

kind of document which must be laid before the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies:

This certificate, in the practice of the House, is always referred with the documents on the fact of election to the Committee on Consecrations. The object of the reference must be two-fold, to see, first, that the certificate is in the form of words prescribed; and secondly, that it is signed by a constitutional majority of the Convention making the election, and it will prevent confusion to bear in mind that this testimonial has no reference to the fact of election, or to anything else, save the moral and religious qualifications of the Bishop-elect; it proves nothing else, and is not even conclusive on that point; for if the House should in any mode become satisfied that the individual named in the testimonial is unworthy, it will not recommend him to the Bishops for consecration.—*Id.* page 96.

He concludes his chapter on this subject as follows, and as in the former instance we give the italics as written by the distinguished author himself. After naming the several documents which have to be laid before the House of Bishops, he says:

Without these things he cannot lawfully be consecrated under this canon: with them all, his consecration does not necessarily follow; it has never happened in our history, it probably never will happen, that any one who is known to be unworthy will be permitted to pass all the previous ordeals, and come before our House of Bishops with all the canonical requisites for consecration complete; but should ever such be the case, or should in any case subsequent discoveries bring to light disqualifications unknown until every ordeal but the last was past, the House of Bishops would refuse to consecrate, and no power on earth could force them to do otherwise. It is a matter between God and their consciences, and there it must be left. Each House in the General Convention has its rights, and as the Bishops cannot consecrate any one against the assent of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, so neither can they be forced by the House to consecrate any one against their own assent. Thus careful has the Church been to subject every one who enters into the highest office of its ministry to a threefold repeated scrutiny: first, by the Convention which elects him; secondly, by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and thirdly, by the House of Bishops. A bad man may indeed get in, notwithstanding all these guards, but the Church in her legislation has at least done what she could to prevent it. pp. 97, 98.

Dr. Hawks himself was subsequently elected Bishop, and his papers brought before the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies did not pass. On that occasion he spoke in his own behalf, and delivered probably the most eloquent speech that ever passed his lips. But what was his defence? It was that the charges made against him were not sustained. It was not questioning the right of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies to refuse to confirm the choice of the Diocese that elected him. That argument was left for a later day.

SENTIMENTALISM.

Speaking of the request made by Dean Stanley to Dr. Colenso, to preach in the Cathedral of which he is Dean, on Dr. Colenso's late visit to England, the *Standard of the Cross* holds discourse as follows:

Certainly no English gentleman would, in the face of an English congregation, have dared to proclaim such unpalatable views of the Pentateuch as Colenso holds. It was to give him as a pleader for human rights a chance to be heard, that the Dean gave him a welcome to the freest pulpit in England.

And again:

Yet we trust the day has passed in the Church of God when any man who honestly and widely differs from the established views of the majority, on even the essentials of the Christian Faith, shall suffer from Christian Churchmen such religious and social ostracism, as may rightly lead him to imagine that if one would possess orthodoxy in creed, he must deny the sentiment and practice of Christian charity.

For ourselves we should rate Dr. Colenso more highly. We believe him thoroughly honest, and would not care to doubt but that "in the face of an English congregation" as readily as in that of a Zulu, he would "proclaim" his views of the Pentateuch, no matter how "unpalatable," on any fit occasion. He has already proclaimed them to the whole world.

But it is not to vindicate Dr. Colenso's boldness and honest frankness, that we cut the above paragraphs from the *Standard of the Cross*, but to ask how far it is proposed to carry religious sentimentalism?

The facts simply are that Dr. Colenso is a deposed Bishop. Being deposed in the South African Church, canonically he is deposed everywhere. How far that deposition affects him as a priest in the Church of England "as by law established"—that is, how far the State law of the Establishment may interfere with ecclesiastical action in the Colonial Church, we do not know; except that it cannot recognize him as a Bishop, since it is as Priest, and not as Bishop, that he is "a Clerk in Orders" of the Establishment. But by the universal law and comity of the Church Catholic, he is a deposed Bishop, and no Bishop in the Anglican Communion would dare to consider him in any other light.

Now either Dean Stanley, to whom the State law gives the control of one of the Cathedrals of the Diocese of London, intended to recognize Dr. Colenso as a clergyman in good standing, or he did not. If he did, he simply proposed to trample on all Canon Law, and on every decency and propriety in the Church Catholic.

