

ment is that of going about visiting from place to place teaching the Bible to gatherings of women. In this work she is aided by a native helper. Miss Mailes has also under her charge five young women, whom she instructs untiringly, and who go out by two and two to read and explain the Word of God to their people.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

WANTED A HYMN BOOK.

SIR,—Will you allow me to ask, through the CHURCHMAN, whether any of your readers can recommend a good Sunday School Hymn Book. I want one that is not expensive, and of a sound Church tone.

Yours truly,
COUNTRY PARSON.

X. Y. Z. HAS A SCHEME.

SIR,—Some people seem to think that I have a poor churchmanship in my brain because I have a prejudice against "altars" and "sacrificing priests." I have this prejudice, and my reason herefor is this: I have read history for the past twelve years, and in every history I find that the "altar" and the "sacrificing priest" have caused more misery and produced more infidelity than all the philosophers from the days of Brahme and Buddha to the days of "Joe Smith." I am firmly convinced that our Reformers knew what they were about when they expunged these terms from the liturgy of the Church of England. I have as much prejudice against these as I have against the "dancing dervishes" of Stent's "Egypt" or the Salvation Army "give." All are foreign to our holy Church. We have no knowledge of these in our creeds. Now what do I want? I want to see you in Toronto with a grand, a noble cathedral, after the pattern of our best English cathedrals, not after the pattern of any other. In that cathedral I want you to have the "white robed" throng of men and of boys leading (not altogether to themselves) the praises of the sanctuary. I want to see, in compliance with the 82nd canon of the Church of England, a decent communion table, properly adorned in this same cathedral. I want to see attracted to this cathedral a staff of clergy possessing the greatest gifts and graces this country can produce. I want to see a series of lectureship founded in connection with the cathedral known as Comparative Theology Lectures; and when this is done I want to creep in under the shadow of the pillar and listen to such an one as "Carpenter" or "Alexander" addressing the students of every Toronto College (Theological and non-Theological) admitted by ticket ("free") on the superiority of the philosophical teachings of the "Nazarene" over those of Zoroaster or Socrates, or Plato or Aristotle, or Spinoza or Comte, or the school of modern agnosticism. Then, in the gloom of the evening, having received the benediction of a true "Father in God," I could steal back to my country parish and be happy. Perhaps my scheme is, after all, only the scheme of a "crank." What of this? Yours,
X. Y. Z.

THE REV. W. J. TAYLOR AGAIN CORRECTED.

SIR,—There is some ground to fear that the Rev. Mr. Taylor blunders in his oral quotations as well as in his excerpts from the Latin writers *de re rustica*. In his great letter to the *Mail* he quoted "his friend the Rev. Styleman Herring" as saying, in illustration of the happy effects of total abstinence, that in his parish were thousands of Jews, but not one in need, though all around were steeped in poverty, because they did not drink. Of course it would be improper to doubt Mr. Taylor's word, but I hope it is not improper to dispute the correctness of Mr. Styleman Herring's alleged statement. In the *London Spectator* of 23rd April last is an article of two columns on "Jewish Pauperism in London," from which I take a few sentences: "Figures show that, last year, every second Jew belonged to the regular pauper class, and every Jewish second funeral which took place in the Metropolitan area was a pauper funeral." The epithet shocking is not too strong to apply to the mass of pauperism of which such facts are indisputable evidence. The death rate of the Hebrews is higher, much higher, than that of the general body of Englishmen. The *Jewish Chronicle* holds that the pauper class constitutes 48 per cent. of the whole body of Jews. The *Jewish*

World, in a recent issue, puts the proportion at 46 per cent. We regard it as nearer 50 per cent. It is only needful to add that the United Synagogue admits that of the total Jewish funerals in London, 44 per cent are pauper funerals, and that there are upwards of forty charitable institutions at work in the community. The poverty of the majority of Jews shows itself, moreover, in some painful statistics as to the death of young children. Of the total deaths registered by the Metropolitan synagogues, 81 per cent. were those of children under ten. The proportion among the residents of the country at large is only 43.5. This fact will show how much truth there is in the allegation so frequently made and so generally credited, that the death rate of the Jews is lower than that of the people among whom they live. The figures we have quoted are those accepted by the Jews themselves as authoritative, and are given without comment. They do not need it, and only too faithfully reflect the appalling mass of pauperism that exists in the Anglo-Jewish community of London. After that what becomes of "As rich as a Jew," or of the necessary antithesis between Temperance and poverty? Alas, even total abstinence is just as little an infallible safeguard against poverty as it is against the frailty of bank managers and directors!

May I say that I lately received, as I suppose others of the clergy did, a book entitled "The New Christianity?" It is Swedenborgianism, decorated with teetotalism, anti-tobaccoism, and anti-tightlacing; its highest energies, however, being directed against the sacred chalice. It may be truthfully and tersely described as a dunghill of twaddle. It boasts of "a host of distinguished scholars" as sustaining its positions, and names some half-dozen half-learned or wholly ignorant persons; but by making them quote one another incessantly all through a book of 500 pages, many a simple reader must be taken in by the miserable simulation of great and numerous authorities. On page 318 the Rev. W. J. Taylor is quoted as one of the "host," and his quotation from Columella does yeoman's duty. To intelligent readers happily the thing of paste and scissors confutes itself. As for answering it one might as well speak into the air. As Bentley said of answering Boyle: "My whole life might be spent at that rate in refuting the merest trash. And he has clearly the advantage of me in this point, for he may commit more mistakes in five weeks time and in five sheets of paper than can be thoroughly confuted in fifty sheets and in a whole year." In the interests of this new Christianity a newspaper so styled made its appearance on 1st November last, and on p. 9 I find a minister of the new church saying, in reference to the spread of Swedenborgianism and its adopted child teetotalism: "What Canon Wilberforce told Dr. Ellis (the lay apostle of the cause) is daily taking place among the most intelligent minds and in the most enlightened portions of the Church. Swedenborg is doing an immense service to day in explaining and illustrating Christian doctrine." If Canon Wilberforce be not misrepresented by his Swedenborgian friends, what are we to say? This modern Sabellianism "doing an immense service" to Christian doctrine! As Liberationists are glad to have the aid of agnostics in their anti-church crusade, are we to think that believing temperance men can league themselves with unbelievers, who, in laboring to overturn drunkenness, design also the overthrow of the Old Christianity? This is indeed "crankiness," if it be no worse.

