

in this stage of his career. The "wailing" chorus, with hautboy solo (exceedingly well played by Mr. Horton), and the duet "Love Divine! all Love Excelling," will perhaps be the most popular numbers. The work concludes with a fugal chorus of a highly jubilant character, and the dramatic interest is greatly intensified by Dr. Stainer's ingenious treatment of the words at the termination of this fine movement. The solos were very effectively sung by members of the Cathedral choir. The preacher was the Rev. E. Carr Glyn, M.A., Vicar of Kensington, and the prayers were intoned by the succenter, the Rev. Dr. Simpson, the lessons being read by the Rev. W. Russell, Minor Canon of St. Paul's. The "Hallelujah" chorus formed a fitting ending to this very successful service.

IGNORANCE OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES AND ITS REMEDY.

IN his reply to the address lately presented to him by his friends outside of Trinity College, Provost Whitaker referred in strong terms to the "appalling chaos of opinion and practice" so terribly visible in the present day, and argued that there was now "more reason than ever for holding fast to the form of sound words which God has so graciously given us in the formularies of the Church of England." The Archdeacon further had no doubt "that the Church would have been far stronger at this moment, far more at unity with herself, had all her ministers without exception hitherto faithfully and fearlessly instructed the people to understand and to embrace with a loving faith the teaching of her services." We cordially endorse these words of a "ruler in Israel" who has grown old in the service of God, and has sent forth able and zealous pastors, trained under his own eye, and reared up in the doctrine and faith of the Church, by one whose knowledge and experience are second to none on this continent. Without a scholarly and learned clergy the Church is nowhere. Zeal is a mighty power, eloquence an undeniable gift; but without sound learning the former lacks discretion and becomes a danger to the community, whilst the latter commonly degenerates into a mere repetition of platitudes, or by running wild in the straining after originality, too often waxes heretical and soul-destroying. The merely zealous or the merely eloquent man when confronted with the Romanist, the sectary, or above all with the well-read infidel, speedily finds himself at a loss, and by his powerlessness to maintain his cause inflicts a heavier blow on the Church than if he had altogether held his peace and refrained from mingling in the fray.

But in these days we need not only a well-instructed clergy, but also a well instructed laity. There are many circles into which a clergyman has not the entry, and the occasions are continually arising when an apt reply or a convincing argument from a layman of the Church of England might turn the scale in favor of the Faith once and for all delivered to the Saints, where, as things stand, the heretic or the infidel has it all his own way. This necessity seems to be recognized by all outside the Church of England, and we say it deliberately that in this country the average Church of England layman would stand no chance in argument with the average Roman Catholic or infidel. From their youth up these last are grounded in their knowledge of their peculiar religious or religionless systems. In the Roman Church the lay people join confraternities whose sole object is to instil into the minds of the rising generation the principles of their Church.

In every Roman Catholic school the Catechism of Christian Doctrine explained by the teachers—as a rule members of some religious order—forms the first and the most important lesson of the day. On Sundays it is the same. From the pulpit, in the Sunday School, in the household, the Catechism with the doctrinal teaching it involves forms the staple of the instruction given. With the infidels and the "free thought" men it is the same. They pick out their cleverest and most fluent speakers, who go out into the highways and by-ways, and, regardless of trouble, set out their peculiar views in their most specious and attractive guise. As might be expected, the young are the first to be caught, and as they have it not in their power to give a reason for the faith that they profess, they naturally suppose that its defence is impossible, that its foundation is on the sand. They in turn become members of this Devil's propaganda and go forth, well made up in argument, to do for Satan what they might otherwise have done for Christ. In a less degree this is also true of the sects—all of whom at any rate take care that their disciples shall be sufficiently well enough read in Scripture as to be able glibly to pour forth a flood of texts which shall make for their own side and against that of the Church, which in common with the Romanist, the atheist, and the infidel, they hate and abhor. To our shame it must be said that of but a miserable percentage of our laity, young or old, can such knowledge, aptitude, or zeal be predicated, and hence it is that every sect seems to be increasing, while the Church either makes no progress or else goes visibly back.

