

one—but as being no longer serviceable, drop out of view. To the right-thinking man they appear as the swaddling clothes of the church of the immediate future—one might almost say, of the church of to-day.

Why should we allow ourselves to be hampered by persistently observing these petty differences? But do we allow ourselves to be thus hampered? Let us take a glance at our own Church. In recent years our clergy have not allowed themselves to be bound down by hard and fast rules of discipline in conducting divine service. They do not hesitate to act upon conviction when a slight departure from the ordinary routine of service appears to be to the best interests of their congregations. For instance, a responsive rendering of the Psalms is not an unknown thing in our city churches (and, indeed, it would seem that that is the correct way of rendering the Psalms, according to early custom, as is indicated by punctuation in the Hebrew, and more especially by the subject-matter of many of them). Chanting the Psalms is also practised—the warrant, if any were needed, being their musical setting in early Hebrew, which would indicate a still earlier practise. Again, the habitual use of the Lord's Prayer and the ascription of glory in a set form of words is another departure from the former practise of our Church. Many and various little innovations might be mentioned of less importance, but equally significant of progress in the right direction, the temporary character of which is proof positive of a striving after something as yet unattained. Similar variations might be pointed out in other churches. The old-time Presbyterian minister, the opposite extreme to the "Methodist ranter," is scarcely to be found. The time was when the relationship which existed between the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches was of the most exclusive character, not being far surpassed in that regard by that between the Church of England and all the other Protestant denominations. But I question whether now the intimacy which exists between Methodist and Presbyterian, close as it is, is equal to that between Episcopal and Presbyterian. The point to be established is that the churches are *all* growing nearer together; and were it necessary to go more deeply into the question, multiplying instances of increasing affinity of the churches for one another, the task would not be a difficult one.

It seems to me, from a careful consideration of all these facts and circumstances, that it would be of very great service in the further development of the Church in the same direction that the various denominations should have *in common* something more tangible than they now possess. The question arises on all sides: What could we have? I answer: *a liturgy*; *a written form of church service*. My Episcopalian