

to sing three or four hymns at each service. There was care evidently to preserve the truly devotional spirit in the praise service.

Thirdly, the preaching heard on both occasions was topical, with little attention to exposition. In both of the services just described there was little need for such exposition. This was especially the case with the morning sermon on Home Missions. The preaching, however, evidently had practical ends in view, and for this purpose both messages were effective. With Dr. Johnston's address at the College Association service we were specially pleased.

We add only another word. This has reference to the liturgical parts of the services. This is one of the tests in our non-liturgical churches, where we often fail, and where we need special care. The prayers in both of these services were above the average usually heard. The morning service was marked by very comprehensive prayers, which were properly objective in their nature, while the prayers of the evening service were briefer and more subjective.

In both there were prayers made for the rulers of Great Britain and the United States. Indeed, there is scarcely a service in Canada where such petitions are not offered. We also noted, what is becoming very general in this whole land of America, less allusion to sin, less confession of sins, and less earnest pleading for forgiveness. Does this mean a decline in the sense of sin, or a change of attitude towards it? Perhaps partly both.—Christian Observer.

DEPREDAATION.

We desire to draw the attention of our historical societies and of all Canadians to an attempt now being made to remove to Detroit three of our ships which were sunk in the Thames, near Chatham, during the war of 1812. They were Government vessels, but the annexationists claim with unrivaled assurance that they are now private property, and that they can easily purchase and remove them and the contents to the States. A correspondent of a Chicago paper writes from Detroit: "The vessels were forgotten until several years ago, when unusually low water in the Thames revealed one of them. A plan was originated to have them recovered, brought to Detroit, and presented to the city as memorials. No productive action was taken, however, until several days ago, when a Detroit exploring party, headed by C. M. Burton and Charles J. Clack, quietly began operations. So far the work of the explorers and their divers has resulted in the definite location of the three vessels at points one and a half, two and six miles up stream from Chatham. The vessels are partly or wholly covered with sand and earth. In the one most exposed the hull was found to contain boxes and barrels of cannon balls and other stores. Further search is expected to reveal chests of silver, which records in possession of the explorers show were taken from the boats." We trust that no effort will be spared to frustrate this nefarious scheme, and that the warships and their contents will be raised by the Government and deposited in suitable quarters. Detroit people show us no consideration. Shortly after Confederation we gave them the old records stored in Chatham, but they have returned us nothing.—Christian Guardian.

I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to the light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right, stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong.

We never find out just how much joy there is in light and sunshine until we have been for a little while in the dark.

"HONOR AMONG CLERGYMEN."

When a clergyman has ceased to believe in the creed of his church, should he be silent, or should he withdraw from his denomination, or should he remain where he is and tell the truth as he sees it? Such is the question that has again been projected into the arena of active discussion in the American religious world by the Rev. Dr. Augustus C. Crapsey, rector of St. Andrew's Church, Rochester. That it is a question of vital import goes without saying. "There are scores of clergymen today in every Christian denomination," observes the well-known religious weekly, the New York Outlook, "who are perplexed by this question. They are men of the highest honor, and resent imputations upon their integrity. They neither wish to remain in a communion where they are not wanted, nor to leave a communion to which by long association and by spiritual affinity they are devotedly attached. They no longer hold the theological views of their youth. They no longer hold those of the youth of their Church. . . . And many young men are kept out of the ministry altogether by the dread of encountering this embarrassment."

Dr. Crapsey is a radical thinker. Last winter he preached a number of sermons rectifying upon the truth of the Virgin Birth and other fundamental doctrines in the Christian creed. He drew upon himself the censure of his Protestant Episcopal brethren, and may have to face a heresy trial. In the meantime he has published a very frank and interesting article in The Outlook (September 2), in which he sets himself to discover what is involved in the phrase, "honor among clergymen." He takes as his text the following sentence from a pastoral letter recently issued by the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country: "If one finds, whatever his office or place in the church, that he has lost his hold upon her fundamental verities, then, in the name of common honesty, let him be silent or withdraw."

