

principle. Other matters, which are parts of the debate, we omit.

MESSRS. EDITORS: In the article in the JOURNAL on the late Convention in the Diocese of Illinois, my right, as the Chancellor of the Cathedral, to vote, is questioned; and as it is assumed that my affirmative vote was given to the Bishop-elect, the propriety of my action is thereby also put in issue. In connection with the right to vote, it should be sufficient to say that it had been heretofore unquestioned, had been exercised at the late annual Convention in the election for Bishop without objection, and that on the merits, it had been conceded to me by a three-fourths vote; while as an abstract proposition, the legality of my action is sustained by the opinion of the Hon. Thomas Drummond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, and other able jurists.

In the selection and election of Dr. DeKoven, I would further say, there was an entire absence of party or partisan feeling; the desire was simply to get the best man. There was no other end than this to serve, no school in the Church to build up.

LENTEN THOUGHTS.—Thursday, Feb. 25, was a day of unusual storm and wind. Sometimes the rain seemed to come down in sheets. Of course the attendance at the Lenten services was small, very. Men were as usual at their posts of business, but little was doing. However the storm raged too violently for many of them to leave for church, and for ladies to venture out in such weather was of course out of the question.

By the way,—to change the subject—Thursday, Feb. 25th, was the opening day of the Millinery Department at Stewart's. We learn from the Times that the sale both as to quality and variety of goods, and the number of purchasers, exceeded that of any previous year. We quote:—

Throughout the entire day the store was crowded with ladies either purchasing or inspecting. In this department some twenty-five persons are usually employed, but yesterday, being a special occasion, the force was increased to fifty, who were kept continually busy throughout the day.

On the evening of Thursday, Feb. 25th, at St. Andrew's (Roman Catholic) church, in one of the lower wards, where the dwellings are exclusively tenement houses, and the inhabitants are mainly poor Irish, a fearful accident occurred. An adjoining building had been burned, but the lofty brick walls were left standing, and were considered secure. They had withstood the many heavy gales of this Winter, but the storm on that evening being one of unusual severity, a wall fell upon the church, crushing through a portion of the roof. Five persons were killed, and twenty-five wounded, some of them fatally. Had the accident happened at some of our up-town churches, that number would have embraced the whole congregation, but in this instance the number of worshippers at the Lenten service amounted to twelve hundred. But they were poor and ignorant Irish.

In a communication to the Hartford Churchman, the Bishop of Albany says:

In a recent editorial in THE CHURCH JOURNAL upon the question of the Illinois election, the statement is made that the Bishop of Albany wrote a portion of the Pastoral Letter of 1871. Any such statement involves a breach, at once, of confidence and of courtesy. Only private information could have conveyed this impression, because I was not upon the Committee appointed to prepare the Pastoral Letter. And private information is not public property.

THE CHURCH JOURNAL begs leave to say, in the very plainest English it can muster, that if there be "breach of courtesy and confidence" in the statement, it is not upon its part.

There was no "private information" given us on the subject. We have heard the "statement" a dozen times, if not a score, going about the streets as a piece of common and "public property" with which, like everybody else, we were supposed to be familiar—a matter as notorious as Trinity steeple.

We wish this distinctly marked and noted; for if there is one thing THE CHURCH JOURNAL in present hands never has done, and by no powers of our imagination can be supposed capable of doing, it is to commit "a breach of confidence," or knowingly "a breach of courtesy."

The Bishop then goes on to state that the portion of the Pastoral we quoted was, "in part," written by himself.

An estimable clergyman has lately written us that he is sorry he cannot recommend the JOURNAL to those under his charge. He wants it himself, and reads it himself, but he has discovered that "an estimable old lady under his care" has been much disturbed by reading THE CHURCH JOURNAL, and therefore wisely declines to recommend to his flock such a troublesome paper.

Our friend is quite right. We admire his large prudence. If his flock be composed entirely of old ladies, estimable or others, he should hesitate as he does.

For THE CHURCH JOURNAL is not written for old ladies. There are papers especially for that constituency, and none reverence the constituency more than ourselves, or recognize more gladly the need of special papers for it over its knitting.

But we have another clientele, and have undertaken to

furnish a paper which might occasionally cause stitches to be dropped in the knitting. Our friend will do better to recommend the —, or the —, to his old ladies.

Meanwhile we are glad to know that there are hundreds of cultivated, clear headed, and strong hearted women, young and old, who are among the most appreciative readers of the JOURNAL.

