

disease, and Christ has taken a full survey of the corruption, has put away the sin and removed the sting of death, the penalty of sin. And now in all the dangers and necessities of the faithful Christian, the Saviour stretches forth His right hand to help and defend him, and will at length bring him to His eternal dwelling place at His own right hand in the Heavenly worlds.

OVERWORK AND STIMULANTS.

THE practice of overwork, especially of the brain, is continually creating sad havoc among the present generation of public men, and if the rising generation is to follow unwatched in the footsteps of their fathers, they will follow them most certainly, with accelerated rapidity, to the grave. Somehow, the rage for this sort of "high pressure" life does not seem to have affected our fathers, those of the last generation. Many of the grandest men of the present day, in different departments of public usefulness, are septuagenarians or octogenarians. Who are equal to Bismarck, Disraeli, Gladstone, Carlyle, Ruskin? It is a very grave and serious question. Will any of those of the present generation who equal such giants of intellect in literature or statesmanship survive to their term of human life? It seems very doubtful. There are few men indeed, who can long bear the evil habit of overwork which is in vogue at the present day. Every man has his quantum of endurance in regard to his line of work, whether mental or physical, and this cannot be disregarded by excess without great peril, indeed without serious actual injury. Exhaustion, muscular or nervous, is sure to set in, and the delicate fibres of the human constitution are bruised and torn. Outraged nature asserts herself in the way of revenge, and they who will not give the system the proper quota of rest are compelled to take entire rest in the cessation of life in the grave. There is only one true remedy for overwork and its effects, viz.: REST. Happy is he who does not realize this fact too late, and only consent to rest when labour becomes impossible, because death knocks at the door and will not be denied, cannot be any longer put off or trifled with.

One sad mistake—more sad than the original one of overwork itself—that those who give way to this mad habit are apt to make, is that of fancying that some kind of stimulant will enable them to make headway under pressure, and set nature's demand for moderation and rest at defiance. If there be one well ascertained fact in the whole modern controversy of Temperance, it is that these stimulants are really only spurs to nature, forcing her with unwonted energy without giving any gain of additional strength or power; nay, creating on the part of nature a demand for a proportionate quantity of her remedy, rest. But, in the bustle of our busy lives, this plain philosophy of stimulants is ignored; instead of the needed rest more stimulant is given. The spurs make a deeper gash in the flanks of the goaded steed of human energy. So the "facilis descensus Averni" becomes vividly illustrated. Given some special object to overcome, the stimulus is nature's aid; but the exception does not bear frequent repetition, a continuous strain cannot be met by the spur. The vice of drunkenness adds its hateful presence to the folly of overwork; and nature inflicts disgrace upon him who outraged her plain dictates.

The old saying, "Two blacks will not make a white," never had a better exemplification than the attempt to cure or even palliate the folly of overwork by the worse folly of drink. "Principis obsta"

must be the true motto on this subject; and temperance—the GOSPEL TEMPERANCE of "moderation in all things." The true principle which will enable our brightest intellects, and most useful public men, as well as private benefactors of society in the less obtrusive ways, to prolong their lives beyond their prime (alas! how many have lately fallen in their very prime of manhood) into an old age of continually increasing richness of wisdom.

THE "RITUALISTS" AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE incarceration of these Clergymen in England, nominally for contempt of Court, really for a breach of the Public Worship Act, is producing a reaction. Already the Archbishop of Canterbury has virtually condemned the proceeding, and in his address to the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of West-bere, said that the Ritualist question turned in a great measure "on the independence of the Church, on the one hand, and the controlling power of the State on the other," and that the "gravity of this question is shown by the whole history of England, and indeed, of all civilized countries."

The Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Church, has written a letter to the *Times*, which has produced a great sensation. The letter is remarkable for its practical, common-sense estimate of the whole subject.

Dr. Lake, the Dean of Durham, a broad Churchman inclined to Low Churchism, has followed suit in a long letter to the *London Times*, has broken a lance in favour of the persecuted section of the Church, and comes to their unexpected defence. He says:

"Let me at once express frankly my belief that it will be a great misfortune for the Church of England if it cannot find a place for most of the practices which go by the miscellaneous name of Ritualism within its borders. All Ritualism is not, what a Bishop, from whom we might have expected larger views, is never tired of calling it, a mere triviality. The self-denying devotion of its leading members, which is certainly not surpassed by any body of men in the English Church, ought to have saved it from this charge. It is, to say the least, an expression of their devotional feelings which is dear to many of the most religious minds among us; and (if I may give a practical proof of this) it is certainly closely identified with many of those now numerous congregations of devout workers, especially ladies, whose services we could ill spare in London and other of our large towns. Much of the "high ritual" which is now so common in our churches is, in fact, the not unnatural development, to use a hackneyed term, of a tone of religious belief and feeling which has, ever since the Reformation, held a considerable place in the English Church. It is closely connected with those high Sacramental views which, whether right or wrong, were almost universal in the early Church. It has become much stronger among ourselves in the last 40 years than it ever was before, and I do not believe it possible "to put it down." Crush it now, and it will only break out a few years hence in a stronger form.

