

of Nantes. After receiving his early education at Norwich Grammar School, he entered Corpus, Cambridge, where his career was a distinguished one. He was D.D. of his own university (1873), and received the same degree as an honorary distinction from the University of Edinburgh in 1884. In 1875 he was appointed an honorary chaplain to the Queen, and in 1878 he was nominated, on the recommendation of Lord Beaconsfield, to the deanery of Peterborough in succession to Dr. Saunders. It should also be mentioned that he was a member of the company engaged on the revision of the old Testament, and also of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts.

VULGARITY OF THE PRESS.—The interviewer is another product of our vulgarity. It used to be said that "an Englishman's house is his castle." As completely as Cromwell's troopers dismantled the castles of their day, razing to the ground curtain and bastion and battlement, so completely is the security of private life invaded and broken down, and every man practically lives in a house open to the sky. The moment his name is publicly breathed it is thought necessary that we should all rush in and gaze upon him with curious, impertinent stare, ask him his views on all things in heaven and earth, mark every gesture, every mannerism, every physical peculiarity of the man, and never rest till we have wormed out of him all that is to be discovered concerning his past life and his present doings. "No man is a hero to his valet;" and if we are to measure our fellows, not by their public achievements, but by the raked-up trivialities, the errors, the weaknesses of their whole life, hero-worship, that once powerful stimulus of great deeds, must soon become extinct.

VULGARITY IN LITERATURE.—In the department of literature and the press the vulgarity of the day is very plainly reflected, and its most mischievous outcome is, perhaps, the society journal. It is an appalling fact that week after week papers are published, and eagerly read by tens of thousands, whose sole attractions are the tittle-tattle of so-called society, descriptions of dresses and presents at fashionable weddings, rumours of approaching marriages and gaities in certain houses, pictures of newly made brides, pretended revelations of the inner family life of distinguished personages, scandals publicly notorious or darkly hinted at, passages in the lives of questionable people, and injurious criticisms on men and women of simple and virtuous living. Some papers we know of which actually speak a language unintelligible save to the initiated, as well for their allusions to names and events in vulgar life, as for the words and phrases in which the information is conveyed. And the pitiful part of it all is that in both classes of journal there is absolutely nothing that can be of the slightest use to any single soul, to inform, to cheer, or to elevate. It is a literature all on one dead level of hopeless, abject inanity.

TRIAL OF THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

The Archbishop delivered his judgment on the above case at Lambeth Palace on Nov. 21st.

The charges brought against Dr. King were as follows:

1. Altar lights.
2. Mixed chalice.
3. Eastward position.
4. Permitting the *Agnus Dei* to be sung.
5. Making the sign of the cross.

6. Making the ablutions.

The Archbishop now ruled that:

1. The lighting of candles when not needed for purposes of illumination, but as ceremony, was not illegal.
2. The mixing of the chalice, i. e., adding water to the wine, should be done before the service.
3. The eastward position is legal provided that the manual acts in the consecration are visible to the congregation.
4. The singing of the *Agnus Dei* is legal.
5. Making the sign of the cross at absolution and benediction, illegal.
6. The ablutions are legal.

The Archbishop's decision has been awaited with the deepest interest, as it was felt to involve not only the questions of ritual directly at issue, but, in the event of an appeal by the Church Association, the ultimate authority of the Archbishop's court. If the Association should be successful in carrying it to the Privy Council, the case would involve the gravest questions as to the mutual relations of Church and State. It is doubtful if the Bishop of Lincoln, or the Archbishop himself, would admit the supremacy of a secular tribunal.

TEACHING.

