

one of his statements, and curiously enough, the one case where he seems to disparage the building he describes. "*As a reredos has not yet been erected, the Sanctuary at present lacks the dignity and beauty which belong to it.*" (p. 139.) We are not sure whether by the word "Sanctuary" Canon Brigstocke means, as we should, the whole house of God, or some portion of it. But he will permit us to defend the beauty of his church, just as it stands, against his criticism, and to assure him that (quite apart from questions of ritual), as a mere matter of artistic taste, a sculptured reredos would by no means enhance the present dignified beauty of the eastern end. In a little church, lavishly decorated, such an addition might please the eye, but in an edifice so really grand in dimensions as Trinity, the effect would be—at least to the taste of many judges, tawdry and commonplace, and utterly out of harmony with the surroundings.

Such a book as this should find many readers far beyond the limits of this city, and doubtless a second edition will soon be called for. We should suggest the addition of a table of contents at the beginning, and, if possible, of an index; also a chronological list of churchwardens. The work is so well done at present, that even trifling details are worth attention to make it in every respect complete, and a permanent addition to the Church history of Canada.

"CHURCH DOCTRINE—BIBLE TRUTH."

Considerable surprise was manifested in many quarters when among the text books announced as the subject of examination for Ordination in our diocese was found included a book by the Rev. M. F. Sadler bearing the title written above. There were two grounds for this astonishment. In the first place it is the universal custom to select standard theological works for such examinations. Butler's Analogy, Pearson on the Creed, and portions of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, are to the theological student what Euclid is to the young mathematician. Bishop Harold Browne's book upon the Articles is deservedly added to these classical works, in acknowledgement of its accuracy and impartiality. St. Augustine's treatise upon Christian Doctrine has been included by many bishops in this list, as well as Wheatley or Humphry on the book of Common Prayer, and Waterland upon the Holy Communion. All these of course are subsidiary to Holy Scripture, general knowledge of the text, and a special study of selected books from Old and New Testament.

Doubtless in different dioceses the list of books is varied. Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, a masterpiece of condensed learning and lucid exposition, and the '*Historic Faith*' of the same author, are frequently recommended. But never do we find any works ancient or modern, which have not obtained that stamp of approval from the public opinion of the whole church, which comes so late, so rarely, and so durably.

In the second place all party advocacy is strictly excluded. The Church of England includes three historic parties, but those who are offering themselves for her orders have enough to do at first in studying those truths and those great text books which are respected by all. There are representatives of all

these parties now, (and we are glad of it), on the episcopal bench in England. Yet we are certain that Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, a most decided and able high churchman, does not examine his candidates in the polemics of the late Dr. Littledale; Bishop Ryle, an Evangelical as able and determined, does not impose the *dicta* of Dean Goode as of supreme authority, nor recommend his own vigorous tracts as embracing all the counsel of God; neither does Bishop Moorhouse, a typical broad churchman, examine upon Dr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures, or Canon Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament.

Privately, these eminent bishops may recommend the treatises we have mentioned, and it is their perfect right to do so. Publicly, they remember the responsibilities as well as the privileges of their position, and they would not think of imposing the advocacy of a party, though it were the party of their own allegiance or preference, upon the mind and utterance of a candidate for orders.

The reason for this is obvious. At the age when our clergy are first ordained, the mind, though active and receptive, is not fitted for judicially weighing the value of arguments. Clever special pleading (if endorsed by authority) passes for logic, will be accepted without question, and adopted as the reason for their faith in after life. We are far from believing that this evil is to be found on one side only. In former days of the present century, when the Evangelical party had lost the old spiritual fervour of the first revival, and had not yet profited by strengthening influences of later times, it was to be found in their books too often, and heard from their platforms. Doctrines asserted to be proved by single texts, detached from the context; the history of the Church of England ignored or distorted; such things were not unknown, we fear among the less educated and more vehement partisans. And therefore it behoves us to remember these things when we find the same errors on a side less congenial to our own tastes. We must not condemn certain fallacies without the sorrowful admission that they express a tendency of all times and all parties, and demonstrate indeed, the inevitable danger of party spirit in the Church of Christ.

Mr. Sadler's treatise must be pronounced the most able and ingenious piece of advocacy for the views of "advanced High Churchmen" that has yet appeared. It is brief in compass and studiously temperate in tone. It professes to appeal to the sole authority of Holy Scriptures as the foundation and criterion of Church Doctrine. If the book claimed to be Mr. Sadler's personal confession of faith, no Protestant could raise a word of objection. He might differ from the results of the investigation, he might point out flaws in the reasoning, but he must needs grant liberty to the individual Christian to be "fully assured in his own mind," he must assume the honesty of the process, and the personal conviction in the results. But Mr. Sadler claims more than this. He claims to speak not only for his individual convictions, but for the Church of England and her teaching. We have a right, therefore, to examine his qualifications as a teacher, and to test his work by such criterion as may fairly be applied to all theological teaching.

Space is not available for a detailed examination of the