

SPIRITUAL INSENSIBILITY.

THE insensibility of the soul has many phases. There are many ways in which the soul may fall into deadly slumber. In one of its phases, it may be called the sleep of the mind, the torpor of the intellectual life. It is manifested by an avowed indifference to all high culture, by an expressed disbelief in any necessity for it, by a persistent resolve never to enter upon the region of lofty thought; by an indifference and a careless contempt, which, one of our foremost writers has been bold enough to assert, are spreading through the bulk of our highest social class, amongst the high-born and amongst those whom their fathers' industry and enterprise have raised to positions of vast wealth, spreading through them and influencing their children. Even the great schools to which the sons of the wealthy resort are not free from this taint of neglect of the higher life of culture. For there—so the whisper is going round—boys are allowed to initiate themselves into billiards, and betting, and gambling, when they ought to be subject only to influences which shall make them earnest workers in the world which lies beyond the school. And are there not instances known to us all, of men of high birth abandoning all fine culture to devote their energies to exciting sports, and wild gambling, and hurried to early graves by the ignoble enthusiasm which possessed them? The soul may also be sunk in the sleep of selfishness,—the selfishness which manifests itself on the one hand in indifference as to others' welfare, in the desire to use others simply to minister to selfish ends, in the disposition to treat servants as human chattels: on the other hand, it may be manifested by men of lower rank in the social scale possessed by a consuming desire to get on in the world, to get money, to get money if they can, above all things to get money, to gain advantages over their fellows, to rise to power, to add to their pleasures. But whether such selfishness manifests itself in men of high rank, or of low rank, the prevailing thought in the mind of one possessed by it is that his personal welfare and the success of his schemes are of infinitely more importance than anything else in the world. The soul, too, may be lost in the sleep of vulgarity, which is really selfishness in its coarsest form. This is an accomplishment which is not monopolized by any one social class. We see instances of it whenever we see a display of pride and position; whenever we see aristocratic skirts avoiding the mud of plebeianism; whenever we see professional hands drawn back from contact with hands engaged in trade; whenever we see any shrinking back from association with each other, of those who ought to be knit together in the bonds of christian union. We see manifestations of that blight of the soul we call vulgarity, whenever we meet with those who take delight in saying what gives others pain, in being rude when it is just as easy to be civil, in cringing to superiors, in being insolent to inferiors in rank. I am afraid that we are scarcely conscious how deathful this form of selfishness is, how that

this vulgarity is but death mingled with our daily life. We are scarcely conscious how men of other countries, when they come amongst us, marvel at the roughness, the surliness, the gloomy silence, the absence of the smiling face, which they see in far too many with whom they come in contact. Oh! let us cease to cherish this kind of selfishness which so excites the wonder of our fellow-christians of other countries. Let us always remember our Saviour's golden rule. Let us, even in the small things of life, do as we would have them do unto us. Let us restrain the tongue which would speak words tending to give pain to others; let us cultivate gentle courtesy; let us meet our fellow-creatures with a genial smile; let our demeanor be most courteous when we speak to those whose grade is lower than our own; let us advance to our superiors with a frank and manly fearlessness, free from all corrupting servility. There is yet another sleep in which the soul may be lost,—the sleep of the bigot and the intolerant. Bigotry and intolerance are based upon ignorance. It is not always a reproach to be ignorant. It is natural, in a world in which men are trained under so many widely differing influences, that some should grow up thorough strangers to the set of ideas with which others have been familiar from the time they first began to think. We ought always to have a thoughtful consideration for those who have no opportunity for seeing things as we see them. But when ignorance becomes aggressive instead of modest, presumptuous instead of distrustful in itself, then it becomes deathful in its character; it becomes that which we call intolerance and bigotry, that which cannot exist alongside of the love of Christ which when it enters the human heart constrains it to work no ill to fellow-men. Oh that none were enslaved to such deathful sleep! Oh that all so enslaved to it would awake out of it into the nobler life of christian charity! Oh that in all our churches the ears of the uncharitable and intolerant could from time to time be made to tingle at the sound of the reproaches of those who would stir them up to enter upon a more brotherly attitude towards the whole christian world.—DR. CROSS in *Lenten Reader*.