I am not, indeed, myself by any means enamoured of many of the extreme Ritualistic proceedings, some of which seem to me only a feeble imitation of the Church of Rome. But taking a fair view, I think it impossible to deny that Ritualism has, on the whole, done good service to the Church of England. It has largely introduced the best music into our worship, has taught us that our rather cumbersome combination of services is not perfection, and has broken them up in a way which has made them accessible to the poor, and certainly not unpopular with the educated. Let any one think of the wearisome dullness which still clings to the services of many of our well-pewed and "three-decked" churches (whose rubrical irregularities are often quite equal to those of Ritualism), and he may well acknowledge the debt which the

religious feeling and taste of England owes to those who have been our pioneers towards a higher conception of public worship.

Of course, I know that there have been many irregularities, and I fully admit the justice of your remark that "a Church must eliminate divergencies tending to disruption." But, in the first place, would they lead to disruption? I greatly doubt it. The number of Ritualist clergy who have been found intractable to their Bishops amounts at the utmost to five or six in all England, while dioceses—Exeter, for example—where Ritualism is generally supposed to be common have not presented a single case of real difficulty, and that of the Rev. Mr. Bodington, as treated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, was a model of mutual conciliation which could not fail to have a good effect upon Ritualists. But, even if there were many more cases of recalcitrancy, I for one should not despair of its being overcome; for, ask yourself whether there has ever been any movement in the English Church, (and I might add the Roman) which has not for a time seemed to "tend to disruption?" In the Roman Church the introduction of every one of the great religious orders seemed to do so, all of which were accepted with hesitation, and all, once heartily accepted, proved the greatest bulwarks to the Church. The policy of the English Church has, no doubt, been different. It has hitherto always driven out its irregular enthusiasts, as it drove out the early Puritans, and the later ones, with Baxter at the Savoy Conference, drove out the Wesleyans, and would have nothing to say to Dr. Newman. Has experience taught us nothing? Have we ever gained anything by this policy of ejection; and can we really afford, at a moment when zealous men are labouring hard to enable the Church of England to regain its influence over the poor, to discard men like the late Mr. Lowder or Mr. Carter, or many out of the numerous congregations which I could name in London? It will be strange to me if our wisest Bishops do not do their utmost to avert what would be, indeed, "another disruption."

I cannot pursue the subject further; for though much more might be said against the policy of pushing matters against the Ritualists to extremities, I could not say this in a single letter, and I have encroached greatly upon your space. But the real question is, whether no course can be adopted short of pressing the extremities of the law against them; and, as I have already referred to the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, I will, in concluding, try to answer the question which, as he says, every one ought to ask themselves at this juncture, "What would you wish to be done?" It may seem to many but a poor conclusion, but I fear it is the only one, to say that if I could not modify the Public Worship Act, (which I should greatly wish) I would urge that the Bishops should strongly discourage prosecutions and work the Act with the greatest conciliation and gentleness. In these respects they have a great deal in their own hands. I am afraid, indeed, that the days in which the Act could be modified are now past; but it must not be forgotten that it was at the time most strongly opposed by two eminent Statesmen on opposite sides—one Lord Cranbrook, the other the present Prime Minister. Many of its disastrous consequences were too truly anticipated by these two eminent men. If they can now be checked or corrected, it can only be by those to whom the working of the Act is mainly intrusted—the Bishops. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

W. C. LAKE, Dean of Durham.
Durham, Dec. 20th."

THE BEST STEPS TOWARDS PROMOTING THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM.

BY REV. CANON CARMICHAEL.

BEFORE entering on the direct subject of the "Wisest steps towards unity," a few preliminary thoughts seem necessary. That once there existed by the grace of God—1st. The happy remembrance of one holy Catholic and undivided Church. 2nd. The faithful remembrance that what has once been through the outpoured grace of an unresisted Spirit, may be again. 3rd. The soul-searching thought