

If, however, nothing of such a nature is at my command, I may at least offer in the place of it some words which, though repeated to-day were most of them spoken long ago, and which, when they were originally written, had for their author one who certainly stood as entirely outside of any cathedral scheme as any bishop, priest or deacon in the land. Some fifteen years ago, a few clergymen in the city of New York were in the habit of meeting for the reading and discussion of papers on subjects historical, theological and ecclesiastical. I shall rehearse this morning the substance of one of these papers which discussed the Cathedral in America. Whatever may be the value of the opinions it expresses, they were not the views of an interested person. They were written to promote no enterprise then present or probable, nor to justify any scheme which was then even so much as dreamt of. They were simply convictions which had been reached by dispassionate reading and reflection, and no boldest prophet would then have dared to predict that their author would ever be likely, under those circumstances which have since then come to pass, to have a personal motive for attempting their realization.

I shall do little more than substantially re-state them now, and in view of their history, I venture to think that I have a right to ask that in listening to them, you will eliminate the personal element altogether. They are not episcopal opinions, formulated to justify a line of action already entered upon; they were simply the deliberate conclusions of a parish priest, derived from impartial study and observation, and set down nearly twenty years ago.

At that time the situation was somewhat like and somewhat different from that which confronts us to-day.

On one side of the Atlantic was to be seen the gradual dawning and development of the cathedral idea; while on the other there was characteristic impatience of the cathedral reality. It had been in England a period of almost destructive criticism, while in America it was an era of enthusiastic inauguration. On one side of the water the cry had been, "cathedrals and the cathedral system are alike failures. The venerable building of the nineteenth century is an anachronism, and its staff of more or less studious, but inert, clergy an offensive incongruity." In a Church Congress at Leeds, a Dean of Durham related that he had been the recipient of a pamphlet entitled "What is the Use of Deans?" and, in an admirable paper on "Suggested Improvements in Cathedrals," he concluded with an appeal for active co-operation in such improvements, on the ground that nothing less than prompt action would save the cathedral system from "parliamentary attacks." In a word the tone of English criticism was either hostile or apologetic; while, at the same time in our own land, we were assured that the cathedral was an ecclesiastical, nay, a religious necessity.

Antagonistic as such opinions seem to be, they sprang, in reality, from the same root. During the previous thirty years, the Church of England had witnessed a marvellous revival of spiritual life. The stir of awakened vigor had been felt through every remotest member of the whole body; and thus the criticism of the cathedral system, as it then existed in England, was at once natural and intelligible. On the one hand it was urged, "here are stately edifices not always opened, rarely filled. Attached to them are numerous clergy, very few of whom are resident in the cathedral city, and almost all of whom are pluralists. This body of clergy consumes large revenues, and does very little strictly ministerial work. True, they cultivate learning and polite letters, and write books, and translate Greek plays; but over against them are clamouring the tens of thousands of spiritually destitute and untaught people, men, women, and saddest of all, children, with whom Christian England to-day is teeming. What," it was somewhat impatiently demanded, "is the cathedral system doing for the rescue of the degraded classes, the diminution of pauperism, the evangelization of the masses?" And the answer then must needs have been, "Not much, anywhere; and in more than one cathedral city, almost nothing at all." Was it any wonder, then, that some people impatient of moss-grown ruins, which, however venerable and interesting historically, seemed only to block the onward march of the Church, and to waste its substance in a sort of devotional dilettanteism? What were wanted were agencies which should not only centralise power, but distribute it; which should not merely gather learning and numbers, but should send them forth again to do some effective and appreciable work.

And so, in America, what had deepened dissatisfaction with cathedrals in England, had called them into being. The same scenes of urgent work to be done, the same need of organized and aggressive activities to accomplish it, the same want of a Diocesan centre of life—a centre which should not be so much conservative as aggressive and distributive, had led in the United States to the rapid multiplication of cathedrals.