The reason is not far to seek. As Cassius said to Brutus, "The fault . . . is not in our stars, But in ourselves, that we are underlings" in this gravest matter. The Church certainly is not to blame. Her formularies, her Catechism, her Creeds, her teaching and practice handed down to us from Christ Himself, are more than enough to withstand all attacks on faith or morals from whatever source they come. She would have each one of her sons another Theophilus, most excellent and most powerful in sacred knowledge, with a perfect understanding of all things from the very first, and knowing the "certainty of those things," wherein he has been orally instructed. She would have each one mighty in the Scriptures, not only able to hold fast, but able to show others how to "hold fast the form of sound words" which he has heard of some one of the ministers, and through the virtue of the Holy Ghost to keep that good thing committed unto him against that day when it shall be necessary to defend and sustain it. She would have religious teaching permeate every educational system, and, whilst not neglecting this world's needs, would have all her younglings trained up first in the knowledge of the kingdom of God and in the dictates of the only true wisdom. Her system is elastic enough to admit of this being done in every way; the misfortune is that men refuse to avail themselves of this elasticity, and, as a rule, relegate all religious instruction to one day in the week, when they expect that the hebdomadal sermon and the hour's Sunday School teaching will do all that is wanted.

Does it do so? Let the miserably deficient knowledge of the history of the Church, of her doctrines, her discipline, and her ritual, her Catechism and Prayer-book, even of the Bible itself, which obtains so universally amongst those who profess to be Churchmen supply the answer—an answer which may well cause us to blush for shame. What then is the remedy? The only

one we know is to fall in with the mind of the Church and make religious training part and parcel of a child's every day life. There is, of course, this difficulty, namely, that the Public School system in Ontario and the other Provinces outside of Quebec is moulded on essentially godless lines, so as to afford the greatest amount of secular teaching—not education in the true sense to the greatest number, and unless we are able and disposed to adopt the expensive and too often the unfair and inferior system of separate schools we must bear with the ills we have and make the best of whatever opportunities are present of another kind.

These are no few. There are those enjoyed by every parent and guardian of youth—the least learned of whom might at all events insist upon the daily recital of some Bible text bearing upon the great truths of Christianity, some short portion of the Catechism, or the verse of some hymn by which the doctrines of the Church are conveyed in some easy rhyming fashion, such as may be seen in any Roman Catholic catechism. In this way the labours of the clergyman and the Sunday School teacher would be lightened and greater time given them on the Sunday to explain the truths thus learned during the week. In the next place there are the opportunities afforded by the Sunday School, whose importance, as "A Layman" has so ably shown elsewhere, cannot be underrated. But here a more serious difficulty crops up, that of the teaching element in the school. How shall the teachers teach others except they themselves be taught, and how can the pupils understand unless their teachers are fore-armed against all the difficulties that must occur to the child-mind during the lesson? We fear that in too many schools the teachers are only a little less ignorant than the scholars, or so wanting in training as to be unable to impart their knowledge to the children in a pleasing and intelligent manner. Hence the work becomes perfunctory and tedious, and gradually both teachers and taught tire of it and drop off—some of the children to the sects, too many to the streets. It is true that in most schools there is a teachers' class during the week. The mistake about this, however, is that too frequently it is presided over not by the clergyman of the parish, but by the lay superintendent of the Sunday School, who may or may not be thoroughly up to his work. Whether he is or is not makes no difference. The work clearly comes under the head of clerical duty—a duty so imperative that nothing save a matter of life or death should interfere with it, seeing that by universal acknowledgment the Sunday School of the present is the seed of the future Church. We hold, we have always held that, powerful though the priest's influence may be in the pulpit, it is felt with tenfold greater force in his parish ministrations, not the least of which is the training of the Sunday School teachers and the personal supervision of the Sunday School whenever practicable. His mere presence in the room, and the knowledge that the instruction given is of his own suggestion, will do more to impress upon the minds of the children the importance of their Sunday and home religious lessons than all his sermons put together. Not that we would in the least despise the agency of the pulpit. In fact, if it were used more extensively for stern dogmatic teaching simply set forth and bearing on the controversies of the day, the church itself might be used to supersede in great measure the lecture halls of the infidel and the sectarian.

Again, why should not the clergy press into