

Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

The DOMINION CHURCHMAN is Two Dollars a year. It is paid strictly, that is promptly in advance, the price will be one dollar; and in no instance will this rule be departed from. Subscribers can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper.

The "Dominion Churchman" is the organ of the Church of England in Canada, and is an excellent medium for advertising—being a family paper, and by far the most extensively circulated Church journal in the Dominion.

Frank Wootten, Proprietor, & Publisher.
Address: P. O. Box 2640.

Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E., west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

Mar. 25. EASTER DAY.

Morning... Exodus xii. to 23; Revelation i. 10 to 19.

Evening... Exodus xii. 29 or xiv; John xi. 11 to 19 or Revelation v.

Mar. 26. MONDAY IN EASTER WEEK.

Morning... Exodus xv. to 22; Luke xxiv. to 13.

Evening... Canticles ii. 10; Matthew xxviii. to 10.

Mar. 27. TUESDAY IN EASTER WEEK.

Morning... 2 Kings xiii. 14 to 22; John xxi. to 15.

Evening... Ezekiel xxxvii. to 15; John xxi. 15.

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1883.

The DOMINION CHURCHMAN has removed into larger and more commodious offices, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. East, west of Post Office.

AMERICAN MISTAKES ABOUT ENGLAND.—Our American cousins have a droll idea of the manner in which social distinctions are exhibited in England. A play of native origin is now in course of representation, in which a great English nobleman is one of the prominent characters. All sorts of people address him as "my lord," and speak of him as "his lordship." Everybody knows that this is not done in England, except among classes who don't know better. But the American playwright goes further. For instance, he makes the personage in question of so much distinction that he has had the most noble and ancient Order of the Garter conferred upon him, and to emphasize the matter he makes him wear the broad blue ribbon and the diamond star, in the house, in the street, and at a garden party.

MANNERS.—So says a contemporary and wisely, for the English nobility regard a man as disagreeable who incessantly lards them with titular terms in his letters or talk. While on this topic we may just add that Canadian Journal objected to an ex-pupil of Archbishop Benson speaking of him as "Benson." If that journalist had been educated at an English public school he would have known better than to object to this, but a common school here is not the place to learn "manners."

MADAME GASPARIN ON "GENERAL" BOOTH. This celebrated lady has issued a pamphlet on "General" Booth's "Orders and Regulations for the Salvation Army," in which she impeaches the movement—its aims, methods, and proceedings—as hurtful to society and disgraceful to religion. Mr. Booth's system, she says, as developed in his orders and regulations, is a military system. "Liberty, will, thought, individuality, are suppressed on all the line, and replaced by a single word—Obedience. In the material world the system may have some advantages. In the spiritual world it is a crime against man, a sacrilege against God. Mr. Booth stops at nothing. Usurping the Divine name and the Divine authority, he appropriates at the same time the rights of God. All the texts which define the attributes of God and men's duty to Him, Mr. Booth adopts and applies to the chief of the army.

The army is the army of God. The commands of its chief are the commands of God. To join the army is to be converted to God. To serve the army is to serve God. . . . Mr. Booth tells us that he has invented all this—subjection, military organization, Salvation Army. He has invented nothing. Military autocracy in things spiritual—with extension to things temporal—battalions, battles, conquests, all existed before he was born. They were called monastic spirit, monastic organization, monastic power, monastic invasions. There was even one who anticipated Mr. Booth in calling himself "General"—the General of the Jesuits. . . . Is Mr. Booth sincere? So was Loyola, and he created the Order of Jesuits. Dominic was sincere, and he founded the Inquisition. . . . If Jesus should descend to us, as all true Christians, humiliated by your acts, pray that He may, know you what He would do? He would break your trumpets and crush your platforms, tear the epaulettes from the shoulders of your officers, bid your women return to their hearths, follow their domestic duties, cultivate humble virtues, fulfil their feminine mission. Your young girls! Do you believe that Jesus, tearing away their veil of modesty, would expose them on your mountebanks' stages and let them make public speeches? Do you believe that He would send them in full uniform, braving a fire of questionable gallantries, to sell your pamphlets in the streets of Paris, and make them beat tambourines in your bacchanalian processions? Jesus! Do not pronounce His name. Invoked in your theatres it is a profanation the more.