Yours,
Port Perry, 28th Jan., 1888.

JOHN CARRY.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

FEB 12TH, 1888.

The Cities of Refuge.

Passage to be read.—*Joshua* xx. 1-9.

Murder is one of the worst crimes. Why? Because, in the Moral Law, God says, "Thou shalt do no murder." Yes, but when were the Ten Commandments given? Long before that, God had shown His abhorrence of murder by saying to Noah, "Who so sheddeth man's blood, &c." (*Gen. ix. 5, 6*), and by punishing Cain for taking the life of Abel. Why does God then abhor and punish murder? Because God Himself gives us life (*Gen. ii. 7*; *Acts xvii. 28*): and has made man in His own image (*Gen. ix. 6*). So now we put the murderer to death. We are justified in punishing the murderer; and in thus solemnly warning others, because God Himself has authorized it.

I. *The Refuge of the Manslayer.*—But sometimes a man is killed by accident. Suppose two men are felling trees, and the head flies off one man's axe and kills the other man, should we regard that as murder? (*Deut. xix. 5*). No one would grieve more deeply about it than the manslayer himself. And, inasmuch as the nearest of kin, who was bound to be the "blood-avenger," and to take the life of the murderer, (*Deut. xix. 12*), might (in sorrow for his lost relative, and in sudden anger against his slayer), not consider whether the death was caused in malice or by accident

—God mercifully provided Cities of Refuge to which the slayer might flee, and, being tried by the elders of the city, might have justice done him. Then, if the death was really caused by accident, he remained in the City of Refuge until the death of the High Priest, after which he was free and no longer in danger; while if the death was caused by "malice aforethought," and so was a murder, he was delivered up to be put to death. Six of these Cities of Refuge were appointed, three on each side of the Jordan, two in the north, two in the south, and two in the centre of the land. The roads to them were good and plainly marked, so that the manslayer might readily and quickly reach the city.

II. *The Refuge of the Sinner.*—Such merciful provision did God make for the people. And of what does it remind us? Surely, that Jesus Christ is the Refuge of our souls. We are in danger (see *Rom. iii. 23*; *vi. 23*). Eternal death awaits us as the punishment of our sins. But God has provided a Refuge—(see *Heb. vi. 18-20*)—a refuge against the wiles of the Devil, (*Eph. vi. 10, 11*)—a refuge from the enmity of man, (*Ps. lxi. 11*)—a refuge for the oppressed, (*Ps. ix. 9*)—a refuge for the poor (*Isa. xxv. 4*)—a refuge for the afflicted, (*Jer. xvi. 19*)—a refuge in all trouble, (*Ps. xli. 1*). Let us then sing the hymn—

"Jesus, Lover of my soul, &c."

And remember our Lord's invitation: "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Family Reading.

UNITY AND WORSHIP.

Worship is a means toward unity. That it is an immediately felt means is one of the commonplaces of Christian literature. It found one of its most beautiful expressions from Augustine, and has lost no freshness since; the emotion of united worship; the thought of earth's unceasing incense of rising prayer as the dawn and dusk of every place each moment waken and each moment send to rest a new meridian; the range of worship from depths of penitence to the divinest treasure of the communion of saints; the range of its forms, from the plainest simplicities, so dear to many, to the best earthly perfections of shape, of sound, of light; the vast varieties of race and character, which worship makes one, from the Corinthian, the Roman Jew, the Egyptian hermit, to the Kentish king, the Indian chief, the Japanese noble; the same words and feeling, mighty to bring all humble, yet exalted, into God's presence. So must the worship of this beautiful house be beautiful, and various and profound. It must give the full and tender music of that Prayer Book, which—while missal and breviary have become the private devotions of priests, and other exercises are engaged in to die as they are delivered—is becoming the Prayer Book of the world. Not a month but brings it to me in some new language or dialect. Make you this house a fit and sober exponent of it, let it be followed up by simplest prayer meetings, let it be followed by wise divinity and deep, and this will be a house of prayer indeed. But further, I want to suggest one other point as to unity and worship. Are we sure we are right to look upon varieties of worship as necessarily marks of variance, or diversities of ritual as material differences? They ought rather to be thought of as so many renderings of one infinite theme, and all to be rejoiced in. How can such a theme be rendered without many forms of utterance, answering to the many harmonies which make up man? Every school of painting, every style of architecture, all the structures of languages, express each some special grace, or order, or deep perception. And ought not the worship of all mankind—with the Eternal God for its object—to express wider thoughts, and of necessity in more varied forms than even those greatest renderings of nature? How widely did the worship taught by Augustine to the English differ from that of our Celtic saints, and both from the forms of earlier ages, and both from our own. Yet we feel the immense differences to be natural and right; we know that there must be such differences in the future. Have these simple facts no moral for the present?—*From the sermon by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the consecration of Truro Cathedral.*