

Church, after the Use of the Church of England," and it was set forth in the year 1548, "by the common agreement and full assent both of the Parliament and Convocations provincial," that is, the two convocations of the provinces of Canterbury and York. It is now usually called "The First Book of Edward the Sixth," or "The Book of the Second Year of Edward the Sixth." "This Liturgy," says Dr. Southey, "was prepared with the same sound judgment which characterised all those measures wherein Cranmer took the lead. It was compiled from the different Romish offices used in this kingdom; whatever was unexceptionable was retained, all that savoured of superstition was discarded; the prayers to the saints were expunged, and all their lying legends; and the people were provided with a Christian ritual in their own tongue. And so judiciously was this done, that while nothing which could offend the feelings of a reasonable Protestant was left, nothing was inserted which should prevent the most conscientious Catholic from joining in the service."

- The committee by whom this book was drawn up, consisted of the following persons:—
1. Archbishop Cranmer. Burnt at Oxford in Queen Mary's reign, March 21, 1556.
 2. Thomas Goodrick, Bishop of Ely.
 3. John Holbeck, Bishop of Lincoln.
 4. George Day, Bishop of Chichester.
 5. John Skip, Bishop of Hereford.
 6. Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster.
 7. Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, afterwards of London, who was burnt at Oxford in Queen Mary's reign, October 16, 1555.
 8. Dr. William May, Dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.
 9. Dr. John Taylor, Dean, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. Deprived in Queen Mary's reign.
 10. Dr. Simon Hayns, Master of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Dean of Exeter.
 11. Dr. John Redman, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Dean of Westminster.
 12. Dr. Richard Cox, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and Almoner to King Edward VI. He was deprived of all his preferments in Queen Mary's reign, and fled to Frankfurt; from whence he returned in the reign of Elizabeth, and was consecrated Bishop of Ely.
 13. Thomas Robinson, Archdeacon of Leicester.

This book, however, was not in all respects approved; and accordingly Archbishop Cranmer, with the assistance of two Reformers, Bucer and Peter Martyn, altered it.—These two eminent foreigners had fled from Germany, on account of the troubles, and taken refuge in this country. Some rites and ceremonies were removed, and some important additions made to the service, especially of the introductory sentences, the confession and absolution, at the commencement of morning and evening prayer. The forms of consecrating archbishops and bishops, of ordering of priests, and making of deacons, were added; and the elements of bread and wine in the communion, were, at Bucer's suggestion, to be received by the people in their hands, and not put by the minister into their mouths, as was to be done according to the first book; and for this reason, that they might not, as had been done, be conveyed secretly away, kept, and abused to superstition and wickedness.

The whole was confirmed in parliament in 1551, and is usually styled "The Second Book of Edward the Sixth," or "The Book of the fifth year of Edward the sixth."

The death of Edward and the advancement of Mary to the throne, after the short reign, if it may be so termed, of Lady Jane Grey, was a severe blow to the cause of Protestantism. The queen's bigoted attachment to popery, and her servile submission to the see of Rome, were soon manifested, not only by acts of fearful cruelty to all who presumed to differ from her on religious matters, but by the public restoration of the idolatry of the mass. But we need not recount the persecutions of this bloody queen, nor tell of the martyrs who, at the stake, witnessed a good confession. By her all Protestant books were prohibited under pain of the severest penalties, and amongst these the Book of Common Prayer. Darkness, indeed, was again beginning to cover the land, and gross darkness the people; but from these calamities it pleased a merciful God soon to deliver our parent country.

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth,—termed in the preface to the present authorized version of the Bible, that "bright occidental star," the act of parliament passed in the previous reign, repealing that by which the Liturgy had been confirmed, was reversed. A committee of divines was appointed to review the two Liturgies of Edward, and to frame from them both, a new Book of Common Prayer. This committee consisted of Dr. Matthew Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Edmund Grindall, afterwards Bishop of London, Dr. Edwin Sandys, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, and six other eminent and pious divines.

The question arose, at first, as to which of the two Liturgies it would be most proper to adopt. But it was at last resolved, that it should be the second; and accordingly an act of parliament was passed, commanding it to be used, "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise." The alteration in the Litany was the expunging the petition "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities;" the addition of the words, in the prayer for the monarch, "strengthen in the true worshipping of thee in righteousness and true holiness of life;" and also in the words addressed to the communicants on the administration of the elements in the Lord's Supper. Other alterations were also made with respect to the situation of the chancel, and the proper place of reading the service; and the clerical vestments forbidden by the second book of Edward, but enjoined by the first, were restored. The prayers for the queen and clergy were added.