THE CHURCH DURING ELIZABETH.

COMMUNICATED.

THE fallacy of pointing to the opinions of a few powerful prelates and nobles, as representing those of the whole Church, is seen most clearly in the conduct of the nation on the accession of Queen Mary. The great mass of the people received the re-introduction of the old services with pleasure, and in the following year (1554), Mary wishing to set up again the headship of the Pope over the English Church, her Parliament was in accord with her. Thus, as Hallam says, "It is certain that the re-establishment of popery on Mary's accession must have been acceptable to a large part, or perhaps to the majority of the nation." Her persecutions being abhorrent to the nation, the great mass of the people were pleased with the

accession of Elizabeth. It has been thought that what are by some called "high Church" usages and doctrines were non-existent in the Church of England, after the reformation by Elizabeth, until the primacy of Archbishop Laud. But does that not seem too much to ask any one to believe? In 1559 the whole body of the English clergy were performing Mass, the overwhelming majority of them conformed to a reformation in the latter part of that year, and yet we are asked to believe that by 1595 the Church in England was nearly free from all usages and doctrines not in accord with modern (so-called) low-churchism! Were we to understand by the word "Church" a few prominent personages to the exclusion of the majority of the inferior clergy, (many of whom could not be trusted to preach, because of their known dislike to any reform,) and a great mass of the laity, this extraordinary proposition would be more credible. But we all repudiate such a meaning of the word "Church," and none more fiercely than "low-churchmen." But even the law of the land as it existed during the whole of the reign of Elizabeth was very much more "high" than during the Stewart's. Take it on a most important subject—the celibacy of the clergy. In the reign of Edward, the marriage of the clergy was legalized; celibacy was again enforced by law on Mary's accession, and this law against the marriage of the clergy was not repealed until the reign of James I. Sandys writes to Parker in 1559 of this law: "The Queen's Majesty will wink at it (*viz.* the marriage of a few clergy), but will not establish it by law." Afterwards, "Elizabeth herself having been sumptuously entertained by the Archbishop at Lambeth, took leave of Mrs. Parker with the following courtesy—'Madam,' (the style of a married woman) I may not call you 'Mistress,' (the appellation of an unmarried woman) I am loath to call you, but however, I thank you for your good cheer." This lady is styled in deeds made while her husband was Archbishop: *Parker alias Harleston*. (see Hallam vol. i, c. iv.) We have no means of finding out, certainly, how the services were conducted in the majority of parish churches, but in the Chapel Royal the Crucifix was used; being removed for a short time it was replaced in 1570 and remained there. The law during Elizabeth regarding lay-baptism recognized a public opinion on this subject much "higher" than that of the majority of modern high-churchmen. Baptism by midwives was enforced, a practice much objected to by the Puritans as recognizing a doctrine differing from their own. "In Strype's Annals, 501, we have the form of an oath taken by all midwives to exercise their calling without sorcery or superstition, and to baptize with the proper words." Hallam, vol i, ch. iv. This was not abolished until James I. For years after the reformation, Sundays and holidays stood much on the same level, and it was not until 1595, that Sunday began to be placed on nearly the same footing as it has now. "The first of these Sabbatarians was a Dr. Bond, whose sermon, (on this subject) was suppressed by Archbishop

Whit
Puritan
ing be
vii. A
be sho
dal, P
folly a
one un
Milton
Eliza
charg
"to ma
presenc
licly th
in defe
tory of
be also
the end
in the
Calvin,
beth, a
We are
interest
pacy"
of diff
Many
agreed
jects.

Protest
pelled
who fle
Luther:
they w
called t
ence in
elsewhe
sec. 3.)

It is
attempt
used th
visitatio
ons tha
Cathed
Holy C
obeisan
Church
ing divi
was a P
fore his

THE

A F
paper, t
Low ch
stated t
ning.
the prod
tical ras
was so
that it
party, a
termed
gued bc
written
asked to
give his
word: