

Let us speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love, let us eschew all needless expressions which may give offence; above all let us remember that the grand object which we have in view is the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace, the firmer cohesion of the members of the Body. By this course our very differences will serve to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith, and our diversities of thought will be at once a safeguard and protest against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church.—  
BISHOP MACLAGAN.

#### THE LATE DEAN CLOSE.

THE death of Dr. CLOSE, ex-Dean of Carlisle, removes from the ecclesiastical stage one who, in his day, filled a very prominent role. With all his failings the late Dean was of great service in furthering great causes, he did yeoman service in educational and temperance reforms. It is to us doubtful whether his true vocation was the priesthood. His energies certainly were far in excess of the necessities of the sacred office of the Christian ministry, as he understood them. It seems, therefore, manifest that his conception of the functions of the sacred calling was faulty, for that calling has not only a supreme claim to all the powers of him who is devoted to it, but, beyond all others, is capable of utilizing all the gifts and forces in man.

Born in a rectory, Dr. CLOSE was devoted from childhood to the Church. At the age of nineteen he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became a scholar, taking his B.A. degree in 1820, about the time when the Church touched its lowest point. In 1826 he was presented to the incumbency of Cheltenham, which was just about developing into a fashionable watering-place. He was thus at the most sensitive and formative period of life placed in a whirl of secular excitements, into which the young men of that period could hardly fail to be drawn. He remembered the days of the battle of Waterloo, Catholic Emancipation, the Reform Bill, and the education and temperance crusades. The Church was beginning to stir with the new life which had come in from the revival of WESLEY, and it was very natural, it was inevitable, that the seed thus sown should bring forth fruit after its kind. Hence the so-called Evangelical movement, the leaders of which, with pardonable haste, took their inspiration and ideas of work from those whose methods, phraseology, and tenets were not in full accordance with the doctrines and discipline and usages of the Church of England. It was a mistake, but an honourable one, their error was not a wilful discardance of Church principles nor an avoidance of Church practices which lived before their eyes as examples and models, but rather the shunning of forms of doctrine and forms of ritual displaying no signs of spiritual vitality, which were therefore naturally associated with the deadness they shrouded. Dr. CLOSE and his school sought to revivify the Church without reviving also its material form. They forgot that in this world spirit is not known to us save through the medium of the body. They overlooked the fact that he would bring the spirit of man into new life from a state of collapse, must first bring his material frame into vigorous health. They and their successors refused to see this connection between Church forms and Church spirit, hence the transiency of the success they achieved, hence, as the *Times* puts it, "While the religious principles the Evangelical preachers inculcated are living and vigorous still, the public shape the Evangelical party wore is not merely dormant, it is apparently incapable of awaking."

The policy of working the Church on the lines of nonconformity, the policy of incessantly beating the tom-tom of party, the policy of spending strength in attacking comrades who are as zealous and as successful evangelists as themselves, the policy of playing the Devil's game by stopping CHRIST'S work for the sake of engaging in party rows, each and all are being utterly avoided by our brethren the Evangelicals of England. They have discovered that "the endurance of docile adherents is exhausted." The admirable letter from CANON INNES, in our last issue, is a striking evidence that the Evangelicals of Canada are equally sagacious as those at home. Indeed, from all parts of the Dominion come to us assuring signs and tokens of this elevation of tone, this reactive elimination from the Church life of to-day of all that in the past militated against the loving, sympathetic, brotherly co-operation of every rank and order in the Church in loyal service to Him who is the head of all and each. As MOXLEY says in one of his University sermons, "there is an end of all religious progress when a man's mind is taken up in the morbid excitement of small enmities, when he derives gratification from these jarring relations to others." But there is much to be done to place peace on a solid foundation. There can be no permanence to so happy a state, however, while institutions exist amongst us whose vocation is, whose entire reason of existence is—the perpetuation of strife. Let then those who love peace cease to give aid and countenance to those who break it as part of their official duty or by the persistent working of a prolonged habit of combativeness.