If, on the other hand, as the *Standard* hints (we know not on what authority) that Dr. Colenso was only going

to appear in the Cathedral as the champion of "human rights," it is natural to ask if there be not public halls, Exeter and otherwise, "Rotundas" and such like, wherein champions of "human rights" make themselves heard on due provocation? Is there no place but a Cathedral for a champion of human rights, from Zulu land or America, to address a London audience?

That Dr. Colenso on the occasion would not have preached his infidelity offensively, is neither here nor there. His being officially in Westminster, would have been, let him have preached as he might, a contempt cast on Church law, and an insult to the entire Anglican Communion. To speak of Dean Stanley's boldness or manliness in the case, is to mislead. The Dean's position is fixed by the law of the land, as a State officer holding under the Crown, and he risks nothing in his most erratic performances. There is no boldness where there is no danger, no bravery where there is no risk.

The point, we say, is how far is sentimentality to take the place of doctrine and order? The *Standard* very inconsequentially hopes that no man shall suffer religious and social ostracism from Christian Churchmen, because he differs even on the essentials of the Christian Faith, and then adds a word about clarity.

All sentimentalism, we regret to say, all helping to mislead and confuse, as sentimentalism does when it, and not reason and duty, takes the guidance of action, is very sweet, very pretty, very amiable, but nevertheless very weak and deluding.

There is here no question of religious ostracism. Certainly none of social. It is a question of Church law and Order. There is no question of differences, nor of "honest" differences. It is a question of fact.

The fact is, every Christian Church has a Faith and an Order. Even every smallest last year's sect has. It is bound to guard its Faith and its Order. If they are not worth guarding, let it cease to be; the sooner the better. In every Church, even in every sect, there is a way, in any doubtful case, of getting at what that Faith and Order are, a constitutional way recognized by those inside and those outside equally.

While a man is in the Church or sect, common decency as well as common sense, demand that he shall live by its Order and stand by its Faith.

That there are good men outside both, honest men, "manly men," champions of human rights, sincere men who are heathens, honest men who deny every truth he has pledged himself to teach, manly pagans if you please, and splendid Mohammedans, is not anything to trouble him unless he is a sentimentalist. If he be a man with reason in force, and a clear head, he sees that he is not called to deny any of this outside honesty, sincerity, or, as the fashion is to say, this "manliness." He is glad it exists, recognizes it wherever he finds it, does not socially ostracize it a bit, or religiously, if it claim to have a religion. But he never dreams, not being a sentimentalist, that in order to avoid "ostracising" somebody socially or religiously, he is bound to have him preach in his pulpit or officiate at his altar. He may be very glad to recognize a deposed Bishop, or a degraded Priest, as the Champion of human rights, may be very glad to give him a platform on which to championize them, but he does not feel that to do this he must break the law of his Church, or make light of the denial of the Inspiration of the Bible. Nor does he drop sentimental tears, nor misuse the sacred word charity because he cannot.

There are difficulties in the Christian position with reference to those outside Christianity. There are difficulties, and no more nor greater, in the Church position, with reference to those outside the Church. There are difficulties in the position of every man who has a Faith, a doctrine or an Order, with reference to those who have another or have none.

Every truth is exclusive. Every religious Faith cuts off. The wall that includes is a wall that excludes.

These difficulties are as old as the Fall. They inhered in the covenant with Abraham, and in the covenant in Christ. They were in Judaism as they are in Christianity. Even in man-made religions they exist as well. They belong also in Buddhism, and Mohammedanism. To every inside there must be also an outside.

But these difficulties, and indeed no difficulties, are ever settled by sentimentalism. There are men who imagine they can be. They seem just now to be abounding. We are having an epidemic of sentiment. But if the difference between inside and outside be a sentimental difference, or if sentimentalism can really remove the wall that excludes as well as includes, and put the "manly" pagan side by side with the "manly" Christian, and the "honest" Unitarian on the same footing as the honest Churchman, will not relentless logic ask what is the use of your inside? Why do you have a wall at all? If a deposed Bishop because he is "champion of human rights," is to be treated exactly as if he were not deposed, and it be a breach of charity to treat him otherwise, pray why trouble yourself to depose him at all? Indeed, why have Bishops and doctrines and exclusive dogmas,

churches, courts, synods, faiths, and so forth? Why not let sentimentalism, "charity," "human rights" and "manliness" have things their own way?