"What are the fundamental verities?" asks Dr. Crapsey. If they are "the basic truths of Christianity given to us by Jesus himself in the two great commandments of the law, in the Lord's Prayer, and in the five laws of righteousness as we find them written in the Sermon on the Mount," then no exception can reasonably be taken to the Bishop's position; but if "certain historical statements, philosophical conceptions and theological definitions" are meant, then, Dr. Crapsey holds, the alternatives presented are unjust. A clergyman who may be both honest and intelligent is forced to choose between repressing his conscientious convictions and becoming "a disgraced and unfrocked priest." Dr. Crapsey concludes:

"The advice of the pastoral letter cannot help any true, brave-hearted man when in the situation it implies; for such a man silence is impossible and withdrawal treasonable. He must stand in his place and calmly abide the consequences of his position. Prophets are not popular. Of them it is written, 'I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city.' Unless a prophet is ready to face the doom of the prophet, he should not undertake the prophet's office."

"But the prophet is not called upon to kill himself or crucify himself or scourge himself or excommunicate himself. He must leave that to others. He, for his part, has but to speak the Word, and the Word will take care of itself. If the Word is not of God, it will come to naught; if it is of God, nothing that happens to the prophet will harm it. And the Word is the thing."

This article has aroused unusual interest in the religious world. The Outlook lends its editorial support to Dr. Crapsey's method as substantially that of Wesley, Luther, Paul and Jesus Christ. It says:

"If a minister finds himself differing on important points from the church in which he is an ordained teacher, it is his duty neither to withdraw nor to be silent. It is his duty, with real, not assumed, respect for the opinions which he no longer entertains and of those who entertain them, to preach the truth as he sees it, and to leave those who differ with him to determine whether the difference is so great that they are no longer willing that he should remain a recognized teacher in their fellowship. This was the method of Wesley, of Luther, of Paul, of Jesus Christ."

The papers of Dr. Crapsey's own denomination, however, condemn his attitude in no uncertain terms. The Church Standard (Philadelphia) thinks his position is "preposterously untenable." It says:

"Meantime Dr. Crapsey's position has been universally condemned as untenable and absurd; and of late it has been said with perfect justice that if the authorities of the Diocese of Western New York shall continue to be silent, they themselves must be regarded as officially allowing and authorizing Dr. Crapsey's position as a lawful and tenable position for a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. It is needless, perhaps, to say, but it can do no harm to say in the plainest of terms, that, if the Protestant Episcopal Church could consent to be placed in that position, it would forfeit every claim to the allegiance, and even to the respect, of Christian people."

The Living Church says of his position:

"Every authorized teacher is under limitation. A public school teacher would not be permitted to instruct those under him that the globe is flat, nor that its interior consists of cracker crumbs. In accepting a teaching engagement he binds himself to teach what is held as true on the specific subject under inquiry by the authority that commissions him. He does not, if he is honest, so covenant apart from his own belief, but because his own belief so far accords with the belief of the authority that commissions him, that in teaching the one, he also teaches the other. If, in later days, it transpires that these have drifted apart, honor then requires that he relinquish the authority under which he has been commissioned to teach, and claim henceforth no authority beyond that of his own mind. Honor would prevent his drawing a living from the authority which he misrepresents. Men easily see this in other walks of life. Robert E. Lee, sworn as an officer of the United States army to support the constitution of the United States, recognized that when he was no longer able to abide by that oath, honor required him to resign his position and surrender the emoluments of his office—and he did it. Is 'honor among clergymen' less sacred than honor among soldiers?"

"Dr. Crapsey's position is one that divests the Church of all teaching authority and leaves each individual with no assurance beyond that which he is able to puzzle out for himself; but it is easy to see that the position is at variance with that which he accepted at ordination."

God never is before his time, or after. As the appointed hour strikes, His messenger stands on the doorstep, the looker-for gift in His hand. Faith may be put to a long test, but never in vain. Meanwhile look, not at circumstances, but at the word and power of the living God. And God will keep His word.—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

Doctrine is sometimes Christianity reduced to a name.