In this state the Liturgy remained until the reign of James I.; when, after a conference held at Hampton Court, between the king, with Archbishop Whitgift of Canterbury, and other bishops and divines, on the one side, and Dr. Reynolds, with some other Puritans, on the other,—several forms of thanksgiving were added at the end of the Litany, and the portion of the Catechism relative to the Sacraments was added. In the rubric, at the beginning of the office for private baptism, the words *lawful minister* were inserted, to prevent midwives and laymen from presuming to baptize; a custom which had been allowed by the previous rubrics, from the Romish, and erroneous notion that baptism was not merely generally, but absolutely necessary to salvation.

The Liturgy in this state remained unaltered until the

Restoration. During the Commonwealth, it had been suppressed, and a Directory for public worship had been set forth, under the specious plea that the Common Prayer was a stumbling block in the way of godly persons, both at home and abroad. The order in which the service was to be conducted was laid down, but the prayers to be used were to be left to the discretion of the officiating minister—no directions being given for the introduction of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, or the Ten Commandments. Communicants were to sit at a table, and not to kneel, at the reception of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Baptism was not to be administered at the font, and the signing with the sign of the cross was to be laid aside. There was to be no prayer or ceremony at burials, at the grave or in the church. All holydays were abolished, as vain and superstitious. Meanwhile the Liturgy was not to be used even in private. It was represented as an injurious and soul destroying production; a mixture of popery and heresy. The person who worshipped according to its forms and language, was liable to a fine of five pounds for the first offence, of ten for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third!

Immediately on his taking possession of the throne, Charles II., at the request of several of the Presbyterian ministers, allowed the whole book to be reviewed, and empowered twelve Bishops, with twelve Presbyterian divines, and nine coadjutors, on each side, to consider the alterations deemed necessary to be made. These Commissioners had several meetings at the Savoy, but without coming to any decision. On the Presbyterian side, an entirely new Liturgy, drawn up by Richard Baxter, was proposed to be substituted instead of the old; but this proposal the Bishops entirely rejected. Some alterations, however, were proposed by the Episcopalians, many of which were agreed to by the Convocation in May following. The chief of these alterations were, that several lessons in the calendar were changed for others more suitable to the particular days; the prayers for particular occasions were disjoined from the Litany; and the two prayers used in the ember-weeks, the prayer for the "Parliament," that for all conditions of men, and the general Thanksgiving, were added; several of the Collects were altered, the Epistles and Gospels were taken out of the last translation of the Bible, having been read before according to the old translation: the office for baptism of those of riper years, and the forms of prayer to be used at sea, were added. The whole Liturgy, in fact, was then brought to that state in which it now stands; and was unanimously subscribed by both houses of Convocation of both provinces, on Friday, December 20, 1661.

C. R.

For the Church.

EXORDIUM OF A SERMON PREACHED ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THAT ON WHICH THE RACES WERE HELD.

EXODUS, XXXIX.—Part of 30th verse.—"Holiness to the Lord."

Well brethren!—and now that the follies of the season are fairly brought to a close,—and now that you enjoy some respite and can breathe freely after the varied pressure of your late laborious vanities, do suffer me to ask,—do enquire of your own hearts, "what fruit ye have had in these things whereof (may I not say?) ye are now ashamed."—Since we last met together in this place, another week is gone to join the weeks that have been—is gone, to carry the long catalogue of our doings to the recording angel—is gone, never to return;—and we, short-lived creatures, are so much nearer to our latter end. And have we made a corresponding advance in holiness? have we experienced a commensurate growth in grace? If not, can we discern—do we suspect any cause of our deficiencies and short-comings? and does any one occasion of evil stand out prominently to view in the records of presumptuous sins?—In all honesty, as regards the doings of the past week, did any of you find the race-course, to which so many resorted, a place well suited for communion with God—a scene in which the soul might be readily called up to high and holy musings—transformed from glory to glory—and fashioned for its eternal destinies? Or did not rather every thing about you and around you conspire to drown these and kindred reflections; and if haply a truant thought did whisper of "righteousness, temperance, and of a judgment to come," was it not soon shamed into silence, by the consciousness that the race-ground was indeed but a strange land wherein to bethink oneself of God?

