

But there is a danger lest mere aestheticism should run riot, and vestments, lights, beautiful music, or intricate ceremonial be adopted simply because they are beautiful and not for the sake of their inner meaning. Put into other words, we must take heed lest these things are encouraged because they please us, rather than as a worthy offering of God. "To obey is better than sacrifice." This principle has been departed from in two different directions. On the one hand are those who adopt any pretty piece of ritual they may happen to be pleased with, whether it be in agreement with our liturgy or not. They will introduce the ringing of small hand-bells, because they have heard them rung in some English or Roman church, forgetting that in the latter they are necessary because of the "unknown tongue" in which mass is said, while in the English service they are not only unnecessary, but are actually among the few ornaments positively and distinctly abolished; they will load their altars with candles, and multiply distracting ceremonies, they will even tamper with the liturgy itself, and say in a semi-audible voice prayers which not only are absent from the English service but also repugnant to its spirit. And on the other hand are those who depart entirely from all recognized customs and introduce surplined "angelic" choirs, female ushers or any other novelty which seems likely to attract the multitude. To the latter class we can only say but little. They have no particular standard by which we can judge them, no principle in these matters to which we can appeal. But with the former it is different. We do these gentlemen but justice when we acknowledge that they are always in search of that which is catholic, and that these anomalous ceremonies are dear to them because (and perhaps only because) they are in use by some portion or another of the Catholic Church. We may remind such, then, that one of the first principles of catholicity is obedience; and that consequently we must not look for our ceremonial guide to any foreign Church, however catholic it may be, to any leaders within our own Church, however prominent and pious they may be, but only to the authority to which our obedience is due.

It is true that ritual in the Church of England and her daughters is in a somewhat chaotic state owing to the terrible neglect of all ritual under Puritan influences. Directions which at the time of their first compilation were easily understood, because they merely confirmed well-known practices then in every day use, are now far from simple because of the long period of lethargy and forgetfulness through which we have passed. Nevertheless the directions remain, and it needs only time and patient study to discover their meaning. Much has already been done in this direction. It has been established that the use of Sarum was the authorized use of all England some years before the Reformation, and was, more than any other rite, the parent of our present prayer-book. The various decrees, injunctions, and acts of Convocation and Parliament which led up to the status of affairs in the second year of Edward VI. (to which our prayer-book refers us), have been fairly thoroughly examined and made known, and pictures, engravings, brasses, and books have been ransacked to find out just what, and how used, the ceremonies, rites and ornaments were, which were deliberately ordered to be retained and had in use at the revision of A.D. 1662. We in Canada have the advantage of all this mass of knowledge, gathered together without effort on our part, and it is the very height of folly to ignore it. Mistakes made in the early days of catholic revival were excusable, and it is only natural that customs which were begun in those days, and have been endeared by long use to many an Englishman, should die hard now that they are known to be without authority. But there can be no excuse for similar mistakes here, and Churchmen have a right to expect that in the revival of ritual which has already begun, and in all probability will go steadily forward, the customs adopted shall be those authorized by our Mother Church and no others. Thus, and thus only, can those who are responsible for reviving the beauty and dignity of worship amongst us disprove the charge so frequently made against them of disloyalty and lawlessness.

RECTOR.

Help Urgently Needed.

SIR,—I shall esteem it a great favour if you will find room for this letter in your widely circulated paper, and will be as brief as possible.

Some time ago I pleaded for help for the little struggling mission at Fairbank, where we are building a church, to meet the needs of a congregation now worshipping in an ex-tavern, and to secure for the Church of England a firm footing in a place which will unquestionably in course of time become a thriving suburb of Toronto, and in its turn a feeder of poorer missions. That appeal met with but one answer (from a lady in England), and so slowly have funds come in that for some time the work of building the church has been stopped, and it has only just been resumed, thanks to a private loan, which has to be repaid within a month. Not only must that be

repaid, but much more will be needed besides. The church will probably be ready for occupation about the beginning of November, and by that time we want to raise at least \$500. Help that is given now will be doubly welcome, and every donation, no matter how small, will be most thankfully received. It is a serious crisis in the history of the mission. We do not want to mortgage the church if we can help it. Fellow Churchmen and Churchwomen, we appeal to you to stretch out a helping hand. There is in the actual working of the mission as much encouragement as we can reasonably look for, and there is a bright future if we can safely weather the present.

Contributions will be gratefully received and acknowledged by

G. FARQUHAR DAVIDSON,
Student-in-charge.

Trinity College, Toronto.

P.S.—The Rector of Christ Church, Deer Park (in whose parish St. Hilda's Church is being built), writes, "I am sure there must be many who would willingly subscribe for so good and so necessary an object. (Signed) T. W. PATTERSON."

Appeal for Clothing.

SIR,—Our boy's home, for which the Government granted \$750, is now complete, and although the balance of the \$500 asked from E. Canada has not been made up, still we could open the home if kind friends would send us *at once* some boys' clothing; there are over seventy boys wanting to come in, but we have not sufficient clothing. The Government has given us twenty blankets and twenty pairs of trousers, but this is not enough—we want shirts (new or otherwise), trousers, socks, jerseys (dark blue preferred), quilts for the beds, as well as sheets and blankets—the clothing to fit boys ranging from six to ten years.

The Government are not giving one cent of money towards the keep of these boys, therefore I am compelled to fall back on Christian friends in Canada—without this help I cannot take in the boys. Who will respond to this appeal, and enable me not only to snatch these poor Indian lads from heathenism, but also to make them bright ornaments of our dear old Church.

F. SWAINSON.

St. Paul's Mission, Blood Reserve,
Macleod, Alberta.

The Church of the Future.

