

and holy truths, whether in Church teaching or Church organization, and to sympathize and work with those who differ from us for all those good things which we hold in common. We hold our Church privileges, and will continue to do so for the benefit of those who do not at present see the necessity for them."

MAGNA EST VERITAS, ET PREVALEBIT.—The Bishop of Manchester has lately emphasized, in a lecture, the peculiarity of Christianity as a *progressive* living force, contrasted with heathen religions—which begin better than they finish, their first days being their best days, their last days dreary and vicious. Buddhism—once pure—is now mere superstition, and grotesque and debasing idolatry. Mahomedanism—at first borrowing much good from Judaism and Christianity—is now torpid, smitten with the paralysis of death. . . . The best days of Christianity—always living, growing, and flourishing more and more—will be its last days! The world grows better for it.

MELBOURNE CATHEDRAL CONSECRATION is reported to have been "by far the grandest ecclesiastical ceremony which has ever taken place in Australia." Not only the building in general, but altar, lectern, font, &c., were all individually commended to Divine blessing by Bishop Field Flowers Goe. The Primate said very aptly: "A cathedral, when rightly regarded and rightly used, will nourish and extend that sense of federative sympathy which binds together the churches of various localities in a blended bond of ecclesiastical order and spiritual harmony. The Church of England (he said) holds a foremost position of responsibility and opportunity."

POCKET PARISHES.—People are aware of the abuse to which *pocket boroughs* owe their existence—something like what is known in America now as "gerrymandering." There is, naturally, a somewhat similar tendency in ecclesiastical quarters to create little conveniences in the shape of petty parishes with tiny churches for any parson who happens to have a superabundance of cash and a fancy for "running a church" at his own sweet will. Such enterprises create immediate contempt, and ultimately terminate in collapse and disaster. There should be restriction as to numbers of population.

DIGNITARIES ON THE RAMPAGE.—We have had occasion at times to draw attention to disorderly proceedings on the part of some clergymen bearing titles of honour and distinction among their fellows. The Apostolic prescription for the treatment of "any brother who walketh disorderly," and not after the apostolic traditions, is short and sharp. What St. Paul would have done with a rural dean or archdeacon, who—after praying against heresy and schism in the morning—proceeds to countenance and encourage it in the afternoon, would have been something—well, "intolerant."

SPEAKING UNTRUTH IN LOVE.—One of the judges in the MacQueary case is reported to have said that he was impelled to advise "by the law of love," as he did not believe the *purpose* of the accused to have been destructive, but intended to prove-helpful to persons of unsettled faith! We are reminded of a place said to be "paved with good intentions," and also of the authority which condemns *doing evil that good may come*. If a man may deny one article of the creed in order to con-

vince somebody that he ought to believe some other article of the same—this is too much "love" (?) and too little sense!

THE FOUR CARDINAL ARTICLES OF REUNION—the Bible, the creed, the sacraments, the ministry—have been severely tried and criticized since they were set forth by the last Lambeth conference. Dr. Dix, in a masterly review of the present status of the whole question, avers that the movement has received a decided *set back* from the too zealous and careless action of certain prominent American clergymen in the matter of interchange of pulpits, thus ignoring the fourth article. Yet the Bishop of Iowa voices the general voice of the Church in saying: "These (four) are the ancient conditions of unity, and the only imaginable conditions for its restoration."

RITUAL.

We have been examining a number of books on "Ritual," such as those of the Methodist Episcopal, the Freemasons, the Orangemen, the Ancient Order of United Workmen, &c., &c. There are very carefully arranged details prescribed in all these books about the way in which certain proceedings should be carried out, and certain occasions marked by these appropriate proceedings. The meaning of each particular prescription does not appear upon the surface; but one cannot get rid of the feeling that in a general way there is *some* meaning worth knowing—or, if not known, worth discovering. In the same way, if one goes to a wedding or a funeral, he is struck with a certain degree of *formality* about the proceedings; some one always acts or is appealed to virtually as "master of ceremonies."