That this was so, we need only look at the cathedrals then in existence to see. Accustomed, as many of us are, to regard the cathedral as an elegant and luxurious appendage of a wealthy and venerable ecclesiasticism, the first thing that strikes us, on looking at the cathedrals which have already been reared in this land, is that they are in hardly any instance to be found in centres of wealth and culture where the Church is strong, either in means or numbers. On the contrary, most of them are to be found in communities where the foundations of the Church have barely been laid, where her ideas are, to the vast majority, religious novelties, and where neither wealth nor numbers are in any sense available. The dioceses in which a cathedral; or something answering in its design and purpose to a cathedral, are to be found, are Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Chicago, Florida, Tennessee, Indiana, Missouri, Maine, Albany, Western New York, Central New York, Central Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Possibly there are others, but I do not know them. Now, with two or three exceptions, none of these are among the older and wealthier dioceses of the Church. On the contrary, but yesterday some of them were not dioceses at all, but unorganized missionary jurisdictions, hardly explored, and equally bare, so far as Church work was concerned, of men and means. Nay, even to-day at least ten out of these fourteen dioceses are missionary dioceses, in such a sense at any rate, that our Church in them is not strong enough to dispense with constant and considerable contributions of both men and money from without. How came the cathedral to be organized in such dioceses, unless the men who have been called to the administration of their affairs, found such an agency indispensable to the prosecution of their diocesan work?

To this, however, it has indeed been answered that the existence of the cathedral in many of our newer dioceses, proved only that slavish devotion to Anglican patterns from which neither American bishops nor presbyters have been wholly free; or, that it illustrated merely that American passion for a pretentious nomenclature, which would fain dignify every clapboard chapel with a stately and sonorous title; that passion, in other words, for covering up meagreness of resources and poverty of efforts with ecclesiastical parade. But such an answer carried with it a very grave imputation, when it was considered who they were whose motive and action it impugned. Churchmen of whatsoever school were hardly prepared to explain the existence of a cathedral in Nebraska, or in Minnesota, or in Central Pennsylvania, upon such an hypothesis. It was obvious that among the dioceses which have been named were those of the most various ecclesiastical sympathies and affiliations, administered by bishops of the most dissimilar Churchmanship and proclivities.

If, from any of them, one might have expected the slavish devotion to Anglican models already referred to, surely, among these such prelates as Clarkson and Whipple and Lee and Howe, Huntington and Armitage could have hardly been included. These men, and others who might have been named, were men saturated with the American spirit, grateful, indeed—as who is not?—for the fostering care of that "dear mother the Church of England" from whence we sprang (as Governor John Winthrop, some two hundred and fifty years ago so filially wrote), but manfully conscious of our independence as a national Church, and of the supreme need of adopting the Church's agencies and activities to the wants of a living present, instead of wasting its strength in disinterring and vainly endeavouring to galvanize the worn-out methods of the past. No one who had watched their work could have the hardihood to affirm that they had not grappled with the problems of our American religion in a thoroughly direct, practical, and intensely earnest spirit. And yet almost the first thing that some of them did was to set about building a cathedral.

It was still urged, however, that such a fact simply argued a spirit of ecclesiastical sentimentalism, which may indeed co-exist with much earnest and practical endeavor, but which is pretty sure to characterize a certain type of churchmanship. Just as the most matter-of-fact woman has somewhere in her a vein of romance, so, it was said, have even moderate and conservative bishops and presbyters of a certain very prevalent type, a yearning for the poetry and the sentiment of a cathedral. There would have been something, perhaps, in such an argument, if it had not been a task so hopelessly impossible to make it fit the facts. Among our frontier bishops, whose cathedrals have marked the line of the Church's advance across our western prairies, have been some, perhaps, in whom the emotional, sentimental, or poetical element was by no means deficient; but the vast majority of them have been men supremely of action, intent upon real, aggressive, persistent work, and to attempt to explain their cathedrals on any theory of religious sentimentalism, was to suggest so utter an incongruity as must needs provoke a smile.