SIR,—In the providence of God, in the olden time, in the days of Solomon, there was erected, for a season, at Jerusalem, a great building called a temple, having two pillars, Jachin and Boaz. We always thought this temple was to be a mere temporary building, and that the local worship of the Jews would some day give place to a real national worship under Christianity, with headquarters in Jerusalem. We were taught to believe that Jachin and Boaz had long ago fallen to rise no more. It appears we have been altogether mistaken, and that there is no such thing as national religion. We are now informed that the Anglican Church is (modestly) about to revive (resurrect) the temple, and place it in quiet old Canterbury, and that the porch thereof will be hereafter supported by two pillars, only under new names,—Rome and Dissent. All the tribes of the earth are to assemble here, for we must know that Jerusalem, Antioch and Rome are in 1893 merely highways to Canterbury. What a religion is this for the closing years of the 19th century! It takes away one's breath. We sincerely pity the Archbishop. He is to be a Lawyer-Bishop. It is only fair to say he himself has nothing to do with the scheme. It is being prepared for him by some very zealous priests of the Church. A national church like that of England, that has now to lean on crutches—Assyria and Egypt—is hardly in a sound, healthy condition. Possibly its load is so great it must get help. When National Synods throughout the world are asked to appeal to Canterbury, instead of being told to settle their own affairs, or to appeal to a General Council (they had no General Synods—they had National Synods and General Councils in the early Church), we know things are not what we had hoped for. When, however, there takes place Church Union (of the generally approved fashion), what a pleasant time there will be the world over. We shall be, you know, all one then—no difference. Good, bad, and indifferent go together. The triple alliance will have taken place. We wonder what Bishop Cleveland Coxe now thinks of this proposed amalgamation. His La belle France at the feet of an "Anglican" is a new role in ecclesiastical affairs. It will be the Western Church with a vengeance—purely Western. The wise men, we are told, came from the East. Of course the Church of the United States of America is prepared to do anything and everything we in Canada tell them to do. They must surely fall down and worship in the new temple erected by us. Pity we could not bring the Archbishop over to Toronto, and we could capture the United States, spiritually, if not politically.

Although Macedonian development (Church of the Thessalonians) must hereafter be received without doubt, even though they had no resident Bishop (no bishop—no church), we hardly think Thessalonica, even clasping to its bosom the 39 Articles (they are beginning to be appreciated in 1893), would expect to see in this architectural age Jachin and Boaz in this kind of Canterbury—Corinthian style. A national religion, or no religion at all, is our national inheritance. Which shall it be? The most inconsistent men in religion we have ever met, and we have met many thousands, have been and are men calling themselves Churchmen. The Holy Catholic Church is to most of them a veritable jumble of political and unhistoric associations. If you ask them what they mean by the "Church," they cannot tell you plainly. They are to themselves the meat of a spiritual sandwich, but this is poor fare for a spiritually hungry world, which needs national churches, national liturgies, and national colors. The logic of to-day is—suppress all allusion to Caerleon and to the Bishop of St. David's, and tell us that the Irvingites are in favor of independent national Episcopal Churches. We must also abhor native Christianity. Is this truth? It may be to others, but not to us. We are always ready to treat with due courtesy those who follow Rome and those who follow Dissent, but, as for union with them, we protest against it most solemnly. They must become one with us under native (imported labor if you like) Episcopacy or remain as they are. In order to preserve ourselves we had to part with Dr. Wilson and Dr. Adams. Are we to change, and now take them back, each, respectively, leading by the hand a General Booth and His Holiness Leo. XIII. When this takes place kindly let us know; we should dearly like to see the reception, but of course no invitation will be sent to such a heretic as we are. Union can only take place through National Synods. We have not advocated the repeal of any General Council; we are not foolish enough to imagine that there is any earthly power which can repeal such. Acts of Councils must stand, and neither prelate nor layman, nor, even National Synods, can erase from history the proceedings of any one General Council. If we are ever to have union with the many branches of the Greek Church, we must, however, either convert them to the "procession" from both Father and Son (a heavy task for Anglicans), or we must modify the Filioque of certain Councils. Which of these shall it be? Possibly we are prepared to be Filioque men to-day, if there be no Greeks with us, and non-Filioque men if there be Greeks. An elastic mode of procedure to please others, would, doubtless, smooth matters, but it could hardly preserve to us the truth. It has not as yet been revealed to us that God, at any time, intended to divide the whole world of peoples among Anglicans, Romans and Greeks, to the exclusion of national beliefs. This appears to be an idea prevalent now-a-days, but who can tell whence it arose?

C. A. FRENCH.

No Society Craze.

SIR,—I am glad to see that you are impressed with the great and growing evils connected with a multiplication of societies in the Church. Fancy having the following societies in the army: "A society for encouraging officers to wear their full uniform," "A society for the promotion of obedience to orders among privates," "A society for the discouragement of insubordination," "A society to put down a too literal obedience to orders," "A society for the upholding of discipline," "A society to encourage people to join the army," etc. How absurd all this sounds, and yet this is about parallel to the present state of affairs in the Church. It seems hardly necessary to get up a society to teach a man his duty. The best lay help after all is to obey orders and do lay work, and not teaching the laity to despise their distinctive duties. I see many and grave evils impending in this connection. I hope others will speak.

FRONDIX.

Notes and Queries.

SIR,—Please answer the following questions. (1) What is the legal status of a retired clergyman as a parishioner? i.e., (2) Can he vote as any other parishioner at vestry meetings? (3) Can he be elected as chairman in absence of incumbent? (4) Can he be legally elected to the office of churchwarden or lay delegate? (5) Can an assistant curate preside at vestry meetings duly constituted in the absence of the incumbent, with or without the latter's consent formally given?

VIATOR.

Ans.—These answers apply to pewed churches in Ontario and Quebec, and to free churches in the diocese of Toronto.