

century. For it was John Wesley who made the saddle horse an important element in the apparatus of an evangelist; he travelled not less than 4,500 miles on horseback every year." The "bike" or bicycle may take the horse's place on English roads, but the roads in Canadian missions still require the missionary's steed—cherished and loved like an Arab's.

ANONYMITY OF AUTHORSHIP is another of those questions about which opinions differ and will continue to do so, though Zola and Tolstoi may dictate a distinct line for their fellows. There are occasions on which the name of an eminent writer adds appreciable value to an article for a special purpose: but, generally speaking, all articles should be good enough to "carry their own weight." Amusing mistakes are made as to authorship of anonymous articles—just as they are made about the age or "bouquet" of wines and teas. We have heard it said, "it is easy to know when so and so writes for such a paper: his style is inimitable," etc.—when *not a word* was written by the said so and so.

ANGLICANS AND ROMANS.—Our finical friend, *Catholic Register*, is exercised over the recent General Synod—because the primate was not appointed by a certain foreign Bishop who resides at an ancient but used up Italian city called Rome. Thanks: we can get along very well, as they did before the Roman dictatorship was invented. Then, however we might like a Pio Nono or Leo, we should steadily object to a Satolli. If we want a guiding or helping hand from abroad, it is easy to go to our own national patriarch at Canterbury. Anyway, we settled our difficulties in apostolic and primitive fashion at the Synod.

IMITATING ROME.—Churchmen are sometimes twitted with imitating the details of Roman Catholic customs, such as clerical dress, architectural crosses, and surpliced choirs, comely altars, etc. There is a grain of truth in this charge—there was a time when Anglicans forgot (in sloth and carelessness) their own immemorial traditions in regard to such things: they are now *reviving*—not borrowing or imitating—these Anglican customs, and they happen to be somewhat like those retained by the Romanists, which in turn happen to be like those of the apostles, being traditional. There is about as much similarity as there is in their Bibles!

"THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS," of which Chicago is so proud, and which the Roman Catholic hierarchy has been trying to *utilize*, does not meet with universal approval even from the disciples of Romanism. Says the *Ave Maria*: "One regrets that the one true religion should have been represented in it. The absence of a representation of the Church at such a Babel (!) would serve to emphasize its superiority and uniqueness, and at the same time give error its own most striking characteristic of diversity." So Archbishop Benson's wise course is endorsed by the enemy (so to speak), and there has been thus demonstrated "the superiority and uniqueness of"—the Anglo-Catholic Church.

"CHRISTIAN ENDEAVORISM," ETC.—A writer in *Arena* dealing with the prospects of a "Free Church for America," says "a society began to work and increase under this name. It seemed as if the coming generation was to realize what Christ so longed to see—'one flock and one shepherd.' But the hireling shepherds took alarm. A portion of the flock was driven off into the

strong-walled Westminster fold: a section turned from the plain into the secluded Baptist river-valley: a large section protected by barbed fencing in the 'Epworth' enclosure." So end many attempts to "hew broken cisterns" to replace Christ's Catholic Church!

A NOVELIST "ON THE RAMPAGE."—Mr. Grant Allan—who has made a success as a romance-weaver—has jumped the fences of his "pent-up Utica" and forgotten *ne sutor ultra crepidam*. In the *Fortnightly Review* he has undertaken to teach the world the folly of the Resurrection doctrine, and takes the tone of an Athenian philosopher translated to the 19th century. Not content with this escapade, he writes in the *National Review* on the "Tuscan nationality." Both articles are full of "outrageous nonsense," and the *Review of Reviews* proceeds to scar him accordingly. A real theologian or historian would pronounce the author to be probably an escaped lunatic. Other novelists take warning!

EXTENSION OF THE DIACONATE—MEDICALLY.—Dr. Belcher has a thoughtful and practical paper in the *Newbury* on the subject of making a selection of reputable medical men to act as "local deacons" of our parishes—duty which they can easily perform without leaving the ruts of their professional practice. This work of Christian physicians is so far analogous to the diaconate function proper as to give plausible color to this proposition. The point is worth considering, and experimenting with to a limited extent.

"FATHER IGNATIUS" CHARACTERIZED.—Among the many descriptions of this eccentric preacher, the following from the *Chicago Evening Journal*, 1890, is too good to be lost: "We think him a pretty clever fellow, a very good Catholic, surprisingly good Anglican, orthodox enough to be a Presbyterian, Scriptural enough to be a Congregationalist, and earnest enough to become a first-class Methodist." Nothing less could describe one who, in a peculiar way, tries to become all things to all men—except Heber Newton and Gore!

MOVABLE ARCHBISHOPRICS, ETC.—The Canadian system of making the dignity of chief Bishops in a province transferable, has great advantages. It is an outcome of the necessities of a new state of things—the creation of an increase in modern colonies, and the evangelization of large areas of the world: and still more it is owing, as a policy, to the change produced by modern civilization. The preminence of such places as Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Milan, Ravenna and Canterbury has disappeared: "the seat of empire" locally removes elsewhere—although such places, as "fountains of evangelization," remain "patriarchates." So, here, Halifax pales before Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, in importance and convenience.

DIGNITY BY SENIORITY is a principle the prevalence of which in new countries is natural and creditable. It may, however, have its inconveniences at times. The "presiding Bishop" of the United States may happen to be, occasionally, a person of comparatively little influence in the community, though long resident or well known. Still the *presumption* is that his long life and official position of long duration create an aroma of their own: and there is no practical inconvenience as long as General Synods are not convened at his see—which may be some "out of the way" place. We cannot always have a Bishop Machray

as senior, or such a central see as Winnipeg, Montreal or Toronto.

THE ELECTORATE OF ROMAN PRIESTS in Ireland who "manipulated" the last elections to the House of Commons, are arraigned by the *flock* in a recent editorial, as vitiating the value of Gladstone's majority in Parliament, and as justifying the *checkmate* of the House of Lords in regard to Home Rule. That majority "represents" not the people, but the Roman priesthood—in fact, the influence of the Roman papacy. There are those who tell us, with good reason, that the representation of Wales is not of much greater value or virtue—but "Dissent" has manipulated it!

WANDERING THOUGHTS

One always reads with a shudder any account of the desecration of a church, the one place in this sinful world which, even though laden with mortgages and debts, people in an indefinite way acknowledge to be God's peculiar property. The acknowledgment is often inadequately made, and after giving it to God, people often treat it as if it were their own.

"My house," our Lord says, "shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." There is something very awful about that text, and I suppose if ages ago men could turn a church into a den of thieves, they can do so still.

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things and for thy pleasure they are and were created." If this be the language of worship, if it be a divinely given intimation to men how they may acceptably pay adoration to God, what about those who never give it, who not having learned and schooled themselves to realize the majesty of God, rob Him of the honour due to Him and turn His house of prayer into a place of amusement. It matters not, it seems to me, whether the amusement be a service or a sermon, or a concert or any other species of entertainment. It is after all amusement, and is a worshipping of self. The desire and motive is to be pleased, not to please. It is to get, not to give. It is not, in a spirit of self-effacement, to fall down and worship Him who is "worthy."

But what shall we say of the dreadfulness of the sin a person commits who enters a church intent upon evil designs, and who with irreverent and sacrilegious hands works injury to the house of God or the furniture. Such a case I read of last week. It was the altar that suffered this time from the sacrilegious hands, the candlesticks being the particular objects of this ebullition of impiety. Perhaps the reader may not think as I do in this matter, and because I have mentioned candlesticks may feel inclined to give little sympathy to those who were pained and distressed by the occurrence. But several questions present themselves to my mind. Was it done by a mischievous boy? Then think of his daring insolence and the training he must have received. Was it done by a man? Then think of his conception of freedom. Are men who hold some particular set of opinions alone to have immunity from molestation in the matter of worship? And if boys and men are growing up and living in our midst unable to tolerate what they, forsooth, disapprove of, and so undisciplined that they hesitate not to commit a deed of violence, what is likely to be the future of this "free" country?

Churchmen have a right to claim freedom of worship as well as others. They believe they