

PLEA FOR TOLERATION.—Many of our readers will remember a pamphlet with this title put forth some years ago by a leading Ritualist in the hope of staying the rage for persecution which then possessed like a demon the so-called Church Association. It had not, apparently, much effect. Now—very curiously—Archdeacon Sinclair, after a virulent attack lately on the Ritualist position, publishes in his *Churchman Magazine* a long "Plea for forbearance in disagreements." It is an appeal to the conquering hosts of Ritualists to be merciful as they become strong! "The tables are being turned."

ARCHBISHOP TAIT ON RITUALISTS is quoted largely by Archdeacon Sinclair:—"A conspiracy to bring back our Church to the state in which it was before the Reformation—I fully believe that most of those who advocate what we deem an excessive ritual would indignantly deny any such purpose." Again, "diversity of opinion is a necessary characteristic of a Protestant branch of the Church Catholic. Sects of all kinds are narrow and unwarrantably dogmatic, defining where God's Word has not defined, eager to exclude from their pale all who will not allow their minds to be forced into one groove. Such the Church of England has never been." Sound words!

"THE OXFORD MOVEMENT"—admits Archdeacon Sinclair—"is on the increase: it is largely recruited every week from many of those who leave the theological colleges. If the leaders of the movement had another quarter or half a century, they would look forward in that case to being strong enough to reorganize the Church of England on their own principles; and to sweep away those traces of the Reformation which they so greatly dislike." The Archdeacon, we are sure, is mistaken. There is no fear of the Oxford leaders desiring or seeking such tyrannical predominance. They value toleration too highly.

"SOFT ANSWERS."—"By the firmness of our attitude, the gentleness of our charity, and the width of our toleration, we can persuade our friends—who in all their earnestness and zeal and self-devotion, etc." So writes Archdeacon Sinclair: and he concludes his valuable and remarkable "Erenicon" by the following quotation from Archbishop Tait:—"I truly believe that in these days both amongst High Church and Low Church, there are persons who are tired of the miserable controversies which have long divided Christendom and who simply desire, while using the liberty allowed them, to follow their own tastes in things indifferent, to worship the Lord Jesus Christ faithfully and to follow Him in their lives." May such a policy prevail! It is high time.

THE SYRIAN HIERARCHY is curiously elaborate. There are three classes of Bishops: Catholici or Patriarchs (our "Primates" and the Roman "Cardinals"), Metropolitans, and ordinary Bishops. Priests are divided into three classes also: Chorepiscopi (our "Rural Deans"), Visitors ("Archdeacons" or "Deans") and ordinary priests. So there are deacons ordinary, subdeacons ("Sacristans" with us) and readers—our "Lay Readers." The chief practical difference is in the diaconate; we do not include, as they do, Sacristans and Lay Readers in that order. We probably ought to. The Syrian Church boasts foundation by Sts. Adai and Mari, disciples of St. Thomas.

THE PATRIARCHATES have varied in number. The "patriarchs" ecclesiastical were the Bishops of

those *Mother Churches* from which, as from centres or nuclei, nations were originally evangelized. The first was Jerusalem; but its peculiar eminence was soon paralleled nearly, by Antioch, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Sileucia. The creation or erection of the last named—for "Assyria, Media, and Persia," and the far East generally—is attributed to considerations of convenience, on account of the local difficulties both of race and nationality. Canterbury is practically the Anglican patriarchate—its Bishop, *aterius orbis papa*. Now, "westward the star of empire."

THE "DYING OUT" QUESTION, AGAIN.

Our contemporary, *The Catholic Register*, enters the lists with us on this subject, and honours a former short editorial of ours (81st Aug.) with a column or two of animadversion. The first paragraph of this editorial (headed "Dying Out") refers to our omission of the full title, *Catholic Register*, in the expression "A certain *soidisant* 'Catholic' print published in Canada," etc.: though the editorial of *C. R.* omits our quotation marks in connection with the word "Catholic"—a point of some importance, but the omission (we may admit in charity) was probably not intended. With regard to the whole charge or complaint of our having not mentioned our contemporary's full name and place of publication, our candid and simple explanation is,—we had, at the moment, forgotten both! We had seen the article *en passant* in a public reading room, and forgot afterwards what the exact title was and where it was published: only remembering that it had the word "Catholic" in its title (has not the rest of the title been changed lately from "Record" or some such word?) and that it was Canadian. We regret our forgetfulness: but the point is not material to the argument. We beg to assure our contemporary that neither that omission nor our remark about the title "Catholic" being "*soidisant*" was either "uncharitable" or "pharisaical." We have much pleasure in restoring to him in our columns both his "local habitation and his name"—and will try to give due credit for them in future. The *Catholic Register*, we may say, in order to make our *amende* complete, is published in Toronto, and appears to be well written and well printed.

