

ing a jure divino, while they all represent a later stage of jure humano development. At what stage, then, shall we take our stand for Church unit? What is the essence of the Historic Episcopate in which all can agree?

"History speaks very strongly for the Historic Episcopate. My historic sense not only gives me great respect and veneration for the office, but also leads me to the opinion that the church guided by the Divine Spirit, did not err in its Episcopal government through all these centuries. The abandonment of the Episcopate was not a natural result of the Reformation. It was not a part of the Lutheran movement. The national Lutheran Churches of Denmark and Sweden have retained bishops until the present day."

"Presbyterians might be willing to recognize all sorts of theories of the Episcopate and tolerate all kinds of human weakness and follies in bishops; they could not unite on any of the theories of the Historic Episcopate, but they might unite on the Historic Episcopate itself."

"It is no time for Presbyterians to increase their demands. We should vie with our Episcopal brethren in generosity and self sacrifice. I believe that Presbyterians will rise to the situation so soon as they understand it. I believe that ere long Presbyterians will accept the Proposals of the House of Bishops, and thus show that they have the spirit of accommodation and desire for the unity of Christ's Church that their fathers showed in the Proposals of 1661. We are thankful that after more than three centuries a House of Bishops has accepted all that our fathers proposed."

To be Continued.

A HOMILETICAL DRIFT.

REV. H. D. JENKINS, D.D.

* * * There is a difference between the simple and the crude and one does not need to become bizarre in ceasing to be courtly. A noticeable change strikes us in the use of the personal pronoun "I." It can hardly be doubted that the dropping of the impersonal "we" from our pulpit addresses is a gain in strength. The Church owes more to Henry Ward Beecher for this casting out of the silly "*pluralis majestatis*" than to any one man. But here also the middle ground is the safest. The man who insists upon the back seat is often as vain as the one who claims the front chair. Egotism has no mask; and of all sins against good taste it is most offensive in the pulpit. Nevertheless, one would rather have Dr. Hamilton's formal sinking of his personality, than his successor's introduction of "this wreck, McNeill," in the middle of his discourse.

And we must be permitted to protest also, that the truth has not gained in effectiveness, by a change in style which passes from Hamilton's "ivy leaf and laurel" to McNeill's "wretched little patch of lentils." Can we reach the masses by accepting in the pulpit the language of the tap-room? If the Bible pictures of his predecessor were overwrought, and the description of Solomon "as he sate aloft on his lion-guarded throne * * * arrayed in white and silver, and crowned with a golden coronet" is a bit too ornate, what shall we say of Mr. McNeill's Shammah, who "pulled himself together" before he smote the Philistines with his rude weapon?