Among the portents of the time this also will bear study, the inundation of "sentimentality how charming," which threatens to sweep away in a tide of lukewarm and sweetened slops not only all precise faith, but all sound reasoning and all the sternness of duty and of law.

The tide has swept away much from the bodies about us. It seems at last to threaten the walls and towers of the Church.

NEWSPAPER REPORTS OF SERMONS AND SPEECHES.

Apropos of an address lately delivered, our *Chief* has received several letters. The following is one, names omitted:

Please tell me, as a friend, whether the *Herald* report of Feb. 9th, of your speech before the "Church Conference"—whatever that is—be correct; and whether the "Conference" did thank you for it.

The Conference did say "thanks" for the speech, but it seems at this day scarcely necessary to add, that no man can be held responsible for a *Herald* reporter's version. Without any special malice, we could wish that, for once in a way, gentlemen who accept all they see in the papers, head-lines and all, as true, because it is in print, might be induced to say something where a reporter could get after them, merely that they might learn how it felt.

Book Notices.

THE PARTING WORDS OF ADOLPHE MONOD TO HIS FRIENDS AND THE CHURCH. October, 1855, to March, 1856. Translated from the Fifth Paris Edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1875.

Whilo slowly dying, Adolphe Monod, the eloquent, devout, and tender minister of one of the Reformed congregations of Paris, had each Sunday his sick-room thrown open, and a Communion service celebrated at his bed-side, when he preached a little sermon to his assembled friends, and made it a message to his flock.

These "Adieus" are here collected, the translation being by an accomplished gentleman, who thoroughly appreciates the beauty, delicacy, and fervor of the addresses.

They are a dying man's utterances, spoken from the edge of the grave. But Faith and Hope are strong, and they are uttered with the confidence of one in whom Faith is changing into knowledge, and Hope into possession.

The circumstances of their utterance throw an unearthly solemnity about the words themselves. They sound as if from beyond the river. They measure things of sense by the measure of a dying man.

Mr. Dutton has prepared an edition in season for Lent reading. The book ought not to be passed by by those who desire deep devotional reading, and the records of much spiritual experience.

These "Parting Words" are words for the closet, words for the knees, words by which to study life, and its issues in view of the solemn veiled to-morrow, toward which, through months of pain, the speaker's wistful gaze was turned.

SPIRIT OF THE HOLY BIBLE. Pictorial and Polyglott, with Illustrations by the most celebrated artists from Durer to Fragonard. Projected and prepared by Frank Moore, editor of the *Rebellion Record*, &c. New York: United States Publishing Company.

The editor of this volume deserves credit for his good intentions. His design was to give a copy of nearly every picture of note in illustration of Scripture, which has been produced by the celebrated painters. But his failure consists in the many wretched to the few passable reproductions. A book of this kind, to serve the praiseworthy purpose of bringing before people copies of the works of the great masters, must not be meanly and cheaply gotten up. It would be well if the editor were to try again, or if some other person would adopt the idea, and give us a book worthy of the subject.

ANTIQUITIES OF LONG ISLAND. By Gabriel Furnam. To which is added "A Bibliography" by Henry Onderdonk, Jr. Edited by Frank Moore. New York: J. W. Bouton. 1875.

The manuscript of this book was discovered in an old book-shop in this city.

It is a work of rare interest to all residents of New York and Long Island, and especially to those who have any connections, by family or otherwise, with the past of either.

To the body of the work is added the complete Bibliography of all works, books, pamphlets, and memorials relating to Long Island, prepared by Mr. Onderdonk.

We are assured by the well known editor, that the work of Mr. Furnam is thoroughly accurate. There can be no more competent judge than Mr. Moore.

NO ROOM FOR JEWS. By Charles F. Deems, pastor of the Church of the Strangers. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1875.

A Christmas Sermon, with many striking things in it. Queerly enough Dr. Deems describes "the Inn," not as Syrian Kahn, but as a modern hotel. What he loses in accuracy he makes up in liveliness.

SUNDAY ECHOES IN WEEK DAY HOURS. A Tale Illustrative of the Epistles and Gospels. By Mrs. Carey Brock. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1875.

This is the fifth volume of this well known series of