

Appeal, and the use of which attracts no attention, being regarded as a matter of course. When, therefore, we find men, who, through errors of defect, break the laws of the Church in points on which there is no doubt whatever, the most vehement assailants of their Brethren, on points of doubtful legality, we are compelled to the belief that there is no remedy but a final authoritative interpretation of the highest court whereby the disputed points may be forever set at rest. They who are guilty of errors of omission, and they who are guilty of errors of commission, in the performance of divine service, are equally reprehensible, and neither can bring charges against the other with consistency. And yet they denounce each other as though excesses or defects in the observance of our Ritual were matters of taste and not matters of law, as if likings and dislikings could have any weight in a ceremonial fenced round by stringent acts of Parliament, and assented to by the clergy in the most solemn declarations. While then I have no hesitation in expressing my own belief that many Churches in the Mother Country practise a ceremonial which deserves to be condemned, I also believe the reason why it is culpable is because it is in many points *illegal*, and not because I have any great apprehensions that its tendency is necessarily Romish. It is incumbent on me to make my meaning on this point clear. There is nothing essentially Romish in a grand Ritual. The Oriental Church, which, as against Rome, is thoroughly Protestant as ourselves, has a ceremonial which to us would seem excessive. The Lutheran Church has a ritual compared with which our own, as ordinarily seen, seems meagre, and yet no sane person can doubt its Protestant character. The body of Christians called Irvingites rejoices in a gorgeous ritual without at all compromising the Protestantism of its members. The fact seems to be that the common sense of mankind knows that Ritual is one of the most powerful agents for embodying, impressing and perpetuating great principles; and well is this known to be the case by such organizations as the Orange and Masonic and Temperance Societies. I cannot, therefore, indulge in indiscriminate denunciations of Ritual which only becomes deserving of censure when it is contrary to law, and when the actors in it become liable to the rebuke denounced by the thirty-fourth Article against him "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church." To this censure I greatly fear that many of our most zealous and devoted brethren at home have become obnoxious. On the legality or illegality of the practices which are most loudly condemned, it may be presumptuous to offer an opinion, since it is impossible for the most sagacious canonists to anticipate the decision of such a Court as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Such a tribunal is beyond the reach of ordinary criticism; but while it is impossible to predict the interpretation it may put on the Ritualism complained of, it is not going beyond the limits of charity to maintain the utter inexpediency of reviving some of those practices, and the *prima facie* illegality of others; for example, the use of services unauthorized by the Prayer Book, and the apparent straining to assimilate the celebration of the Holy Eucharist to that of the Romish mass.

But, except on the principle that "when one member suffers all the members suffer with it," we have scarcely a direct interest in this controversy. There is no probability that our Diocese will overstep the law of the Church and be guilty of illegal excess in Ritual; and my ground for