

"EXCELLENT INNOVATIONS. —Our charming little contemporary, *Church Bells*, makes merry over a number of Church "notions" adopted by several bodies of English Nonconformists, with a desperate pretence that they had never been thought of before—"quite new"! Among these are settled parishes or cures as an improvement on Methodist "circuits"; infant dedication as a Baptist substitute for infant baptisms and sponsors; house to house visitation, etc.

"FOR BETTER, FOR WORSE."—The heart of the British people has been profoundly moved—as its conscience had been deeply aroused by guiltiness—by the truly noble and manly tenderness and staunchness displayed in Mrs. Osborne's case by her husband. His fidelity to her as his sacred trust in Holy Matrimony has supported and strengthened her in a very severe ordeal, and may yet prove powerful in mitigating her punishment as well as retrieving her position.

"TWIST A LION'S TAIL," say an editorial in the *Living Church*, "and as you change its form you will speedily arrive at the conclusion, from the playful and peculiar manner in which the lion behaves, that you have inadvertently done something to change the matter of that tail!" This is a very "American" but very effective way of reducing the "Higher Criticism" position to absurdity. They pretend to twist the "form" of Scripture, and not the "matter."

NET RESULTS OF THE BOOTH SCHEME.—Among these are to be noted—as we read in *Church Bells*—the fact that the public subtracted £150,000 from their usual Hospital contributions alone, besides other similar reductions, in order to give Booth £100,000 for his scheme. All that they "see for their money"—now that it is spent and the accounts rendered—is a cool request for £30,000 per annum to "keep the pot boiling" for Booth! Meantime, the hospitals, &c., are languishing for want of support.

DR. WILD ON SCIENTIFIC (?) CRITICISM.—"So God (as easily as an engineer can ungear a portion a Corliss engine's machinery) . . . could ungear the sun and moon for a short time at Joshua's request (at the valley of Ajalon) and all else move on. It is actually laughable to hear some men talk on a subject of this kind, and tell you that God "could not" do such a thing. . . They will not allow (their) God the same power and knowledge they do to a mechanic! They have a funny idea of their own Creator."

COPE OR CHASUBLE.—The legal decisions being in favour of the cope as the most dignified vestment for the celebrant of Communion to wear, has given prominence to that garment, and occasioned its presentation to, and use by, many Bishops and Deans. The *Guardian* notices a recent publication which goes to show (what many ritualists had always held) that, after all, a chasuble is only a cope modified into convenient shape for the purpose of the celebrant. The Eastern Churches retain the simplest form of it still—most like the Anglican, least like the Roman, which is a mere "jacket."

MISSION FAILURES.

It very often happens that, although an attack has been beaten back—because of some erroneous methods of proceeding on the part of the assailants—there remains a consciousness of unpleasant impressions on the side of the victors themselves; a feeling that their position had such elements of

weakness that a more skilful and well-directed assault from the enemy should succeed, and may, in fact, succeed on some future occasion. Several assaults have been made on Christian Missions of late years, on the general ground of "small returns for large outlay." The general tenor of the triumphant answers has been (1) that the returns are much larger than represented by these objectors, and (2) that it is folly to weigh the value of one immortal soul against a world full of treasure. The victorious verdict has been on each occasion, that the money was well spent, and should have been more. At the same time the feeling has been left to the champions of Missions, that there was too much truth in the objections after all, and that the returns for so much trouble ought to be larger than they are—that all this smoke of objection was not without some fire of reason beneath it.

UNSUITABLE MISSIONARIES

are no doubt responsible for a good deal of the element of failure in missions—so far as they have failed. Attention has been largely attracted to China lately and the sufferings of its many missionary martyrs. The question has arisen: "Are they not themselves somewhat to blame for these sufferings?" A press correspondent, Mr. Kinnear, has suggested, to the British Foreign office, an answer in the affirmative. He said that "the course taken by many of the missionaries there was fruitful of mischief." Mr. Kinnear mentioned "as an instance of the utter unfitness for the sacred calling, a missionary who had previously been a railroad porter, and whose experience before going to China had been almost wholly confined to the handling of luggage." He thought "that sufficient care was not exercised in the selection of men for missionary work." Now, this is only the standing obstacle to missionary success—Christian disunion—in a concrete form; there is abundance of zeal for "making proselytes," if only it were characterized by discretion. Men, fired with the wildest ideas of their vocation, hurl themselves pell-mell into the mission-field—to do more harm than good.

