are identified with those of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and the English Church Union. No "scholastic pedantism," however skilful it may be, can succeed in disconnecting the adoration of the Host from this hymn. It is useless to assert that this particular hymn is already in some widely disseminated Hymnals, because many of the clergy who use these Hymnals do so on the understanding with their congregation and their choir that such a hyma will never be sung; and they plead for the introduction of these Hymnalso on the ground of their many excellent qualities, which no one will deny. But still, whilst using the Hymnals they are bold in condemning the hymn in question. And again, it will serve no purpose to say that several of the clergy use that particular hymn, and that it is dear to them. There is now perfect liberty in the use of Hymn, the Church. Each individual clergyman bears alone the responsibility with his congregation for such use. If he promulgates heresy, it is for the ecclesiastical courts to take it up; but for a committee representing the whole Church to choose a hymn and put it into a Hymnal authorized by the Church is a totally different matter, and it is no less than authorizing and legalizing vision that a supposition between the supposition and legalizing vision that a supposition to the supposition of the supposition of the supposition and legalizing vision that a supposition to the supposition of the s authorizing and legalizing views that are unmistakably condemned and rejected by the Church. It is impossible to give the sanction of the Church to this hymn without at the same time contradicting and practically denying the teachings of Holy Scripture as interpreted by the third Rubric of the Communion of the Sick, the Black Rubric, the whole Communion service, and Articles 25, 28, 29, 30 and 31. The adoration of the Host, as taught by the hymn under review, is merely a branch of a tree, the root of which is the doctrine of the Real Presence, as taught by the C. B. S. and the E. C. U. (which differs from Transubstantiation only as an unscientific statement differs from a scientific one), the other branches heing the Elevation of the Host, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Incense, Altar Light, Sacrificial Vestments, Massing Priests, Fasting Communions, Reservation, Withdrawal of the Cup, and Masses for the Dead. The development of errors in relation to the doctrine of the Holy Communion as shown by the history of dogma establishes this beyond contradiction. Where one of them is, the other is not far off; they are so many links of one chain. The impartial study of the history of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper reveals the fact that all these doctrinal errors are so many links in a chain, the first of which is the Real Presence, rightly called Transubstantiation, and the last, Masses for the Dead. There is logic in history, and if you adopt the premises the conclusion must follows and it follows in the many databases of destrict which is the many databases of destrict which was a solution of the many databases. follow; and it follows in the present development of doctrine within our own Church in England. That scholars desirous of producing one Canadian Church Hymnal, and endeavoring to bring closer together the legitimate schools of thought in the Church, and working on a theory of "unity by inclusion" should, in three or four days, let pass one such hymn out of four hundred may easily be conceived; but as the choice, so far, is merely "tentative," it is are "hoped that such a hymn, or any other like it, will be withdrawn on furonsideration. If not, there is no reason why the Hymnal Committee in not, in such inclusion, recognize as a legitimate school of thought, any not ranging from Arianism to Vaticanism. But then "unity by inclusion" will only work out "unity by exclusion" and their collection will only become so much more "dead wood." Further, the suspicion of a Romanizing drift in the Church entertained by many of her loyal members will be intensified and amply justified, and the sympathy and good-will of many outsiders belonging to other Protestant communions will be withdrawn. Is it worth while to insert hymns of that class and others cognate with them at such cost? Or if we cannot have one hymnal without such, is it not better for us to continue as we are, and use our different Church Hymnals till we are brought closer together

J. J. ROY,

in teaching and doctrine by the Holy Spirit of the Living God.

Rector of St. George's Church,