AN UNEXPECTED SLIP.—The Nation of last week spoke in its leading article of "humanitarian enthusiasm excited by the war." Strictly speaking, this means an enthusiasm growing out of the doctrine that Jesus Christ was only a man. The Nation undoubtedly intended to refer to an enthusiasm growing out of man's sympathy with man; in other words, it intended to describe the enthusiasm as benevolent, humane, or philanthropic. It is true that Worcester, differing from Webster in this respect, gives to the word "humanitarianism" the secondary meaning of "humanity, philanthropy," and the Westminster Review as the authority for this definition. We are surprised that Worcester should have sanctioned the usage of the Review, even as a secondary meaning, and we are more surprised that the Nation should have followed Worcester's example. The error occurs often in public and private speech, and sometimes in the daily journals; but it is to be hoped that it may not receive the authority of use by the more dignified and careful weekly prints.—Evening Post.

The Evening Post has becoming reverence for its mother tongue, and in this respect is a credit to the daily press. But we cannot avoid saying that "the unexpected slip" is on its own part, here.

The sense for which it contends, is a small Boston provincialism, growing out of a small New England Theological squabble; and if the word be admissible at all, a sense of which no one out of the atmosphere of New England would dream—as witness the Westminster Review.

That little squabble introduced the word, perhaps, in New England; but it is of common use now, if memory serves us right, both in England and in this country, by good writers, to express philanthropic enthusiasm; and in the adjective form, zeal and effort for the well being of men, without the remotest reference to any theological question.

We trust the Post does not accept the superstition that Boston owns the English tongue?

Our attention has been called to, and we take pleasure in correcting, a misapprehension which most of our readers must have corrected for themselves, in the communication from the Tribune, published last week.

There is certainly no reason why, with 26,000 confirmed (900 more than in 1873), there should not have been added 18,000 to the communion of the Church. Allowing for deaths, that would be just about the normal increase.

At this rate of increase, the Church would about double her communicants in twenty years—not so discouraging by any means.

Dr. Newman's reply to Mr. Gladstone is not, as we expected, quite so grateful to our Roman Catholic friends as he might have made it. Dr. Manning's suits them far better.

The Catholic World in reviewing Dr. Newman's Answer dwells, as we have done, on the unhappy man's subtlety, that singular subtlety which has been always competent to "make the worse appear the better reason," and which is quite as troublesome to his Romish friends as ever it was to his English.

It discourses as follows:

In speaking of the Syllabus, in particular, we fear that he has spoken in such a way that some readers will infer that they may disregard it altogether. He says it has no dogmatic authority. That it has not, by itself, the quality of a complete and independent dogmatic document, we may concede. It is a supplement to a whole series of doctrinal pronouncements, of the nature of a catalogue of the errors condemned in them. Yet all the errors enumerated are really condemned by virtue of the sentence pronounced against them in the whole series of pontifical acts. It is not lawful for any Catholic to hold any one of them. Their interpretation is to be sought, by those who are competent to do so, in the original doctrinal pronouncements of the Holy Father, and by the rest of the faithful in the explanation of their pastors, and others who explain them under their sanction. So also, although a condemnation of some particular system of mixed education—e. g., in Ireland—does not involve infallibility, but only authority to which obedience is due, yet an *ex cathedra* judgment of the Pope defining as a general proposition that mixed education is dangerous, is an infallible judgment on the question of morals.

Moreover, although the condemnation of errors frequently leaves a margin for discussion respecting the full import and extent of the condemned error, and the precise limits of the contradictory truth, which is affirmed, there is always something positively and certainly decreed. Over and above the fact that there is an error of some sort. Frequently, the meaning is obvious; and, at least generally, it is soon settled by the agreement of theologians, so far as its essence is concerned. We cannot criticise in detail every particular statement or expression in this pamphlet which, in our view, falls short of a clear and unmistakable and complete expression of correct theological doctrine. Dr. Newman's particular line has led through so many caveats, exceptions, limitations, so much subtle balancing of opposite weights, and of what he consents to call "minimizing," with which ordinary readers are not familiar, that he leaves the impression that truth, infallible teaching, the authority of the Church, even the Catholic faith, is something to be afraid of, to be guarded against, somewhat as Englishmen

feel about a standing army. We would prefer that, instead of being apparently so solicitous to assure weak brethren and timid converts that they need not believe so much as they are afraid of being made to, he would speak out with a more clear, ringing, and full note of his own peculiar, unequalled melody, to persuade and encourage them to believe and confide in the Church of God and in their prelates, joyously, fearlessly, enthusiastically, with the noble spirit worthy of the children of God. We do not like to hear our enemies call Dr. Newman the head of a party of liberal Catholics in England, and set him over against his Archbishop, and pervert his language into a weapon against the Council of the Vatican. We do not like to have to vindicate him from the praise of anti-Catholic writers, and to qualify the approbation which we would like to give to the productions of his subtle and erudite genius by "minimizing" criticism. He once wrote of himself,

"Time was, I shrank from what was right,
For fear of what was wrong."