THEY HINDER THE TRUE SOLDIERS

—these untrained, untaught and undisciplined skirmishers. A large proportion of those in the mission field are of "disorderly-Apollos" order, rather than followers of the Apostles. They are not only imperfectly instructed in Christianity themselves—coming misshapen, from the operations of very inadequate machinery in sundry minister factories all over the world—and they play havoc with the Gospel they try to preach, as well as with the souls they try to save. It is no wonder if the practical wisdom of their methods is found to be only on a par with the culture (?) of their theology. It is, of course, a question of degrees, and is best seen by looking at extreme cases. Fancy the effect of the arrival of a Salvation Army contingent in a part of Japan or China where some Anglican or Presbyterian missionary has been quietly at work. It is the arrival of a "bull in a china shop" truly! The whole idea of Christianity becomes discredited in the minds of the natives by this grotesque and eccentric travesty of the Gospel, which the regular agents are two weakly charitable to repudiate and disown. But the same thing is true in less degree in innumerable other cases.

DIVERSITY IS THE HINDRANCE

at the bottom of it all. It almost seems as if a concordat of some kind would become necessary (at least, for the present necessity), so that certain fields of labour should be left to the "first comers" of the

host of missionaries—a "motley crew" indeed, if they try to run any ship together, but moderately decent in various degrees, if they can be induced to operate in different fields and separately. The efforts of each missionary organization are too diffusive—they each of them want to "cover the whole ground," and do it at once! This results in endless confusion, each day worse confounded by the invention or arrival of some new form of Christianity. Individualism—bad enough even in the day of the Apostles, as the Bible indicates—has run mad in the nineteenth century, in its recoil from the cast-iron repression of Romanism, which dominated so long a large part of Western Christendom. Meantime, there seems no other course than the Apostolic one of stern repudiation of all imperfect forms of the Gospel as being unauthorized by the Holy Catholic Church. It would *startle*, but it would force men to think!

COLENSO AND THE ZULU.

We do not mean to say that even orthodox Churches are free from the blame of causing some amount of failure in the Mission field. The fate of that mathematical genius who was allowed to masquerade as a bishop was too "monumental"—like Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt—not to be long "remembered" by those in authority, and so prevent the repetition of similar mistakes of putting square men into round holes. The English luggage-porter is not the only form of unsuitableness that may be descried in the Mission field. Handling trunks and valises may be about as useful training for mission work as working algebraic equations, speculating in lumber, or pleading in Chancery Courts—if the proper learning of the Creed and Practice of the Church of God be not carefully superadded. Many a "wild Apollos," both at home and abroad, harangues eloquently upon points he knows little or nothing about, and adds his quantum of distraction to the divided camps of Christendom. Long years of preparation are needed, both by clerical and lay evangelists; the results will be in proportion to the care and forethought expended.

"DIGNITY" BISHOPS—AND DEACONS.

By a curious coincidence the exigencies of Church life and work in England have brought to the front together two great needs of the Church—extension of the Episcopate, and extension of the Diaconate. American Churchmen gaze in amazement at the spectacle of the magnificent Communion of the Mother Church struggling in the toils of that reptile—social dignity. When attention is drawn to any point where more bishops are sorely needed—as Birmingham or Carlisle—and the months and years roll by without the want being supplied, we naturally ask the "reason why," and the only answer we get is—"The endowment is not yet large enough!" Our good brethren across the ocean have become so accustomed to bishops as personages possessing princely incomes, palaces, thrones, etc., that they seem paralyzed at the idea of setting off a diocesan bishop with an income differing little from that of wealthy parish priests. Whereas, on this side of the water, no one thinks of providing a bishop with more than he needs for the decent discharge of his spiritual functions—all considerations of family, society, state, being considered quite secondary, if not impertinent.

"A BISHOP'S STOOL."

In commenting on an important letter on this subject in the *Manchester Courier*, the editor of the *Church Times*, with characteristic trenchancy,