

Paul's Cathedral on Quinquagesima Sunday. He quoted from Hooker, St. Augustine, St. Ignatius, Whitgift, Bancroft, Hall, Andrewes, Cosin and Laud, to prove that Anglicans are inclined to lay over much stress at present on Apostolic Succession and the Episcopate. He does not point out, however, that "it may be had" easily enough by our Dissenting friends.

"THE FAITHFUL"—AND THE UNFAITHFUL.

Every one feels a sentiment of respect for the man or woman who tries earnestly to live up to chosen convictions—no matter how wrong these convictions may be in fact. Earnestness is itself a virtue, quite aside from the material upon which it acts. In the same degree it is true that even those who profit by the lukewarmness or unfaithfulness of some one else, naturally despise their tool while they use it, and throw it aside with disgust as soon as it has ceased to serve their purpose, as something exceedingly unpleasant to handle at any time, and to be got rid of as soon as convenient. It is true in sexual relations, of those who profit for the time being by marital infidelity: it is true of the spy, who betrays his country—of every one who is unfaithful to trust and duty. The Roman traitress of old who died under the weight of the golden bracelets piled upon her by the scornful soldiers whom she had served, was one in a long line of similar examples. False to duty! What a crime in the eyes of all men—how much more in the eyes of the All-Holy One! Heathenism, Romanism, Buddhism—whatever your convictions, be true to them. That way lies reward, and ultimate finding of the Truth!

KEEPING LENT

is one of those tests by which men judge of the *sterling value*, or otherwise, of professors of Churchmanship. "He is a Churchman, but he doesn't keep Lent"—nothing more is needed to condemn, even the worst of mankind be the judges. Such hypocrisy, such infidelity, is depth of wickedness worse than their own. Publicans and harlots are angels compared with those who are only—white-washed saints, pinch-beck Christians, lukewarm Church members. It is so, of course, with all Church principles. The man who handles his Prayer Book familiarly enough, but neglects Confirmation or Communion—of what value are his professions in the eyes of God or man? They may be represented by the *minus* sign! Most of these things, however, belong to the "interior economy," so to speak, of the religious life, whereas Lent is a tangible something which has to do with one's outside actions and demeanour in the arena of the world—of every day life, outside the church walls. It therefore belongs to a class of things open to general observation—as much as the conduct of a Rural Dean who, while clinging to the status of a Church priest, hobnobs on equal terms with self-appointed and self-authorised preachers.

AMUSEMENTS

are a very large factor in social life in these days—the "society papers" are largely read and patronized, even by those who have no expectation of "figuring" in them at all. People note what prominent Church members are doing—and remember that it is "Lent." Their estimate of the reliability, safety, consistency, honesty, integrity, of those who set the solemn rules of their Church at defiance, is easily summed up, and will not fail to be used, for future reference, in most unexpected circumstances, as occasions arise. What human beings say or think or esti-

mate, however, is of little comparative moment. The important thing is to consider the "phonographic" office of conscience how it records by indelible impressions the transactions of our lives from a moral point of view, to confront the traitors to duty and principle some day with evidence—as damning and unanswerable as their own hand-writing would be—to their miserable truckling to pleasure. How little excuse will they have to unfold who despise even the set times of holy solemnity, which are intended to *secure* the possibility of their progress in holiness, so difficult at other times. Their fate will be to appear—"speechless"!

GOD AND HEREDITY.

When a writer of power and note gets momentarily off the orthodox track, his good qualities become a source of excessive danger to the reading public: just as a locomotive, "off the track," is dangerous to the public safety in proportion to the predominance of those qualities which made it an excellent servant while on the track. Under the circumstances occasioned by the occurrence of these perilous episodes in the lives of popular authors—which sometimes, as in the recent case of Guy de Maupassant, take the form of actual lunacy in practical exemplification of their temporary crazes—it is well to have a vidette or two, well-posted to observe and "pick off" such dangerous "Knights Errant," when necessary for the public safety. An instance of this, fortunate provision we have lately noticed in our old friend *Blackwood*, which has been doing good service—like a good humoured *Saturday Review*—in its criticisms of sensational novels of late. The last character which has fallen under its very effective lash is "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," the latest production of Thomas Hardy, and sown broadcast as a "Pure Woman" (sub-title!) in the pages of one of the great English illustrated weeklies.