My brethren, let me narrow the compass of my observations. Briefly then, Horse-racing does tend either to promote the glory of God or to dishonour Him. I repeat it, Horse-racing does tend either to promote the glory of God or to dishonour Him. Now "Holiness to the Lord"—the Christian standard of duty,—this is the only question with which as a Christian he is concerned; and surely a question on which Heaven or Hell may hinge, is neither to be carelessly set aside, nor lightly entertained. "I speak unto wise men, judge ye what I say;" and I entreat you to take the Word of God in your hands, and in that spirit which becomes responsible beings, to canvass the subject in all its bearings fairly and calmly and dispassionately; and that you may arrive at a just conclusion, do let me implore you at once to dismiss from your minds all idle prejudices, and to discard that vulgar cant about *hypocriy and fanaticism*, in which the meanest intellect may indulge, but with which alas! but too many, of whom better things might have been expected, will stop their ears against conviction. Nicknames are at best but sorry arguments,—nor are the grave observations urged against races, to be met by counter-statements that they are "good old English sports;" which nothing but an extreme of morbid sanctimoniousness could possibly deny.—Good old English sports!—Now what if I were to term them a *relie of barbarism*? There are many who would support me in this view of the matter, even, on other than religious grounds, and thus issue might not unfairly be joined, on a point of mere assertion. But a few short years ago, precisely the same arguments were adduced in favor of pugilism and cock-fighting. They too were good old English sports—much in the same sense that bribery and corruption were good old English practices;—but now thinking men are generally agreed that it is not a useful pastime to witness two cocks spurring out each others eyes, nor a pleasing employment to encourage two rational animals to bruise and maim each other even for the important purpose of instructing a rabble in the art of self-defence. The tide of popular opinion has now set in strongly against such unmanly diversions, and horse-racing will soon share their fate in public estimation:—let but sound views of religion and morals pervade a community, and the day of these things is for ever gone. I know that it may be said that gambling, and drunkenness, and "revellings and such like,"

are by no means essential constituent parts of these diversions, and that if those who attend them will choose to destroy their own fortunes, and to brutalize themselves, the fault is entirely their own. But granting that they are not the necessary, are they not the natural accompaniments? Ask it of experience. Do they not always go hand in hand together? Were they ever dissociated?—Races without betting! What man who has any character for fashion to lose, or any distinction in society to gain, would think of frequenting them on such terms? Races without any facilities for drinking!—and where would be those crowds which now throng the course? Why, these are the very things which give to these amusements their relish and their zest. The rich man dissipates his money in bets of honour, forgetting too frequently that other and more honourable debts remain unpaid; and the man who has no money to spare, bets in kind, and decides at the price of his own intemperance the relative merits of the contending horses; while high and low, in a vast majority of instances, think a recourse to the bottle a scanty and becoming mode of celebrating their good luck, or drowning the remembrance of adverse fortune, and winding up the excitement of the day.

I will mention a circumstance which came under my own observation,—the allusion to it may seem very childish to some; others may possibly regard it as a fair sample of the effects to be expected from these opportunities of riot and excess. Having been summoned from home on the evening of the first day of the races, I saw immediately on leaving my house, a poor fellow much intoxicated, staggering up to some comrades who were lounging about the street. He had come from the races!—and the tenor of his communication, interspersed, I need hardly say, with fearful oaths, was—"I have lost all my money on that gray horse."—Now I was so fully prepared for such scenes, that this man's remark made but a slight impression upon me at the time, and I am sorry that I lost sight of him; for on afterwards reflecting on what he said, I could not help feeling that it might have been true to the very foot of the letter;—it might have been that he had lost his little all, and that little all the hard earned wages to which an anxious wife and children were looking for their winter's comforts or winter's subsistence, thus cruelly and recklessly squandered! and he himself—it might have been that he had flown to the intoxicating draught as to a friend in distress, and if haply thus to check the keen remorse that was gnawing at his soul!

O these races! I do tremble at the thought of the wretchedness which they must have brought with them in their train; and if I could hope that the promoters of them would not treat with contempt any suggestion which I might offer, I would put it to them to consider solemnly before another season shall return, whether as good citizens and good neighbours,—whether as those who have hearts to feel, and souls to be saved,—whether as dying men, and who must soon be judged,—they do wisely or well to create occasions of falling to themselves and to keep up stumbling blocks in a brother's way.

C. Q.

THE CHURCH.

COBourg, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1838.

We have pleasure in returning to Dr. Chalmers's celebrated Lectures upon church extension, and the practical benefits of an Establishment in religion. The second Lecture of that distinguished divine was attended by crowds of respectable people, comprising many of the nobility and gentry and a vast number of the clergy. After recapitulating briefly the subject of his previous address, he adverted again to the popular prejudices against Church Establishments; and much as this unmeaning outcry is to be deplored, one grand result has been achieved,—the array of arguments and a power of reasoning in favour of Establishments, which has effected the utter demolition of the sinister and shallow sophistry which of late years has been advanced against them. Alluding to the popular prejudices so studiously and unworthily excited, Dr. Chalmers observes,

"In these days of fierce partisanship, when men were borne along in masses, as if by a gregarious impulse, in support of the popular cry, much cool and clear discrimination was not to be expected. A few years ago an American clergyman of the Presbyterian denomination had delivered lectures in Edinburgh when no sooner was the connexion between Church and State mentioned, than a flame was lighted up throughout the meeting. All present were delighted that such a connexion was held in abomination all over America. In a subsequent conversation with that clergyman, he had asked, if a Christian philanthropist should bequeath £10,000 for the erection of churches for a district in Maryland, and for the maintenance of clergymen, whether such an endowment would be rejected as unscriptural? There could be but one answer to that question—that an endowment of that sort, placed under the guardianship of what was deemed a Scriptural Church, and adhering to the supposition that the clergymen under this endowment would be placed not in subordination to the State, but only to their ecclesiastical superiors, must be admitted to be desirable. If so, would it not be equally desirable if, instead of being confined to a small district, the system could be spread over the whole of Maryland?—The transition was not difficult from the one single state of Maryland to the whole of the United States. Would, then, such an endowment, coming from a few individuals, be less desirable if it had emanated from the State some hundred years ago as a separate proprietary?—The rejoinder should be remembered. If this were all that was included in an Establishment—if it only meant maintenance on the part of the State, and uncontaminated theology on the part of the Church, such an arrangement was unquestionably desirable. They deprecated civil authority in religious matters, but they would be thankful to any body who gave them an organized provision for the clergy. This was all he wanted—a legal provision for a christian clergy. When the connexion between Church and State was denounced, an instantaneous effect was produced upon those who did not reason logically, but were borne away by the noise and plaudits of a popular assembly, in which the still small voice of truth was overborne."

This is a practical argument,—easy to be understood, and hard to be answered. The reverend lecturer, after some spirited remarks upon the independence of the Church of Scotland, as to her spiritual jurisdiction, proceeded to shew by a great variety of positions, that the principle of free trade, in the regulations of commerce, was not applicable to a free trade in Christianity; that there was no analogy between the two, for the principle which governed the operations of commerce always proceeded upon the fact, that the demand for the article would create a sufficient supply in the market; and he shewed that, if, in religious instruction, this principle of economists were acted upon, the supply must fluctuate, and would be taken to those places where there was an effective demand for it, that is, where there was money enough to ensure its success. He says, in happy illustration of this point,

"A free trade in common would only exist in places where the demand insured a remunerating return. Religious instruction, under the free trade system, would cease in those places

where there was not money enough to pay for it. The lessons of religion would cease to be taught where they were most wanted. If such a policy were pursued, that religion which was ordered to be preached to the poor would leave the places where most required, and the teachers of that religion would be no longer in a situation to preach its doctrines. Whilst commerce prospered under a system of free trade, religious instruction would shrink into narrower dimensions, and be limited to small fractions of the people. By the constitution of human nature there was a sufficiently intense desire, and, by consequence, a sufficient demand for the articles in which commerce dealt, so as to create a proportionate supply; but there was no such intense desire for the article of Christian instruction. Between the love of gain on the one hand, and the love of enjoyment on the other, the wheels of commerce would continue to move with sufficient velocity; but the reverse of this existed in the article of Christian instruction. It was not with man in his moral as in his animal nature; although it might be true that the longer a man was without food, the more urgent was his desire for it, yet the more ignorant a man was, the less, generally speaking, was his desire for knowledge. The more a man was immersed in vice and voluptuousness, the less was his desire of virtue and holiness. Before a man's moral wants were supplied, an appetite for the supply must be created in him. The less a man had of religion, the less did he care about it."

This is a line of argument which there is no controverting; and we could adduce abundance of facts to shew that, practically speaking, the system of demand and supply in religion, works precisely as Dr. Chalmers has represented it. We have before us some extracts from Dr. Dwight's "Travels in New England and New York," in which it is stated that in 1798 in the State of Connecticut, in which there existed a legal provision for religious instruction, a population of 251,002 souls possessed the services of 194 ministers; whereas in the States south of New England, where no such legal provision existed, a population of 4,033,775 enjoyed the ministrations of only 209 ministers!—a fact, to use the words of that respected individual, which affords "a fair specimen of the natural consequence of establishing, or neglecting to establish, the public worship of God by the law of the land." In further contrasting the respective religious conditions of Rhode-Island and Connecticut, the same judicious writer comes to this conclusion, "A sober man, who knows them both, can hardly hesitate, whatever may have been his original opinion concerning this subject, to believe that a legislature is bound to establish the public worship of God."—We have not space to multiply such testimonies, and must return to the observations of Dr. Chalmers. The advocates of Establishments are often referred to the manner of propagating the Gospel in the primitive days of the Church, as a proof that no other than the voluntary system was then in operation. In reply, however, to this assertion, Dr. Chalmers contended, with a knowledge of ecclesiastical facts not often possessed by those who maintain the contrary position, that

