Collect, except the Prayer of S. Chrysostom and the Grace.

These examples of directions in the Canon, and not in the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, will suffice, and I would, with your permission, refer "J. E. W." to the Canons themselves for others, of which there are several.

Your obdt. servt.

J. E. W. FOWLER.

[We thank our correspondent for drawing attention to our neglect to refer to the Canons of the Provincial Synod, which, of course, are binding upon our Church in Canada.—ED. C. G.]