JOKING AND BADINAGE ASIDE,

we must proceed to point out flaws, one or more, in the argument of *Catholic Register* (we had almost written "Record") in reply to our former editorial. It says, with strange inattention to our former words—"the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN makes light of the subject and ridicules any attempt at moralizing on facts and drawing inferences." On the contrary we expressly said, "the facts are worth noting, very interesting as a study, and do supply inferences"—other than the mere inference from increase of numbers, as a means of influencing the world. Again "*C. R.*" says, "It says that it regards man only as a reproductive animal amongst other animals." On the contrary, what we did say distinctly was, "their way of looking at the facts ('*C. R.*'s way!) and drawing inferences regards man only as a reproductive animal amongst other animals." Those are our very words! They actually object to such a method of using the facts for inference. "This race will increase most rapidly, therefore this race will conquer the rest"—we deny such animal and material inferences. Mind is stronger than matter: and mere numbers are not the criterion of national comparison or predominance.

THE SUBSEQUENT MORALIZING

of our respected contemporary—founded upon this misreading of our former article—may almost be passed over. It is very good reading. We have as much objection to Darwinism, Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau as any one—and therefore we had objected to "*C. R.*'s" line of argument in dealing with Dr. Douglass of Montreal. The French race in Canada may increase twice as fast as it does and carry Romanism with it all the time: that will neither improve the morals of the country necessarily, nor conquer it physically. And so of other races, when we point to "Catholic France" as a proof that Romanism does not succeed in teaching its people to respect their marriage vows—the answer is "France is not Catholic, but infidel." Well, that is a confession and revelation! Since when did France—that much prized and belauded "eldest son of the Church"—lose her title to the epithet of "Catholic" or the position of a field for Roman influence? We shall note this admission.

WE WOULD ADVISE

our excellent contemporary to add to his many virtues that of not imputing bad motives without strong proof: and also the virtue of carefully reading that which he is going to criticize, so as not to misunderstand it. We can assure him that we are at one with him in the necessity of "promoting social purity and warning our readers against a sin that called Heaven's vengeful fires on seven wicked and adulterous cities." If this results in greater increase of population for Canada—whether French or English, Roman or Anglican—we shall rejoice with him. To the victors belong the spoils—but something more than numerical increase will be necessary for either side to gain the upper hand.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

General satisfaction is expressed on all sides with the results of the late General Synod, and it is interesting to listen to the remarks that fall from the lips of people, who, though not having had anything to do with it, show that they felt a deep interest in its deliberations. I overheard a Churchman, a mechanic, say, "Well, I am glad the work of union is done; if nothing else, it shows that we are alive." Another Churchman said, "I am very glad nothing was done in the direction of tampering with the Prayer Book." These two remarks voice the mind of a vast number of the members of the Church. They desire that the Church shall put forth all her strength, yet it must be on conservative lines. They are Prayer Book Churchmen. They are satisfied that the Church of England is a true branch of the "Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" of Christ, that she retains the true and Catholic faith, and that the Prayer Book, not as it is acted upon perhaps by many, but as it really speaks in its ritual and services, reflects the Catholic faith apart from all accretions of modern Romanism.

This is their hope, that this union may lead to a better sense of mission and duty, a better knowledge of history and doctrine, and a restoration of what may have been lost, in careless and faithless times, of all that is good and useful for building up Christ's kingdom on earth, and causing it to become indwelling in the hearts of men.

I may, however, as well give an opinion of a different kind. It was given by a lady somewhat in this form, "What business had those laymen there? What do they know about things they have never studied! And think of their assur-