PLAYING FAST AND LOOSE

with several of the central commandments—intended for the wholesome regulation and "general benefit" of human life, Mr. Hardy's heroine is painted as a victim of heredity, but otherwise a *pure woman*. The *Blackwood* reviewer does good service in showing how a really "pure woman" would have acted under the imagined circumstances, and thus furnishes a "set off" for his readers to the moral—or "immoral"?—of the story. He well observes, accounting for the author's eccentricity, "Naturally a *new creed* must treat such a situation in a new way, especially when the principles of that creed are indignation (against whom? Unhandsomely we are given to understand that it is *against God*—but then when "there is no God"?) and wrath, and have no sympathy with the everlasting reconstruction which another philosophy perceives to be going on forever in the moral as well as in the material world." This *fin de siècle* silly cant "about the Creator having forced the role upon her," is handled without gloves by *Blackwood's* able writer for being angry "with the Deity who punishes the vices of the fathers on the children, who does not ask us whether we wish to be created, who gives us but one chance," etc., etc. The absurdity of it is that Mr. Hardy is angry with a God whom he does not believe to exist!

AFTER ALL, WHAT IS HEREDITY?

It is simply a branch of that power of *affecting others* than ourselves, beneficially or injuriously, as we choose, which is a necessary part of *any* form of life—to take it away is to take away life! A

man by the use of his arm can either help or hinder his fellows—all the Hardys in the world have never yet imagined, nor ever can imagine, that power absent unless the man be *dead*; and the same is essentially true, naturally and necessarily, of *all* animals. So all animals affect most of all—being nearest to them—their offspring, immediate and remote; just as in a less degree they affect other people. To argue against the existence of this "power of affecting others" is simply to argue against the existence of life in all its imaginable forms. To such an absurd position does this petulant complaint against the Creator find itself reduced when examined by reason. The Creator Himself has revealed to us—and the teaching of the Bible is "broad-cast"—that He does not expect or require us to do more than we are naturally able. The stripes for wrong doing will be *in proportion* to knowledge and power of doing right in the premises. Adam, Abraham, Paul, Socrates and Hardy will all be dealt with on that scale.

THE USE OF HEREDITY

is learned at once by him who thoughtfully observes its existence as a rule of life—it is an encouragement to well doing, and a deterrent from evil doing. A man of common sense knows that, for instance, such a habit as drunkenness is bound to affect not only himself and his immediate surroundings, but his posterity. He puts a poison in his blood which makes it physically impossible for him to transmit an untainted type of human life, so far as that vice is concerned. So of other vices and virtues. Would you dissuade a man from excess in drinking by consideration for his wife and children?—as we all naturally do. You can add to the force of such persuasive considerations the argument of his effect on generations yet unborn. Every way, therefore, this factor of actual life works well—or is "calculated" to work well—with reasonable beings. It is every whit as *reasonable* to inveigh against a man being "able" to hurt his fellow by hitting him, as to inveigh against the same man being able to produce effects beyond his immediate time and place. Even Mr. Hardy may do harm—or good—by his writings, far beyond the span of his own natural life. The thought ought to make him reason before he writes!

REVIEWS.

THE EARLY DAYS OF MY EPISCOPATE, by the Right Rev. William Ingraham Kip, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of California. 8 vo. Pp. 263. Price \$1.50. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Toronto: Rowse & Hutchison.

This instructive and interesting narrative embraces a period of about four years, 1858-1867, and gives, with many personal adventures, an authentic account of the difficulties before a Bishop in the formation of a new diocese in an unbroken field. When he was consecrated in Trinity Church, New York, to be the first missionary Bishop sent to the Pacific coast, he was to go out into the wilderness without diocese or clergy, and organize the Church where men were in the full swing and tide of Californian gold-mining. It required a bold heart to make such a venture, and nothing but strong Christian faith and an indomitable pluck could have overcome his difficulties. We read with great interest his account, first of his eventful journey across the isthmus and his voyage up the Pacific, and then of his missionary journeys through the tropical vegetation and waste sterilities, the wild grandeur of the mountain passes and the constant danger from banditti and grizzlies. Everything had to be done in organization when he came to San Francisco. His diocese was represented at the first convention at San Francisco by two clergymen, and lay delegates from three churches, of which two were in San Francisco; at the present day