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Very little serious thought will enable us to answer that question in a general way for all such forms of "Ritual"—whether we understand and approve of them or not. It certainly means in the first place that the occasion or proceeding is regarded as *important* to a degree, which justifies the thing being done with care, with thoughtful prevision of the right way—"rite." At least there is an idea that there must be some *right* ("rite") way of doing the thing, and that it is even better to make some awkward, and perhaps some ludicrous attempt to reach this standard, than to show no desire to reach it at all. The very attempt, people feel, will make them somewhat wiser in the pursuit, and the question

"SOLVITUR AMBULANDO."

In the second place, the particulars of the Ritual pursued, attained, prescribed, must be, so far as it goes, an *index* of the particular sentiments for which the people engaging in the performance do entertain and desire to express. It is not enough that the proceedings should vaguely bear the character of being grand, dignified, solemn or ornate. Every one feels that a mere meaningless display of ceremony, a purely empty show, is—so far from being a way of giving honour—a way of insulting and making little of that which is done, belittling the cause in hand. If a man engaged in such work is directed at one point to *stand*, there must be some definite idea connected with the assumption just then of that particular posture. If he is to *kneel*, there must surely be a definite sentiment under cover of that posture also. In fact intelligent ritual

MUST BE EXPRESSIVE

of those exact and particular sentiments which are proper for the occasion. When one has got thus

far in the development of religious, Masonic, or other ritual, the next step is not far off. It only requires the exercise of great care in order that the ritual should not only be roughly expressive of the proper sentiments, so that an interested spectator, or God Himself, if the act be one of worship, may see clearly enough what is meant; but that it should also have such great powers in its expression as to be

ALSO IMPRESSIVE

to such a degree that ordinary careless spectators should *become* interested in what is going on. It is not enough that they should be awe-stricken—like untutored savages at the sound of a gun—but that they should have imparted to them a definite intelligent and intelligible idea of what the others are expressing. So in the New Testament, we hear the argument used that service should be so performed that those who behold will say "God is in you of a truth," and themselves be induced to make a confession of faith, joining in the sentiment expressed. This is the very acme and triumph of perfect Ritual!

A GOOD WORK IN FRANCE.

No one who has had the opportunity of seeing and hearing "Pere Hyacinthe" on his own ground and in his own language, could fail to recognize in him a jewel of rare excellence in the field of sacred oratory, or to wonder at the vast concourses that attended his Lenten "Conferences" in Notre Dame de Paris, while he yet remained in the Church of Rome. Indeed, this is so thoroughly true of him, that little else remains to be said in the way of description—a point which the Protestant part of Christendom has been shamefully slow to recognize. He is so completely an orator, that he cannot well be much of anything else—not without straining his natural bent, and detracting from his natural force. This, we feel sure, has been the true reason of the fact that he has not been such a power for reformation of French Christianity as was hoped at first that he would be. His instincts are all those of the orator; but his energies have been warped and frittered away in comparatively uncongenial work as a pastor rather than preacher, administrator rather than teacher.

THIS ERROR IS BEING CORRECTED.

and chiefly, as we understand, owing to the good judgment and zeal (fraternal, in the fullest sense) of good Bishop Coxe—always a lover of Gallican Christianity, and promoter of its true interests. In the last number of the *New York Churchman* appears a letter from "A.C.C.," from which we learn that the English and American friends have formed a "combine" to provide M. Loyson with a stipend, leaving him perfectly free for pulpit and platform work. Bishop Coxe gives an eloquent description of the effect of the Pere's preaching in the wretched little church in the remote quarter of Rue d'Arras, where, however, overflowing crowds pressed to hear him, after his victorious progress through the southern provinces. Five thousand is the average audience, who try to reach the sound of his wonderful voice, even under disadvantageous circumstances.

THE GREAT DESIDERATUM

is "a decent church in the heart of Paris, where the great witness whom God has raised up in France for Scriptural and Catholic truth can be heard by the leading minds and directors of French thought"—so the Bishop puts it. The Paris journalists and litterateurs are beginning to