

The Word "Protestant."

The Bishop of London, Dr. Ingram, is a past master at addressing men's meetings, and in the heart of his address at the last Congress at Stoke-on-Trent to 3,000 men at Burslem, we find these words recorded: "He was not ashamed of the word 'Protestant,' for there were many Roman things he could not consent to, but he gloried in the word 'Catholic,' because that meant they had the whole truth to tell to the whole world." In adopting the word Protestant Bishop Ingram gives himself up with great bishops like Bishop Stubbs and Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, and with great jurists like Lord Chancellor Selborne, and with the King's coronation oath in which His Majesty declared himself a faithful Protestant. The word is often objected to, but it is interesting to note that the greatest living bishop in the Anglican Communion accepts it and lives by it.

Dunstaffnage Castle.

We recently pointed out an instance in old Upper Canada days of history being preserved by well written legal judgments. The Scottish judiciary have just given a finding which we trust will shed light on the history of the part of the West Highlands which Scott just touches (and not attractively) in the legend of Montrose. The court was called on to decide as to the relative rights in Dunstaffnage Castle of the Duke of Argyle and Campbell of Dunstaffnage. The question arose from a desire to know who was entitled to exercise rights of repair and ownership. In and prior to the fifteenth century the castle was the stronghold of the Lords of Lorne, and when the lordship passed to the Earls, now Dukes of Argyle, it was made the seat for the payments for the Barony, and this has continued in writing since 1540. The Campbells of Dunstaffnage in 1667 were made "Captains" of the castle and bound to defend it. In 1810, the castle was destroyed by fire and the Duke of Argyle desires to reconstruct and render habitable the picturesque old ruin.

John the Baptist.

Do Church people realize how strikingly this great prophet is held up before us by the Church? Not only is his wilderness cry repeated in the opening sentences of the Prayer Book, and his father's prediction concerning him sung in the morning canticles, and his life commemorated every year on June the 24th, but he is definitely held up by the Church in the 3rd Advent collect, at the beginning of every Christian year, as our particular example for worthily preparing for the Lord's return. Canon Simpson said not long ago in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, "short as is the story of his life, there are few figures that stand out more impressively from the pages of Scripture than that of the great preacher who prepared the way of the Lord." Has the Church tried to learn the meaning of the word "like-wise" in the 3rd Advent collect? It is a startling and humiliating experience to compare our lives with the life of John the Baptist, as this word requires us to do. If John's way is the right way, how does it accord with the professional revivalism, and the large conventions, and the elaborate advertising and the star preaching of the present day? Was not his method simple and direct—delivering his penetrating message of repentance to soul after soul? Crowds came to him, but they came not as a result of long continued advertising, but of faithful testimony. Church organizations may serve a good purpose in many cases, but the 3rd Advent collect shows us what the Church expects of every Church member, viz.: faithful testimony to one soul after another, and this testimony, if it is to be like John the Baptist's, must grow out of a life of secret communion with God.

The Growth of a Community.

It is a pity that Romanist journalists, who know better, should so often forget courtesy and good manners when speaking of Christians and other communions. We were struck by a reference to a Methodist question by the allegation that the want of large families would soon adjust things in a different way. In like manner the Tablet in England, while alleging that a large portion of Romanist marriages take place at registry offices, claims that the number of marriages is not the only factor in estimating the growth of a community, but it was necessary to take into account the fertility of the marriages.

The Chinese Change.

It seems idle for us with our meagre information to say what is the present ruling movement in China, or to attempt to foretell the character of the future government of this immense country and population—whether it will remain one nation or break up or have portions nibbled by encroaching nations. Of one thing we may be proud, that is of Sun Yat Sen, who has held such a foremost and directing place during the recent troubles. Sun Yat Sen was trained in the English mission school at Honolulu and was baptized in Canton. Thus, as the Living Church said, "the throne that is older than the Christian Church succumbs to the vision that has been implanted by a humble mission among the Chinese in one of the farthest outposts of Christian civilization." His father had been a poor Cantonese who had gone to the Islands and worked in a sugar plantation. The work of the missions permeates the rank and file of the revolutionist army.

MOHAMMEDANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Few of our Church people, we imagine, have any clear or adequate conception of the character and present status of this great rival system of religion which confronts our missionaries in certain regions, and which at present, according to unimpeachable information, is gaining more converts from Christianity than Christianity from it. Mohammedanism at the present moment is emphatically "the" enemy. With "heathen" religions—so-called—the case is somewhat different. In Mohammedanism we find a religion that to a certain extent fights Christianity upon its own ground and with its own weapons. And undoubtedly, viewed from a non-Christian standpoint, and as compared with many other systems, Mohammedanism has many merits of its own, which makes it all the more dangerous. It is manifest that no religion that boasts the history and occupies the present status of Mohammedanism, could be devoid of much that in itself is excellent and even admirable. Mohammedanism stands for certain fundamental truths in common with Christianity, as against the rest of the world. First and foremost and always it has upheld the Unity of God. This belief has been a great uplifting force and it accounts mainly for the moral ascendancy of the Moslems among all the Asiatic peoples. Coupled with a strong belief in God's eternal and unchangeable purposes, and of themselves as the chosen instruments of those purposes, this belief made them at first absolutely, and later on, all but irresistible, in their onward advance. The conception of an invisible God of such moral majesty, the one eternal, unchangeable, indivisible Creator and Disposer, enhances again the estimate of our own personality as His offspring. The higher our belief the higher our opinion of our own worth and importance. This, then, is the supreme redeeming feature of Mohammedanism, which has undoubtedly to a certain extent, as in the case of the monotheistic Jew, imparted a strength and dignity to the character of its adherents. Upon this belief follows, in the second

place, spiritual worship, at least a worship absolutely free from what in the narrow sense, and only in the narrow sense, may be called, "idolatry." In the third place, Mohammedanism teaches on the whole, and with some exceptions which may be paralleled in Judaism, a sound morality, truthfulness, honesty, mercy to the poor, etc., a morality as far as we can judge, as a working system, above any of the non-Christian religions to-day. Again, there is the missionary spirit of Mohammedanism. It takes the whole world for its province. Its motto is, "The World for God." And magnificently have they in bygone times given effect to this belief. Few people, we suspect, realize how narrowly Europe escaped being Mohammedanized and how quite possibly the whole future course of human progress and civilization hung on the issue of the Battle of Tours, when after three days and nights of desperate and incessant fighting, Charles Martel finally arrested the advance of the Saracens. Had it not been for that crowning victory, due to the personality of the great Christian champion, we might all of us have been the followers of the Prophet to-day, and the whole history of the human race would have taken another course.

So much may be said for Mohammedanism. On the other hand, to take point by point, (1) the Moslem idea of God, though noble and exalted and certainly tending to the elevation of human character, is, as has well been said by a recent writer, "singularly sterile." We look in vain for that strong sense of His Fatherhood as taught even in Judaism. To the Moslem the words of the Twenty-third and One Hundred and Third Psalms would be incomprehensible. God dwells apart from Man, remote, inaccessible, untouched by human woes or needs, as some one has put it, "in lone egoism," a Being before whom we might fear and tremble, but hardly venerate and certainly never love. It follows, therefore, that the worship of such a Being, though superficially spiritual, must be largely mechanical. Worship in this case takes the form of propitiation rather than of communion. Such a worship, then, is merely negative. It is the averting of certain evil consequences rather than the imparting of spiritual life. Therefore, in spite of all its simplicity, it becomes mechanical. Mohammedan worship lacks all the true essentials of worship as understood in the higher sense, reverence, confidence, love, spiritual communion. (2) The Mohammedan morality, though well enough as far as it goes, and under the circumstances not to be despised, is fundamentally defective, because in matters of rules, rather than of principles, and like its worship, consequently mechanical. And it is saturated with materialism. There is no love in it of righteousness for righteousness' sake, no unselfish enthusiasm for the truth, irrespective of all personal ends. Then, it is governed by an iron bound fatalism which, while it imparts a certain force and strength, crimps and dwarfs. (3) Again, Mohammedanism relies on physical force. Its kingdom is emphatically of this world. It works from the outward to the inward, not from the inward to the outward. Lastly, the personal character of its founder, not only being far below the ideal, actually fell below the standard set up by himself. He is revered, therefore, not for what he was, but for what he did. This is one of the cardinal defects of Mohammedanism. It puts zeal before righteousness, proselytizing before personal holiness.

To contrast Christianity point by point with Mohammedanism: (1) In the character of God in His Fatherhood, nearness, accessibility and in dwelling power. (2) The spirituality of Christian worship, wherein man has communion and fellowship with God and meets Him face to face, which is not the mere propitiating of a higher

power,
human
or holi
terms o
grasp i
tireless
realizat
hast ma
till we
of Chri
earthly
enthusia
its victo
affection
to the b
tion, cu
that is
ally, th
Founder
on this
The cha
that of
times.
reformer
Mohamm
undoubt
knew C
Stanley
medans
corrupte
ant, self
as we h
Adversit
been his
obscure,
Christ c
Mohamm
inferior
erous riv
as it doe
it can o
making
code of
polygam
ianity at
will prev
moment
the tide r
missions
suffer te
confidence
Mohamm
tion and
and pro
capable
remains
possible
apparent
Lord Ho
put it:
"Moham
Christi
So as th
And r
The lett
Stiff a
While a
The sp
Flows th
More f

We ha
cular of
owing to
land, is
is seldom
that has
uniform
exception
the dioc