

must be in union with and subject to the See of Rome.*

This fact alone, that the Church of England is the only religious body that has no distinctive appendage to its name, separating it from the rest of Christendom, should make us earnestly consider.

Why is it?

Why are its members simply called Churchmen?

It is simply because it is nothing but part of the One Church, never having separated itself therefrom.

It may, indeed, be asked, 'Is not the addition of England a distinctive mark, as much as the others we have mentioned? We may fully allow that the title in this country is a great anomaly, and a most unfortunate mistake. But it is only a distinctive name in appearance, not in reality. It differs entirely from those we have mentioned. In England it simply meant 'The Church of,' or 'belonging to,' or 'situated in,' that country, and that quite independent of all merely accidental circumstances, such as being 'Established by Law.' It was the Church of England, or of Britain, long before there was one State. It was the unity and organization of this One Church through the land that, as the greatest historians of the present day have said, taught England to be one. She was acknowledged as the 'Church of England in the Magna Charta' (1215), the great foundation of England's liberties, as fully as she has been since the days of the Reformation. The first clause of that Charta, which it must ever be remembered, was wrested from King John chiefly by the energy and determination of Stephen Langton, the Archbishop of Canterbury, runs thus:

'That the Church of England be free, and hold her rights entire, and her liberties inviolate.'

The Church of Christ, wherever it spread, was called the Church first of the chief cities, such as the Church of Jerusalem, of Ephesus, of Corinth, of Rome, and then of the countries—the people of which it won over to the faith. It was in accordance with this general principle that the Church in England was called the 'Church of England.' It will be noted that though England, Scotland, and Ireland now form one Kingdom, the Church in each country is called the Church of England, or of Scotland, or of Ireland, because at the time when the Church was planted in each of those countries they were separate kingdoms.

To call the Church in this country the Church of England, however great may be the anomaly, is simply a relic of the time when colonies were regarded as mere dependencies or parts of the mother country, and therefore the Church in those colonies was still called the Church of the mother country, for lack of any more suitable name. To have called it the Church of Canada,

*At the close of the Council of Trent, in 1563, Pope Pius IV. promulgated Twelve Articles of Faith, as the summary of the decrees of the Council, adding them to the Nicene Creed. These Articles are now required to be confessed by all persons received into the communion of Rome. Nothing, therefore, can be more authoritative. The Tenth Article says:

'I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches: and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome.'

The oath taken by Roman Bishops, at their consecration, has these words:

'I, N., elected to the Church of N., will, from this time forward, be faithful and obedient to the Apostle Peter, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord Pope N., &c.'

The 'Roman Church' is mentioned in three other places in the same document.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the authorized title of that Church is the 'Holy Roman Church.'

or of Australia, would have been considered as allowing those countries too much of an independent position. But now that those colonies have grown into self-governing, and almost independent 'Dominions,' the time has certainly arrived to drop the title that has lost all real meaning and is decidedly deluding to many minds. The name 'Church of England,' out of England, simply means, if it has any meaning at all, 'The Church of the English speaking race.' The Church in the United States calls itself the 'Protestant Episcopal Church,'—a far more unfortunate and objectionable title, for this certainly does partake of 'denominationalism.' The Church of Australia and of South Africa calls itself correctly the Church of Australia and of South Africa.

It is to be sincerely hoped that it will not be long before the country drops the unmeaning addition 'of England,' and refuses any addition to her rightful title 'The Church' of, or in, Canada.—*Church Messenger*.

LITURGICAL V. "FREE" WORSHIP.

