

upside down" went hither and thither, securing a great amount of persecution, this kind of uniformity has ever been the most certain of toleration among worldly men. The subject is alluded to by Canon Trevor, with telling force, in his recent letter to the *Times*, in which he remarks that the questions now disputed among Churchmen have been debated ever since the present prayer book was first established. They have been treated of by all Church commentators. He says: "A vast amount of diversity of ritual existed in the Church of England before the Reformation, and in spite of the efforts of the Roman Curia, a good deal is found on the Continent still. The chief effect of our own Acts of Uniformity was to establish Dissent. The uniformity of neglect was all they secured within the Church. Clergymen of my age, who have officiated in many Churches, smile when they are told of the unbroken usage of the Established Church. We have witnessed and gone through a long succession of ritual changes, and each was thought an improvement, arising from a higher sense of duty. . . . The new thing is prosecution. Before, we were content to argue and work. Can there be a question which answered best?" And he adds: "Thoughtful men are asking themselves how long any Church can endure the spectacle of zealous, if mistaken, clergymen being suspended and deprived by a court of law on points which all churches, and our own most emphatically, have pronounced to be indifferent."

Canon Trevor also points out with much clearness, the inconsistencies of the judgments pronounced by the highest court of the realm on some of these comparatively frivolous questions. As he remarks, nearly twenty years ago, the judicial committee, with Archbishop Sumner and the present Archbishop of Canterbury, decided that "the same dresses and the same utensils or articles which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., may still be used." (Knightsbridge Churches' case, 1857). This sanctioned the use of albe, vestment, cope, and tunicle for some services, and surplices and hoods for others. Then, in 1871, the judicial committee, consisting of Lord Chancellor Hatherly, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London and Lord Chelmsford, adopted the ruling of 1857, but "with a qualification that made the Canons of 1603 the ultimate authority, instead of the Rubrics of 1549; and these Canons require copes in Cathedral Churches, and surplices everywhere else. The Bishop of London being a party to the judgment, put on a purple cloak, such as no Bishop of London had ever worn before. One or two others took to scarlet, but the majority retain the black satin and lawn. So that the Canon remarks: "It can hardly be wondered at that the clergy who had used these vestments for fourteen years, on the authority of the Supreme tribunal, demurred to abandon them on a construction entirely novel, and delivered in an undefended case."

Another glaring inconsistency is pointed out by Canon Trevor, which is in reference to the eastward position. In 1868, the judicial committee, consisting of the present Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of York, Lords

Chelmsford and Westbury, with Sir W. Erle and Sir J. W. Colville, decided that the words, "standing before the table," in the rubric, before the Prayer of Consecration, apply to the whole sentence, and, therefore, also to the entire prayer itself and the acts accompanying it. So that they not only legalized, but prescribed the eastward position. But with marvellous inconsistency, as well as with amazing acumen, in 1871, the Court decided that only the word "standing" applies to the prayer; and that the whole service ought to be performed without coming before the table at all!

With these contradictory decisions before them, when the clergy in England are reminded that they ought to obey the law, they may well ask—which law? whether Canon law, Parliamentary law, or Judge law? If Judge law, which of them? Is it to be the decision the Archbishop of Canterbury helped to give in 1857, or that for which his Grace contends, twenty years later? Lord Penzance, with wonderful simplicity, and with the most perfect innocence of all ecclesiastical knowledge, cuts the knot by accepting the latest decision of the Judges, whether the case was defended or not.

In the meantime, we, in Canada, may have some cause to be thankful that we are very little troubled with these questions. We occupy a position similar to that claimed by Canon Trevor, when he says: "We bystanders survey the combat with amazement and distress." At the same time, it may not be very unprofitable for us to ask ourselves whether, in many cases, ours is not the *uniformity of neglect*.

THE PAROCHIAL MISSION.—NO. IX.

THE WORK OF PRAYER IN THE MISSION.

"SUCCESS will depend, under the good hand of our God upon us upon the amount of pains taken before, and the amount of pains taken after the Mission; and no one ought to have requested a Missioner to come into his parish who is not prepared to take that pains. In this, indeed, lies the peril of the enterprise."

The above weighty sentences were uttered recently by the Bishop of Manchester, England, in relation to an extensive mission, (in which eighty parishes are to take part), that is to be held in that city, in the month of January, 1877. They suggest most valuable thoughts, upon which we would fain enlarge a little.

What are these "pains" of which the Bishop speaks, which are so essential to the Mission? and why are they so important?

We have already (DOMINION CHURCHMAN, October 26th), suggested some considerations as to the value of the earlier, that is, the preparatory parts of the mission work. Those considerations have their bearing upon these questions. But we will take up the subject again a different manner, and offer counsel in relation to it upon some definite points.

The most essential of the "pains" the Bishop speaks of is—*Prayer*.

A short time ago we received a letter of

inquiry from a clergyman in the United States, who was about to engage afresh in some Mission Work. Amongst other things he asked this question: Does not the special force of the Mission lie in the after meeting? He acknowledged that some Missions in which he had been previously engaged had largely failed, and he supposed it was on account of the omission of that feature. Our answer to him was that the root of the efficacy of the Mission lies in special prayer, united, and continued. This is a point that has been most strenuously urged by all those who in England have given the fullest attention to the matter.

It is not difficult to get up a series of services, with a number of preachers, that shall be interesting, and from their novelty gather considerable audiences, and therefore pass off very well. But alas! the peril is that the whole thing will *pass off* with but an evanescent influence; with positive injury to some in whom influences are stirred that are never settled to any permanent benefit.

Valuable and effective as Mission Preaching can be, in its right place and due relation to other spiritual agencies, it is a sad mistake to depend upon it as the only spiritual agency employed.

Prayer is that instrument of grace to which most especially and emphatically the promises of the Gospel are made. And in prayer lies the root of the efficacy of every other Gospel instrument. He who thinks he can undertake but one thing, had better gather together those whom he can to pray with him for an outpoured blessing upon his people, than to get his brother clergymen to come and only preach for him.

This, then, is the first particular of "pains" beforehand, that is essential to the Mission. The neglect of it involves many perils.

Suppose a clergyman makes up his mind to have some kind of Mission in connection with the next Lent season; whether it be a complete Mission or a mere week of Services; whether he will engage one Mission Preacher to take the whole charge of it, or will get a dozen to preach at different times in its course; let him begin his work in due season beforehand with prayer.

In the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, June 8, we gave some of the reasons for which it is generally considered best that the Mission should be held before Lent begins. If it be in the season it should be as near the beginning as possible. In 1877 Lent will begin February 14. The "pains" of prayer for the Mission should therefore begin as early after the Epiphany as arrangements can be made.

Let the clergyman, having put other necessary matters in train, get such spiritually-minded persons as he can, even if at first they be only a few, to meet him, once a week, at least, for united special prayer. Let him use a form—they can be obtained from different sources—we can supply prayers that have been so used if desired. Let each of those who pray together take away several copies, one to use privately himself. If they can all agree to use that prayer at the same stated time every day it will put them still