"The Apostles and early teachers of the Gospel had not been paid for their services by those to whom they communicated instruction, but from sources totally distinct. Christianity, in its infancy, was maintained by the few for the good of the many; Christ himself was supported by individuals, and so were the Apostles. It was not the people to whom the Gospel was preached that bore the expenses of it; the receivers of the benefits were not those who bore the expenses. Paul the tent-maker provided bread for Paul the Apostle. They to whom Christianity was preached received not a thing from having bought it, but received a thing given to them. The establishment and endowment of the Church by Constantine was not, therefore, an infringement upon any system of free trade in Christianity existing anterior to the endowment, but a carrying out of a principle which had always been in existence."

After some further observations upon what he terms the free-trade system in religion, and shewing that, on this principle, it could not be maintained even in countries where it was already established, he thus remarks upon its operations in England;

"No one could question the good done in proprietary chapels by such churchmen as Newton, Cecil, Howell, and Daniel Wilson, or by such dissenters as Doddridge, Watts, and Robert Hall, but it did not follow, that because they could supplement, they should supersede the Established Church. Of the chapels founded on the strict principle of free trade, there were but a fortunate few who could carry on their work in entire dependence on the system. In numerous instances the rent of seats, the voluntary offerings, were inadequate, and collections were made, to which the public were contributors, and journeys undertaken to raise money for their support, whereby the buildings were to be rescued from their sore embarrassments.—They had examples every day of the difficulties under which they laboured, the struggles they made, and their frequent applications to the charity of the public." He then proceeded to point out "the total inadequacy of the free-trade system to afford religious instruction to an extended class of the community. There were thousands of the common people who could not be allured into the houses of the dissenters, and there was no house provided by the establishment. What was the reason? Because the establishment was not properly designed to hold forth christianity free of charge.—The great bulk of ordinary workmen were neither church nor chapel-goers. In Glasgow there were 80,000 persons who went to no place of religious instruction. There were 50,000 in Edinburgh, and perhaps 500,000 in London, and in the manufacturing districts of Yorkshire and Lancashire, there might be untold millions. The dealers in things necessary to godliness fell far short of the population, though the dealers in things necessary to support animal life kept pace with it."

The reverend lecturer, after some further observations in the same strain, concluded in these eloquent and forcible terms, which were received with loud and general applause:

"There was a departure from all principle of truth when the truths of the Bible were likened to the ordinary calculations of commerce. The best and greatest interests of society must not be trifled with. He had made use of the word 'cheapness;' he would confess he felt no sympathy with what was called the spirit of the age. The worst effects were to be dreaded from it. It made everything a question of finance. Science, scholarship, religion, were vulgarized, and brought down to a common standard—the standard of the merchant in his counting-house. Some years back there had been a struggle as to the trigonometrical survey of the country; by one vote it was carried; that survey would be hereafter looked upon as the national index for the guidance of posterity. The spirit of the age caused trembling lest a fearful resurrection of a Gothic spirit should arise amongst them. What was that spirit?—a spirit of unsparring retrenchment—a regime of hard and hunger-bitten economy, before the ravenous pruning-hook of whose remorseless reign lay prostrate the noblest interest of the commonwealth—a monster which, in the guise of patriotism, ran through the length and breadth of the land, and eazed not if both religion and philosophy expired. A national establishment was the best expedient for pervading the general mind with the lessons of Christianity. It was not the principle of free-trade in Christianity, the real meaning of which was the principle of 'let alone,' that could secure the interests of religion."

We feel very much obliged to the 'Gospel Messenger,' the 'Christian Witness,' and the 'Southern Churchman' for their kind notice of our humble exertions; and we beg of them, as well as our other contemporaries of the Episcopal Church in the United States, to accept our heartiest reciprocal wishes for their own prosperity and success.

We beg to undeceive our friend of the 'Kingston Chronicle' as to the identity of the authors of 'Alan Fairford' and 'Zadig.' They are different persons; and while the former