There is much to be said both for and against the adoption of a liturgical form of worship, and the subject is one which has frequently been ventilated in conferences and in the public press. The latest discussion of the topic is reported from Saratoga, where the Unitarians are holding a congress and cheerfully congratulating themselves among other matters, on the establishment of no fewer than sixty-one new churches. That so 'advanced' and 'progressive' a body of Christians should, by a preponderance of opinion, decide in favour of a liturgy, is a sign of the times. There was a period when Christian worship was by many supposed to suffer from the observance of anything like forms and ceremonies, and there were people who thought the spirit and the truth of religion could be best developed in bare, barn-like structures. The Church at that time had been for years suffering from a cold formalism, and the people were for reality and inspiration at any cost. Better a converted collier preaching on a pit-bank, they said, if the Lord was with him, than a parson in gown and bands droning out the prayers or reading his sermon in a church from which the life had departed. The Quakers had already given their testimony to the effect that 'the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands.' For a season liturgies were at a discount in the religious world. The time came, however, when it was again realised that the soul of true worship can be clothed by a liturgy as well as by a service in which free prayer and extempore preaching take a prominent part. Of course there were many who had never failed to recognize this, as was natural, when the Anglican liturgy, which has been justly declared 'incomparable,' is considered. That liturgy has been associated and blended with the lives of millions, and there seems every reason to suppose that it will continue its hold on the minds of men, wherever the English tongue is spoken, for a long time yet. It has been the mine from which other liturgies have been hewed, not always with the best success.

With regard to worship no doubt very much depends on how the thing is done. The best of either of the methods is often more inspiring than a mediocre sample of the other. We are told sometimes that a liturgy allows no scope for the reality of living worship, which is best ministered to by the devout utterances of the moment. The defect of 'free' services, however, is their tendency to degenerate into irreverence. An American reporter once described the supplications of a popular minister as 'among the most sublime efforts ever addressed to an intelligent audience. This is indeed a habit into which it must be the easiest thing in the world to fall, and it may perhaps be said

that an audience never listens less to prayer than when it is misdirected toward itself. There is, however, one thing worse than praying and forgetting whom we should address; and that is, praying and forgetting whom we are addressing. It is frequently the case that the supplicatory efforts of our ministers are such as to appear to an unprejudiced hearer to be addresses to a being of exalted rank and high character, but not otherwise differing greatly from those who offer them. Everybody has heard prayers to the Deity of a very extraordinary nature from uneducated men, but it is at once evident in such cases that it is a want of education and not irreverence that gives them their peculiar quality. It is nothing worse than pure ignorance. But familiarity of approach to the Divine Being upon the part of an educated man, perfectly acquainted with the powers of language and the meaning of words, is quite another matter. Again, eloquence of diction is far worse than useless in prayer. Minuteness of detail is needless, even where it is possible. Faith being general and submission general, we err if we begin to specify details as though we were drawing up a legal document to which an omission might prove fatal. What is left to us but the spirit of supreme reverence, alike needful whether we pray or trust or submit, not to be expressed—much less superseded—by any fashion of speech whatever, but perfectly capable of expressing itself without any? This given, the spirit, at any rate, of prayer cannot be absent. This wanting, forms or the absence of forms are equally valueless, and we had better be silent. It may be that neither in the still solemnity of a Friends' meeting nor in the monotonous monotony of the Roman Catholic mass do we find intelligible utterance to the soul; but give us either of these a thousand times over rather than that we should be compelled to listen to a man who almost presumes to give advice to his Maker.

[The foregoing leader from the *Toronto Mail* of the 26th September is not without significance, and is worthy of reproduction in our columns. That a secular paper—and one, too, occupying the leading position in Canada that the *Mail* does—should devote nearly a column of its valuable space to the discussion of the subject, is a sign of the times; that its finding is so strongly in favour of the liturgy of the Church is noteworthy, in view of the fact that probably thousands of its subscribers are worshippers without a form of sound words. Secular papers usually reflect the trend of public opinion, and are careful not to exceed the bounds.—ED.]

RELIGION—SENSIBLE AND PRACTICAL.

Some good people think that a truly religious life is something very different from, and outside of, our everyday life, and that it must be considered and treated accordingly.

This we are sure is a great mistake and leads to endless confusion and trouble. One object of our Lord's coming into this world and clothing Himself with our humanity, was to show men and women how to live, how to live here, how to take part in and discharge the duties of parents, children, neighbors, friends and citizens—studied simply in His earthly life, from His childhood to His death, in what He said, what He did, what He taught in public and in private. In His sermons on the Mount, in the Temple, in the Synagogue, in private families, in His talk with His disciples, with publicans and sinners, with the rich and the poor, with the sick, the sorrowing and the desolate of all classes and conditions; and in all and through all there will be found innumerable precepts and illustrations of what life should be on earth, what principles and spirit should control us in business and in pleasure in each and every rela-