No, the cathedral, where it exists already in our

American Church, exists because it stands for a felt want, and witnesses to the recognition, on the part of its builders, of its definite function. It is no longer a theory among us, but a fact; and the comparatively rapid multiplication of cathedrals, especially in our newer dioceses, would seem to imply that the want which they were intended to supply, and the functions which they were intended to perform, were at once real and definite. What that want has been, we may as well let those who have most keenly felt it, tell for themselves. Said the Bishop of Minnesota, in a sermon preached at the consecration of a cathedral in a neighbouring diocese some fifteen years ago:

"The primitive Church gave to the bishop his cathedral church to be the centre of all the work which ought to cluster around a bishop's home. Our American branch of the Church was fettered in her infancy by the ideas of the surrounding sects. The separated clergy stood alone. Each one grew more intensely individual by his isolation. The bishop was, in theory, the centre of unity; but he only met his clergy once each year, and he could not know their wants, so as to be, in very truth, their father in God. There was no diocesan unity in great plans of work; and hence many a noble apostle has gone down in sorrow to the grave with a broken heart. In the diocese there were as many 'uses' as individual tastes might weave into the service; opinions became matters of faith, and brought party shibboleths and party strife.

"The cathedral church gives the diocese what every parish cannot give—the daily prayer and weekly Eucharist. No day should ever dawn or sun go down without its incense of daily prayer. The lonely missionary and the parish priest and the Christians hindered from such devotions by worldly cares, will be strengthened by the increasing worship which here goes up to God. There was a day when men revolted against superstition, and in their zeal for simplicity, they stripped the Church to very baldness. The King's daughter should be clothed in garments of beauty. The graceful lines of architecture, the vaulted roof, the stained glass, the carving of the sanctuary, and the precious emblem of our faith, may all elevate our souls, and give us a deeper realization of God's presence in His Church. The law of ritual cannot be left to the fancies of the individual priest. The bishop's watchful care will see that we do not symbolize doctrines which the Church does not teach. Year by year the service will become more beautiful; and it ought to be the expression of hearts united to Christ. Without this our beautiful ritual will be in God's sight as kingly raiment upon a corpse. The bride of Christ ought to be clad in garments of beauty; but the fine linen of her adorning is the righteousness of the saints.

"The cathedral is the centre of the diocese's work. Our Lord sent out His disciples two and two. The greatest of the apostles took a brother on his missionary journeys. How much greater the need in these days of doubting faith! In our western fields a bishop's life is one of deferred hopes. He must often work without men or means. If he build a school, a divinity hall, a hospital, or home of mercy, he must lay the corner-stone with prayer, and water it with tears, and believe almost against hope that where we are blind to see no way, God will make a way. The bishop is a pitifully helpless man, unless he have the loving sympathy and the kindly aid of all his children in the Lord.

"The cathedral is the bishop's home. He is the father in God to all his brethren. The best bishop is the truest father. This fatherhood will deepen by daily contact with fellow-laborers. He will have clergy with widely different theological views. They will have different plans and modes of work; and he will give to all the liberty the Church gives. There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of administration, but the same Lord; and there are differences of operation, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."

(To be Continued.)

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

QUEBEC

Ordination.—The Lord Bishop of the Diocese held an ordination service in the Cathedral, Quebec, on Tuesday, June 11th, when the Rev. R. J. Fothergill, Curate of St. Peter's Church, Sherbrooke, was advanced to the priesthood.

Confirmations.—The Lord Bishop held a confir-

mation s
on Wed
the sam
day he
Townshi

Gross
of St. Pa
the Gros
of June.

Person
arrived b
Bishops
incoming
Norman
L. W. V
June 27th
spent the
ing at the
in the ev

Sunday
dral, St.
Churches
their tea
8.30 p.m.
a very in
to Anima
Litanies
were: C
four, M.
J. E. Ha
the child
School w

WEST
who has
is about
in the di
will lose
learned,
many fri
his new s

LENNON
Bishop's
of 28, an
about \$10
D.C.L.,
that the

ST. AN
laboured
past two
Andrews,
Mr. John
ministry,
James M
Theologic
Leslie to
months.

MONTE
been rec
meets on
Dr. T.
desiring
and privi
thing laid
Canada,
Diocese,
until and
pressed a
the Synod
The R
report of
456 of th
by this
end that
to appoin
Legislatu
the Chur
with.

The O
petition t
amend t
of Mont
draft of F
Wherea
have by t
to the A
the 14th
being ch
vision for
the Unit
Diocese