

toral staff. Taking the new Archbishop by the hand, the Dean conducted him to the throne and invested him with all the rights, honours, privileges, prerogatives and pre-eminences. After this investment, the Dean turned to the congregation, and proclaimed the installation and enthronement. After the singing of the *Te Deum*, the Archbishop, addressed the congregation. He said it was with strangely mingled feelings that he had taken part in the solemn ceremony of that day. To tread so close upon the steps of one who was not only for too brief a space his admired predecessor, but for a good many years his familiar friend, was enough to sadden and almost to appal him as he stood face to face with the vast burden of responsibility before him. The duty which lay nearest to him, and which had the strongest claim upon him, was the spiritual oversight of more than 1,200,000 souls committed to his charge. It was one of the special difficulties belonging to the Northern Archbishopric that it should be associated with so large a diocese. It was true that with a view of lightening the burden two suffragan Bishops had now been appointed, whose help would be invaluable; but this would only enable the Archbishop to delegate to others some portion of the duties for which he himself must still remain responsible. It would be his endeavor to strengthen the relation of the Northern with the Southern Province, and especially of the two synods, without sacrifice of the rights and privileges of either. Amid all the various duties and manifold temptations of the office, it would be his happiness to remember that the primary duties and the most urgent were concerned with the religious welfare of the Diocese and the Province—that he had been appointed not for statesmanship, but for spiritual work.—*Church Review*.

LORD SELBORNE AND WELSH DIS-ESTABLISHMENT.

The *Globe* states that the Earl of Selborne has addressed the following letter to Mr. Joseph Ellaby, of Carlisle, with reference to the subject of Welsh disestablishment:

BLACKMOORE, Petersfield, Sept. 12, 1891.

Sir,—The agitation for disestablishment in Wales means, of course, the general disestablishment of the Church of England, and nothing else; it being, apparently, thought more easy to succeed by dividing the operation and taking Wales first. There is no separate Church in Wales (as there was in Ireland and is in Scotland), but only four dioceses of the Church of England; the most ancient, and (from their representation of the early British Church) certainly not the least interesting. I have treated the subject in the concluding chapter of my book in 'Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment and Disendowment,' and need not therefore now do more than refer you to what I have there said, and to what Mr. Gladstone said in 1870, which is quoted there. These dioceses are not confined to Wales. One of them (Llandaff) includes Monmouthshire. Eleven whole parishes in Shropshire, and parts of three others, and one in Cheshire, are in another (St. Asaph). On the other hand, fourteen Welsh parishes and part of another are in the English diocese of Hereford, and part of a parish in the English diocese of Lichfield is also Welsh. As to the countenance given by Mr. Gladstone to this movement, I prefer not to say what I think. You ask whether I think there is any chance of its being successful if English Churchmen resist it as becomes those who care for their Church (for so I interpret your words). I am no prophet, and in this and some other things I may, perhaps, give my countrymen credit for knowing the value of a good institution which they have inherited from their ancestors beyond what the event [which is in the hands of God] may justify, but I can say with confidence that if English

Churchmen do their duty they have power to prevent the success of this movement, and of all that would follow its success against their Church; and I should hope that their resistance will be conducted in a manner more worthy of the Christian name than the attacks.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
SELBORNE.

FOREIGN PRESSURE.

Living, as we do, in times when the very foundations of religion are assailed—religion in its broadest sense, of an acknowledgment of the One true God, as opposed to a blank atheism—it surely behoves all those who cling to the old faith, and claim their right to stand in the ranks beneath the standard of the Cross, to overlook, as far as possible, in all non-essentials, the differences which separate one body from another, to abandon untenable outposts needed only for the defense of a comparatively unimportant custom or private interpretation, and, holding firmly to the great essential points of our most holy faith, to make common cause against the assaults of infidelity.

An undeniable proposition, no doubt, and one in which most Christians heartily concur. Yet how few act up to it! Not in one, but in one thousand modern books it is assumed—as, for instance, in *Essays Speculative and Suggestive*—that all thoughtful minds have cast off the trammels of a by-gone superstition, and are completely satisfied to give up their trust in God in favor of an impersonal Law, relinquishing all hope of the future life as a mediæval chimera, without one pang of regret that never

'Then shall come the great rejoicing
On the far eternal shore.'

nor the solution of this life's paradoxes, which was once believed to lie 'behind the veil.'