"CHURCH BELLS," ON A KNOTTY TEXT.—In reply to 'A. W.,' we beg to refer for the interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 21 to the notes in *New Testament Commentaries*, edited by Bp. Ellicott, vol. iii. (Cassell & Co.) It gives the sense thus: 'Noah's flood, in antitype, to this day saves you—that is to say, baptism, which is no cleansing of the skin from dirt, but an application to God for a clear conscience.' No doubt 'the putting away of the filth of the flesh' means the outward cleansing of the body by water; and the Apostle tells us that baptism is no mere outward washing of the skin, but that while this is the outward and visible sign, the thing signified is a conscience cleansed from sin by means of Christ's Resurrection. The word translated 'answer' in the Authorized Version cannot have that meaning. The Geneva translation was, 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in that a good conscience maketh request to God.' Some such word as 'inquiry,' 'request,' or 'appeal,' must be substituted for 'answer.' But there may be difference of opinion as to whether the appeal is made by a good conscience or for a good conscience. The Greek admits, grammatically, of either translation. In the one case the meaning would be that a believer whose conscience has been already purified through Christ's Resurrection comes to God in baptism, and requests admission, by baptism, into the ark of salvation. In the other the candidate for baptism would appeal to God, through the appointed outward means, to have the power of Christ's Resurrection brought to bear inwardly upon his conscience, so that he might no longer be under the power of sin. Either meaning is consistent with Gospel truth. But we incline to the latter as being, on the whole, more like what we read elsewhere, while it fits in excellently with the rest of this epistle.

CHURCH BUSY BODIES AND MEDDLERS.—Bishop Wilberforce had a facile and commendable way of treating negligent clergymen. An Evangelical clergyman had omitted on St. Bartholomew's day, which fell on a Sunday, to read the Athanasian Creed, and the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the saint's day. The Bishop rebuked the clergyman, who replied that it was only a "trifling irregularity," and requested the Bishop to give up the name of the person who had made the complaint, whom he denounced as a "busybody." To this the Bishop replied that neglect of the prescribed Office was not a

"trifling irregularity," that the person who had given the information had "taken the proper course in complaining to the Bishop," and that he should not disobey his Bishop with impunity. The Bishop's rebuke is needed at times nearer home for an instance has recently occurred of a layman who, acting for a considerable body of communicants desired an occasional Celebration of the usual type and for this was dubbed "a meddler." The real meddler in such a case is the cleric who meddles with well established customs and order.

A BAD PRECEDENT.—For a thousand years no such rite was known to the Latin Church at all, as the elevation of the Host and Chalice at the moment of consecration; but about the tenth century it began to make its appearance. But how, and why? Priests wished to mark by some definite act, at the time of consecration, their belief in the truth of the words they had just uttered, and to invite the people to adore the present CHRIST. And so some French priests, out of their own private devotion, introduced the elevation, first only of the Host, then of both Host and Chalice. Thus the practice quietly spread and then become a written tradition. In the course of time (in this instance as in many others) Rome accepted the devout innovation. Synods took up the matter, canons endorsed and prescribed the rite, and so by an easy process it became at last universal in the West. In 1549 the Church forbade elevation at consecration. In 1552 the prohibition was withdrawn, and English priests who now seek out of their own private devotion to restore the elevation are only trying to bring back this edifying rite by the same channel through which it originally came in.

Thus, says the *Church Review*, forgetful of the danger of allowing individuals to bring in ceremonies contrary to general usage, which were never known until the tenth century. Surely that fact condemns such usages as not Catholic!

FALSE IDEAS ON WORSHIP.—The conception of worship,—the oblation of our inmost thoughts and aspirations: the protestation of our absolute dependence on a Being with Whom are the issues of life and death; the different modes of approaching Him, through the Mediation of CHRIST, in prayer, in praise, in thanksgiving, in propitiation; the going forth from oneself to Another, to hold Communion with Him, mind with Mind, heart with Heart, life with Life, has been exchanged for a subjectivity of devotion, in which thoughts and feelings are ever revolving round oneself, and one's own justification is the centre of the system instead of the Incarnate Life of our God. This puts in a nutshell the fundamental distinction between the worship idea of the Church and the notions of the sectaries. The Catholic Christian is bent only upon "the honor and glory of God," as the old formula said, the sectarian regards worship as something designed for his personal benefit.

AN APROPOS ANECDOTE.—Mr. Baring-Gould in his "Village Preaching" tells the story of an old clergyman who could never get his wife to kneel in Church, and who brought her to see the inconsistency of making a request to a Superior in a sitting posture, by getting the cook to come one day into the drawing-room and take her seat on the sofa beside her mistress and in that posture ask for a holiday. When the incensed lady replied "leave the room instantly, you impudent woman, and if you want a request, learn to ask for it in a proper manner," at that moment the cunning husband put his head in at the door, and reminded the lady that she was preaching the lesson which she had for years refused to learn. But sitting is a reverent attitude for prayer, compared to that adopted in many Churches where the effort is made to appear reverent while at the same time a position is assumed more conducive to a quiet doze. We recently attended a Church where out of a thousand or more present not a sound was heard to indicate that the worship of Common Prayer was being proceeded with.