Something of the same mood seems to have come over his sensitive heart in his seclusion from active ecclesiastical life, during the Council of the Vatican, and to have not quite withdrawn its penumbra. We are reminded of St. Gregory Nazianzen complaining of councils, and of St. Basil as he went away weary from Constantinople into retirement, and of St. Colman gathering up his relics to quit Lindisfarne and escape from St. Wilfrid. These were weaknesses of saints, but still weaknesses, and it was their heroism, and not their weakness, which made them worthy of our veneration. We trust that Dr. Newman will remember that there are some others to be thought of besides those who are weak in the faith, and his own *petite clientelle* in England; and that he will not close his career without one more deed of prowess, which shall discomfit the enemies of the Holy See and the Catholic faith, and show that his pennon still flutters beside those of his fellow-champions.

MESSRS. EDITORS: One not unfrequently meets with the remark that Roman Catholicism has culminated in the declaration of the Pope's infallibility, and that the system is now complete.

To me it seems that one thing is wanting, that a declaration of special incarnation of Deity logically follows that of personal infallibility. The doctrine of special incarnation also completes the resemblance of Roman Catholicism to Tibetan Buddhism, from which it has, apparently, derived so many of its forms and ceremonies.

And why should not Romanism, as well as Buddhism, have its Grand Lama, its Lord God upon earth? There is no reason to doubt either that the great mass of Roman Catholics would readily accept the doctrine, or that it would bind them more firmly to the system which it would render complete.

P. S.—I picked up, the other day, a volume of discussion (printed fifteen or twenty years ago) between a Methodist preacher and a Roman Catholic priest, in which the priest roundly denounces the preacher as a slanderer for asserting that Roman Catholics believed in the infallibility of the Pope. He repudiated for himself the doctrine most bitterly.

[It used to be denounced as a "Protestant lie," in "Controversial Catechisms" and other books of Roman Catholic defence. But the "unchangeable Church" has changed, and the "Protestant lie" is now a "Catholic truth."—Eds. CHURCH JOURNAL.]

Book Notices.

THE CHILDREN'S HYMNAL. With Tunes. F. J. Huntington & Son, New York.

This book is beautifully made, and reminds us by its excellent illustrations, of the English book "Nursery Rhymes with Music," which appeared four years since. The music composed for it shows an agreeable departure from the inane tunes, childish instead of being childlike, which are commonly taught children.

Of the new matter, for which we are indebted to Dr. Tucker, we instance No. 142 (not named), 153 by Tucker, 155 and 211, with its "wavy" theme for "Brightly Glams our Banner," by Arthur Sullivan; 102 by Corneil; and 238 by Cutler. Mason's tune, No. 199, were better omitted by reason of its close resemblance to the grand old tune "Alla Trinita Beata," which will be as much sung in the future as it has been in the past. The tune from one of Pleyel's instrumental works, has evidently been put (it will never be wedded) to "Onward, Christian Soldiers," merely because they suit each other rhythmically.

We judge too that Mr. Barnby would not be gratified to find at No. 91 his C. M. tune, written especially, with its mild descending harmonies, for "As now the Sun's declining rays," separated from the same.

"The Children's Hymnal" is, nevertheless, a great step towards an improved style of hymn music for children.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE RESPECTING THE ATONEMENT. By Thomas J. Crawford, D.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. Scribner, Welford & Armstrong, New York. 1875. pp. 538. Price \$4.50.

Dr. Crawford follows the "inductive method" with Scripture in this inquiry into the doctrine of the Atonement, and proves, in doing so, the utter futility of that method in theology, inasmuch as he comes (and so every man must come) with traditional interpretations and conceptions of the meaning of all the expressions he finds in Scripture.

The result is a moderately Calvinistic view of the Doctrine of the Atonement, as might have been expected. "Moderately Calvinistic," we say, for the charitable conclusion is that "Christ died for all," and not for the elect only, as rigid and orthodox Calvinism would require us to believe.

Books of this class are necessarily heavy reading, and this portly volume is no exception to the general necessity.

When the human intellect undertakes to cut and dry and tie up in bundles and label for future reference the various organs, limbs, and fragments of a dissected divine mystery, the process is not interesting, nor the results beautiful. This anatomy of Theology we confess a repugnance for. It