

all the great moral, social, and political interests that dignify humanity and give exaltation to a people.

If that is Church of England citizenship in Canada, it is of a far lower type in patriotism, courage, manliness, political wisdom, and moral elevation, than can be seen in lands that are only half civilised. God help the Church of England in Canada if her sons have lost touch with the political life of the country. Her candle stick is in place, but the light is dimly flickering. We need pray that this generation may be blessed with the baptism they were baptised with, whose noble work our fathers have declared unto us as done in the old time to keep their Church and country and ours free from the accursed thralldom of Rome.

HEATHEN ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN USAGES.

THERE are some writers who take a morbid delight in tracing Christian usages to heathenism. The figure of the Cross is thus traced with much unction to throw shame upon its use as a symbol. Surely every child knows that the cross that christians hold in reverence for its sacred associations, is so regarded because it represents a heathen instrument of torture and death. A writer in the *Rock* is greatly exercised over the word, "Easter," which he has just discovered to be of pagan origin, "both the name and the festival." The very word "bun," in "hot cross bun" is, it seems, pure Chaldee, meaning a round cake divided into four to indicate the four seasons. All this sounds to us very stale news. But it is given much prominence in our contemporary as though the discovery were novel and of great moment. The writer in much distress of mind at this alarming discovery goes on to ask, "How did we get Easter as a Christian festival?" and he replies—The answer is "From Rome!" Well, so far as that goes it is a matter of supreme indifference to us where the word Easter comes from. If we are to regard with abhorrence all words that come from a heathen tongue, how shall we be able to pay respect to the words, "Evangelical," "Atonement," and so forth? The writer who seeks to destroy our reverence for Easter because the word has a heathen root, must have strange notions about philology for one who quotes Greek and tries to correct the translators of the Bible! Does he imagine the Greek Testament was written in a language invented for the occasion. If not he must know that the very Gospel itself was communicated to mankind chiefly through a heathen medium. In all sincerity we recommend our evangelical friends to cease worrying themselves about the origin of christian customs, and endeavour to utilize them for the edification or delight of the people. This applies to usages derived from Rome as well as from heathendom. Evil is not in the names, or origins, but in the spirit and intention of usages.

To tell us that the Festival of the Resurrection came from heathenism is too heavy a

demand upon our credulity. To tell us that Eastertide came from Rome is a strange speech indeed from an English Churchman. We much fear our friends who are so busy tracing Christian words and Christian Festivals and Christian symbols to pagan sources know more about the literature of heathenism than of Christianity. That any usage now adopted by the Church was once heathen, simply shows that such usage has some root in human nature, and the Church in her wisdom does not seek to destroy human nature but to purify and elevate it. If those who object then to the symbol of the Cross, to christian feasts, to christian words, and usages, because of their heathen origin, have no better ground for their objections, they are not likely to make any impression upon those who think, and reflect, and read other matter than party tracts and papers. Time and time again have Englishmen on this side of the Atlantic been made to feel that there is on the part of the Canadian Press a bad feeling towards the old land. The ways in which this ill will are shown are unworthy of the Press, often indeed are more ludicrous for their pettiness than offensive for their spite. Any deed of note done by an Irishman, Scotchman, Frenchman, German, or American find eulogists in our newspapers, but those of an Englishman are quietly ignored. We suppose one reason to be this, the English race blossoms and blooms with perennial vigour and fruitfulness. Acts of gallantry on sea or land, heroism in new and glorious forms of self-sacrifice, great achievements in literature, or scholarship, or science, or art, are fruits never absent from the tree of English life. Hence constant, unbroken familiarity deadens the sense of appreciation. So it comes to pass that some deed brilliant enough to set all the world wondering, if done by an Englishman only elicits a half growling recognition which could be expressed by the words "of course!" The sun shines, what of that? England wearies us with her glory, her triumphs are monotonous, if we blew forth the story of her victories we should blister our lips, for the trumpet would never be silent!

This explains why the gallant rescue of over 700 souls by Captain Murrell has been ignored by the Canadian Press. Columns of excited rhetoric, huge head lines, descriptions bursting with adjectives of praise appear in all our papers if some paid base ball team scores an extra hit over another paid team, but not a word can be spared to honor a splendid deed of heroism like that of Captain Murrell which honors all humanity!

DR. CARRY'S LETTER.

DR. Carry objects too our regarding the exclusion of reporters from the Union conference as a mistake. It is a matter of opinion. If it were a question of *theology* we should feel disposed to back down under his adverse judgment. But as we are deferential to one so learned as Dr. Carry when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is from his study chair, so should he be disposed to accept our decision

when we speak of a matter upon which the experience of the conductor of a public journal is incomparably a safer guide than the opinion of a divine, however erudite. There is just as much need of what some foolishly call "worldly wisdom," with a deprecating emphasis on "worldly," as for scholarship and spirituality, in the conduct of such negotiations as the Union Committee undertook. It is hardly fair for Dr. Carry to ask us to suppose that amongst his distinguished accomplishments or those of the divines who were his associates at the Union meetings, that "worldly wisdom" must necessarily be numbered. *Such completeness is not common to humanity*, indeed the fact of its being claimed by any person is a demonstration that it does not exist in his case—at least.

Dr. Carry may depend upon this that *the Press will thresh out the Union question some day in spite of any dislike of "tumult"* on the part of its promoters. It is just as well for advocates of any cause to realize the functions and the power of the Press at once, as to seek first to ignore them and then be compelled to submit to their free exercise.

Dr. Carry defends the nonconformist members of the Conference from the charge of acting in the same exclusive spirit as the priests whom they are never weary of accusing of clericalism and sacerdotalism. Dr. C. is chivalrous, but inconsistent, for although the policy we disapproved, that is the secrecy of the meetings, was suggested by our clergy, yet as the nonconformists approved of it they are equally responsible with its suggestors. Had the meetings been only of our own Bishops and clergy we should have felt bound to respect their desire for privacy. But as they are incessantly assailed by nonconformists for their alleged clerical exclusiveness, we could not resist the opportunity of pointing out that the Church of England has not a monopoly of "clericalism." Indeed all the dreadful "isms" which act upon some Churchmen as a red rag does upon a bull, flourish just as luxuriantly in the wild lanes of dissent as in the garden of the Church.

The meetings held in England some 25 years ago, which were attended by a large number of the most distinguished divines in the Church of England, Dr. Carry calls "a phantom." Well, the learned Doctor has the right to do so. He might have called them an "isosceles triangle" without being indicted at the Assizes. But "phantom" seems to us not precisely the right word to use as a designation for gatherings of such historic significance, meetings which we believe initiated the very Toronto conferences which Dr. Cavan and Dr. Carry think the most important since the Reformation. It is not usual for a "phantom" to have such noble progeny. As Dr. Carry, as a member of that Toronto Conference is in a direct line of descent from the English "Phantom," he is not paying proper respect to his ancestor by calling his progenitor such a flouting name.

And as to our good friend's hope that we shall support the cause of Union. Why! this