And while an unprejudiced spectator, looking on from outside, would naturally expect to see all Christendom rising up, as one man, to show, by word and action, its abhorrence of such statements or assumptions, and to prove that the old belief, for which saint and martyr once counted it all gain to spend the last drop of of their blood, is still living and active in the hearts, ay, and in the minds of men, our daily press, in a few short months, has to record such disputes as the 'Reredos Case,' the 'Lincoln Case,' and, perhaps worst of all, the wrangle of two cities concerning the possession of spurious relics!

It is a well-known fact in secular history that foreign pressure consolidates a nation, and teaches it the important lessons of cohesion and unity. It was the Persian invasion which made Athens great; the French wars which welded the Norman and Saxon elements into a nation of patriotic Englishmen, the war of 1870-71 which raised Germany to the front among the countries of Europe. 'In the days of the Persian wars,' said an Athenian, 'we no longer asked who a man's father was, but whether he could row in the triremes;' which, being interpreted, means, we gave up our old pet prejudices, even those time-honoured ones of rank and class, and thought of our cause first, and our differences last.

Why does not the pressure from without have the same effect on Christians throughout the world? Truly, the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. What judgment would his country pass upon a general who poured all his artillery and men into a breach made in some outlying fort by a few malcontents from his own camp, while the enemy was concentrating his whole force upon the very citadel itself?

Instead of presenting to the foe an unbroken front, we are bringing dissension into our own ranks by using the two powerful weapons of Intolerance on the one hand, and Indifference

on the other; and these insidious foes of our own household are working us far more ill than the direct assaults of those who are openly hostile.

Would that each individual Christian realised his individual responsibility. Those who read the signs of the times say that the tendency of the age is to exalt the *individual* above the *class*. Let us again take a hint from social politics in matters religious. Infidelity spreads from unit to unit, not from mass to mass. Every word and act of each unit affects other units by whom it is heard or seen. Every irreverent, flippant speech uttered in jest, every uncharitable word spoken of those who differ, every careless act which shows the indifference of one professing Christian towards the faith which he, nominally at least, professes, adds fuel to the fire already kindled, brings discredit on the religion which he at least pretends to hold. If the mental development of every unbeliever could be traced, in how few cases would it be found that the obstacles to belief had been raised by 'honest doubt,' in how many that it was the carelessness and ignorance of some indifferent Christian, or the intolerance of some bigot, which had brought about the shipwreck of that man's faith. After all, when another man has been induced to accept some minute detail of our own faith or observance, nothing very great has been accomplished. One great teacher, F. D. Maurice, frequently expressed his dread of persuading others to think as he did in matters of detail, lest he should lead them astray; but this humble spirit is not too common; we are all apt to forget that, as one has said, 'uniformity is of earth, unity is of Heaven.'

Let us look well to the defences of our citadel, the grand essentials of our faith. Let us rally round these with no uncertain mind, but with the infectious zeal of enthusiasts, resolved that no show of intolerance and narrowness, of lukewarmness and indifference should give a handle to the foe, or an occasion of stumbling to some 'forlorn and shipwrecked brother, sailing o'er life's solemn main.'

THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Come with true penitence and faith and love, and though *unworthy*, you will come *worthily*, or in a worthy and acceptable manner.

In the Church Catechism are five simple heads of self-examination:—

1. REPENTANCE.—Do I repent truly of my past sins?

2. AMENDMENT.—Do I steadfastly purpose to lead a new life?

3. FAITH.—Have I a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ?

4. THANKFULNESS.—Have I a thankful remembrance of His death?

5. LOVE.—Am I in charity with all men?

Try and use these faithfully in searching your hearts. Don't want to know the *best* but the *worst* of yourselves, and if you are in doubt or difficulty, just as you would go to a physician about your bodies, you may go to God's ministers about your souls.—*Guardian*.

RAINY SUNDAY.

Miss Frances R. Havergal, the author of so many sweet-spirited hymns, gives the following reasons for attending church on rainy Sundays. Because—

1. God has blessed the Lord's day and hallowed it, making no exceptions for rainy Sundays.

2. I expect my minister to be there. I should be surprised if he were to stay at home for the weather.

3. If his hands fail through weakness, I shall have great reason to blame myself unless I sustain him by my prayers and presence.

4. By staying away I may lose the prayers