One of the practical duties which the great Lambeth Conference of last year urged upon the faithful generally, was the duty of clear, definite and persistent teaching of the truths of the Gospel. There is no more important subject to which they could have addressed themselves. And we are persuaded that there is no duty that needs to be more earnestly urged upon the clergy and the parents of this generation than this. In religious matters this is an undogmatic age. It is an age which is striving after great definiteness in all matters of science and of history, but which has strangely persuaded itself that what it calls dogmatism—which is only another word for clear, definite doctrinal statement and teaching—is a great danger to the freedom of the intellect and a hindrance to the progress of general enlightenment and civilization. This sentiment has probably grown out of the *sectism* of the Christianity with which we are brought in contact. To state clearly, for instance, the doctrines held by the Church of England, is of necessity to condemn the doctrines held by some of those who have separated from her. And this is thought, in the first place, to be uncharitable, and in the second place to shut up our sympathies, as well as our subjects of speculation, within narrow limits. Indeed, the acceptance of any doctrine or system of doctrines as ascertained and definite truth, is assumed to have a curbing effect upon the expansive powers of the mind by removing certain subjects from the region of enquiry into that of ascertained truth, by giving a certain direction to the mind and by fixing a certain limit to thought by its very certainty. And so it has come to pass from the one cause or the other that we are living in an age that delights in Christian sentiment and opinion, rather than in definite doctrinal statement; and so it has turned out that many of us have been brought up on exhortations, and many more upon platitudes; and but few upon clear, authoritative, unhesitating statements of the truth.

POPULAR TEACHING.

Popular teaching outside the Church imposes but very few doctrines, upon the faith of those whom it seeks to win. The old elaborate systems of Calvinism and Arminism are seldom or never

advocated now. One popular preacher in Toronto boasted, not long ago, that his Church did not even require its adherents to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, but only just in the Lord Jesus Christ. He was necessarily concealing either from himself or from his people the fact that belief in the Lord Jesus Christ implies belief in the whole Catholic faith, including the Trinity. Another popular preacher boasted in a controversial letter that his Church did not propound to its people an elaborate system of doctrine like that of the Church of England, but just taught a few essential doctrines, such as Justification by Faith, the Atonement, Conversion, etc. These teachers did not perceive that what they boasted of as their glory was in truth their shame; that upon the Church has been laid the burden of teaching all things whatsoever He, the Master, has said; that to fail to declare to the people "the whole counsel of God" is to fail in the fulfilment of the most solemn duty laid upon those who are called out to witness to the saving power of His name.

Thus, however, it has come to pass that the age needs definite and full doctrinal teaching, and what is more, the age desires it. General Booth has said lately that in spite of their clamouring for liberty, men do like to be governed. It is equally true that in spite of the vagueness with which some are seeking popularity, men do like to be taught, and to be taught clear and definite doctrines. After all, authority is the greatest power in the world. Men and women know full well that they have not the knowledge or the ability to ascertain for themselves, amid the many conflicting theories, the ultimate and the whole truth, or to guide themselves amid the perplexing speculations that are forever going forward; and so they are ready to follow and do follow any positive and unhesitating leader who may offer himself. Hence the necessity of teaching the whole truth with unhesitating and dogmatic authority. People very seldom, under any pressure, abandon in after years what they have thus learned.

DUTY OF THE CLERGY.

Therefore we would say to the clergy, lay yourselves out to teach—to teach the whole truth. Learn to teach in your sermons, lectures, catechizings, with clearness, with illustration, with all the attractiveness you can throw into it. It may not give much opportunity for the display of rhetorical eloquence, but it will build your people up in faith and in holiness.

DUTY OF PARENTS.

And to parents we say, remember that this is not a matter of choice with you, so that you may do it or leave it alone as you feel inclined. It is a responsibility that rests upon you by the very fact of your privilege of being parents. God's command stands unrepealed: "Thou shalt teach them (the truths of God) to thy children when thou goest out and when thou comest in, when thou liest down and when thou risest up." And yet how few parents are there who are giving, or who ever have given, anything but the meagrest instruction in Christian truth to their children and servants? They give them spasmodic instruction at home, or they assign them to a governess, if they have one; or they send them to Sunday schools to get rid of the bother of looking after them for an hour or two. The Sunday schools are excellent and useful institutions in their place, but not as substitutes for parental teaching. If parents would enquire of their children what lessons have been set them by their teachers, insist upon their learning them, and help them to learn