There was, too, in Dr. CLOSE's case especially, a startling inconsistency between his anti-sacerdotal fulminations; the mysteries of faith and Articles of religion being shouted by him from the platform with all the passion of a stump orator, and the life he was leading. The *Times* speaks of Dr. CLOSE as "the Pope of Cheltenham with pontifical prerogatives from which the temporal had not been severed. His decrees were accepted in thousands of households without a thought of opposition as submission was extorted by the terrorism of clamour." There is one Diocese in this free land which knows how potent a weapon, in beating down the freedom of the less learned and less socially independent laity, this "clamour" is. We quote again from the *Times* some very significant and highly valuable reflections on the ultimate results of all this party drum beating and uproar: "Churchmen unaddicted to partizanship will congratulate themselves on their escape from constant liability to religious riots and tumults with which they could feel no sympathy. Evangelical Churchmen may congratulate their cause no less. While they lament, as he deserves, a stout and valiant champion of their side, the sincerest among them will acknowledge that the energies Dr. CLOSE managed so skilfully and the scenes in which he occupied so large a space are grown out of date. Possibly he may have had a superabundance of force, sufficient to storm in one capacity before a mob and in another to win hearts. They will understand that for the majority of their brethren the double task both is and was incompatible. A pastor, by whatever party name he chooses to be styled, who is to be the comforter of the sick-bed, a guide to the weak, and a preacher of the Gospel, has more than enough employment for all his faculties without attempting to arouse the passions of the multitude in party strife."

The latter sentence would make a splendid sen-

tence for illuminating as an adornment to the library of those clergy who, like the late Dr. CLOSE, have energies and gifts in excess, as they think, of the requirements of their sacred calling, and who spend these forces in flourishing the obsolete sword of their party. A leading journal says: "The name of Dr. CLOSE is associated with the platform phase of Churchmanship, which finally exhausted the endurance of docile adherents. He was in reality much more than his popular reputation implied. Evangelical chiefs thundered against sacerdotalism as a tyranny. They were themselves inveterate martinets. All issued their edicts, and endeavoured to compel obedience."

It will be well for themselves, well for the Church, and better still for the world, for those who are trying to restrict the liberties of CHRIST'S freemen by clamour, by inventing suspicions, by inflaming passions, by endeavouring to compel obedience through the humiliating agency of party discipline, it will be well, we say, for such to study the career of Dr. CLOSE. They will discover that all his party zeal was vain, all his party successes were overwhelmingly reversed, all his party fruit turned to Dead Sea apples, and his honour in the Church now is, and ever will be, not as a party warrior, but simply and alone as a builder of churches and schools, as a temperance reformer, and, above all, as a noble worker in promoting a system of national elementary education under the government of the Church.

#### SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND SUNDAY SCHOOL UNIONS.

IN discussing this question, we cannot forbear to say that religious instruction should be given at home and in church; that if parents fulfilled their duties, and if the old Church rule of afternoon catechising were systematically observed, Sunday-schools would become to a large extent unnecessary. But we must take things as they are and not as they might or should be. It is unhappily the fact that many parents are very ignorant about Christian truth, and are careless in following out Christian precept; whilst there are not a few who openly acknowledge that they care nothing at all about religion of any kind. And, as regards the catechizing, we venture to think that the mere repeating of the Catechism, and the struggles of the children to repeat its answers, which are often very puzzling to them, would not be very edifying to the congregation, to say nothing of the real trial which it would be to the children to undergo this examination of their memory in public. But catechizing, where the subject matter is made easy, and familiar explanations are given, would be found a pleasure to the children, and also be instructive to the older members of the congregation, who would learn in this way many things which they did not know, and which they were ashamed to ask about. This kind of catechizing, however, requires practice on the part of the questioner, and perhaps some of the clergy would shrink from attempting it. We are glad to know that this mode of instruction is becoming much more common, as also are children's services, and thus our children are being led gradually to associate religious teaching with the house of God itself.

Meanwhile the agency of the Sunday-school proves most valuable as one of the many arms which the Church puts out to draw the people into her fold. By means of it, children, who would often be neglected or allowed to run idle in the

streets, are gentle but with many things up utterly greatest imp

And the decided influence. Some of them of a fixed principle different to children, and any belief at thing, somehow once let the affection for child's welfare and surely heart of a parent error. Ther the parents b the faithful teacher, and been convert given to the

To some looked upon in church by ren into clas school teach tives to ac that we belie and misunde in the Sund the fact that deputy of not to intru cretion, but ous whole.

And as a improving schools, we of Diocesan

These Un help to org work, and h gregationali back to Chu

Sunday-s from all par the congreg than ever h engaged—t find sympat relate their or successer ticular wor should be, burgh meet an annual which all more than and streng vice.

In concl schools are definite Ch the Creed i tion truths the Holy C know what it, and th gerous. I Sacrament Let them