

went up through an enemy's country in military array, marching in rank and file; nor had they proceeded far before the kings of Edom and Moab, and the Ammonite opposed them. And for the Christian there are difficulties innumerable, and enemies unnumbered to grapple. Voices are heard in the wilderness—"Lo, here!" and "Lo, there!" There are still gods many and lords many, and those who believe in no other god make gods of themselves, believe in their own infallibility; and with as much blundering in philosophy as in religion, imagine themselves not only infallible but impeccable also.

The lessons taught by the Church in the Epistle and Gospel of the Communion Office are as impressive as they are exactly suited to meet the evils growing among us and constituting the boasted "spirit of the age."

THE PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY.

The following remarks of the United States "Church Review," for 1858, on a speech of T. B. Macaulay's are particularly appropriate at the present time.

After alluding to the futile attempt of Lord John Russell to prevent the establishment of the Roman hierarchy in England by passing the Ecclesiastical Titles act—ridiculous in its results—Macaulay says, "The papacy rose from its debasement—rose more intolerant and insolent than ever—as intolerant and insolent as it had been in the days of Hildebrand—intolerant and insolent in a degree which dismayed and disappointed those who had fondly cherished the hope that its spirit had been modified—mitigated by the lapse of years and the progress of knowledge." Thus, then, we have both 'Pope and Pagan' at work distilling nightshade again for the nations, and that successfully in the midst of the 19th century; and that by the admission of such a one as Macaulay! But our orator is not the man to prescribe remedies for a plague like this..... It does not escape him, however, though the reason does, that in one spot of Europe, and one only, the pestilence was stayed. England was yet too strong for the destroyer. He at least does justice to the fact. "We in the meantime have been exempt from both these calamities which have wrought ruin all around us. The madness of 1848 did not subvert our throne; the reaction which followed has not touched our liberties. And why is this? Why was our country—with all the ten plagues raging around us—why was she a land of Goshen? Everywhere else thunder, fire running along the ground, a very grievous storm, a storm such as there was none like it since man was on the earth, yet everything was tranquil here. And then again, thick night, darkness that might be felt, and yet there was light in all our dwellings." Very good, so it was, but why? He asks a question which he does not answer; for the speech goes on to glorify the British Constitution, when the very question is—*what saved the British Constitution?* The world stands on the elephant, and the elephant on the tortoise, but why did he not tell us where the tortoise finds footing?

The British Constitution is indeed glorious, but it neither made itself nor saved itself from ruin. It never could have been made except by the religion of England; and it never could have been saved except by that religion. Why did not the orator tell the people plainly that London only failed to become as Protestant as Berlin, or as Popish as Vienna, because the religion of law and order, the religion of authority and reason together, the religion which implies morality, had saved London

from red-republicanism, and enthroned the principle of self-government in the heart of a great people? What would the Constitution of England have been in 1848 but so much parchment, if the people of England had been previously reduced to the social condition of the blouse-men of France or Prussia, by a prevalent national infidelity? And why, then, did he lose so good an opportunity of pressing upon his hearers the importance of cherishing and sustaining the national Faith? Alas, he was speaking to Scotchmen! and that might suggest an apology, for what could the Kirk have done for Scotland, if Scotland had not the British Oak to hang upon? What has the same sort of Kirk done for Switzerland? Some excuse, then, there was in "Auld Reekie" for hesitating lips and for a stammering tongue; but let us charitably hope that if he had been speaking to the electors of Westminster, he would have pointed to the Abbey towers and told them to behold the Palladium of England. He would have said, "Behold your Church! There she stands such as God intended His Church to be. For hundreds of years she has been to you the inspirer of your holiest thoughts and noblest enterprises; she has taught you the gospel in its purity, its loveliness, and its power; she has taught you to love liberty and to seek it in the path of obedience and duty; she has showed you the true secret of happiness, in a heart fearing God and loving man; she has made *Home* the darling word of the English tongue, and *Mother*, its inspiring idea; and all this she has done by teaching you to read and to understand aright the Holy Scriptures which are able to make you wise unto salvation. Even he, then, who dissents from that Church; but especially he who betrays it, and, above, all the man who wars against its spirit by a life of selfishness or irreligion, such a man is, in such degree, the enemy of his country, the enemy of the human race, the breeder and propagator of Vandalism, the forerunner of the barbarians.

RITUALISM.

D. R. LITTLEDALE, author of "Plain reasons against joining the Church of Rome," has long been denounced by a certain faction as a leading Ritualist. The following letter recently written by him gives his real opinions on the subject:—

MY DEAR SIR,—I was too unwell yesterday to answer your letter in which you ask my opinion of what is called Ritualism. The question is a wide one, and I can only set down the barest jottings of reply.

In the first place, then, I look upon the present importance and prominence given to Ritualism, by its opponents and its defenders alike, as being a mere temporary and transitional thing, which will pass away ere long, leaving the good and rejecting the evil. The good, I apprehend, is this: There are two main reasons which induce people to attend Christian religious assemblies, (a) their own edification, *i. e.*, to get something for themselves; (b) to pay homage publicly to God as their King, *i. e.*, to give something, namely, worship. Now, this most important duty was very generally lost sight of as lately as my own youth; and in my earlier clerical experiences I have ministered to congregations where kneeling to pray was practically unknown. People did not realize that they were assembled to do honor to a Person, and that Person one Who had ordained a very stately worship for Himself in the Old Testament, and revealed in the New Testament that yet more splendid Heavenly worship of which the earthly ritual was but the type and sha-

dow. This error has been corrected by Ritualism, and the truth forced on people's attention, that the chief motive for attending Church ought to be an unselfish, loyal, and grateful one, and that we ought to give God our best and costliest for His service.

On the other hand, the bad side of Ritualism is, that, unless held in check,—which it can be readily enough by plain teaching and by plenty of unadorned Service in Church—it tends to satisfy people with the mere outside of things spiritual, and to make them consider the mere physical pleasure they take in beautiful sights and sounds as a test of religious acceptance and piety, as a substitute for an active Christian life of well doing.

The rocks on either side are thus irreverence and formalism. It will not do for men to choose either of these as the lesser evil of the two, and then encourage it. Both must be stamped out. But Ritualism is necessary to kill the former, just as personal religion, independent of forms, is necessary to kill the latter. The true Christian thinker will therefore try to refuse the evil and to choose the good; and by giving the question of forms of worship in its due place, and no more, in the Church system, bring it down from its present exaggerated position.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

A CONSIDERABLE portion of the correspondence addressed to us privately, consists of questions as to facts or principles requiring direct answers which may be much better attended to in a separate department. We therefore purpose to devote some space to this object, which we trust will prove both useful and attractive. Some questions may require considerable research to furnish answers to them, and as libraries of reference are not very numerous or accessible in this country, a little patience may have to be exercised in waiting for the solution. Some of our young readers may meet with difficulties on which they desire information. If they will send us some questions we will give them the required information.

The following are some questions which we have been asked, with the replies we make:—

SIR,—I have recently seen the term "Sabbath School" made use of. Will you kindly inform me of the difference between that and the Sunday Schools?
JAMES RICHARDS.

The Sabbath School is held on Saturday for religious instruction; there may then be a catechising in the church on Sundays as the Church directs, and also in order to ascertain the result of the Saturday's teaching. Sunday is thus made more a holiday than a day of hard work. We know of no Sabbath Schools in this country; but the experiment has been very successfully tried in some parts of England, and has there been found to be a great improvement on Sunday Schools.

SIR,—I once asked a Canadian Bishop about the "Sealed Prayer Book." He informed me that he had not a copy, and did not know what such a book could be. Can you inform me?
WILLIAM SIMON.

After the last revision in 1662, some of the printed copies were examined and carefully corrected by commissioners appointed for the purpose, and were certified by them under the Lord Chancellor's Seal. One of the Sealed Books was placed in each cathedral and collegiate church, in the respective courts of Westminster and in the Tower of London, to be preserved for ever among the records, as the authoritative standard of the Book of Common Prayer. A reprint of the "Sealed Book" has been lately published by the Ecclesiastical History Society. It does not contain a metrical version of the Psalms, the Table of Prohibited Degrees, or the Service for the Accession of