

THE SACRED COLOURS.

BY REV. H. C. STUART, M.A.

THE correspondence that has been carried on for some weeks past in the columns of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN concerning the relative merits of the Sarum, as contrasted with the Roman Ecclesiastical colors, is likely to produce in people's minds an idea that there is not only an irreconcilable divergence as to the use of colour prescribed by each, but it is also likely to produce an impression unfavourable to the judicious employment of colour for the purpose of presenting to the eye the particular doctrine it is claimed to symbolize.

Like many others, I have lamented the want of elementary teaching as to the signification of color prescribed in the various rules of the Church. The variations complained of seem to afford no common ground for intelligent action that will commend itself to the mind of that daily-increasing number of churchmen who desire to follow orthodox uses, and who yet, in the absence of any authorized direction, long ardently for a more intelligent rule than has yet been given to us, or at any rate for such simple elementary instruction on the subject as is requisite for understanding the causes of the variations complained of.

Such elementary teaching can happily be acquired with very little exertion. The A B C of the subject is supplied in the Scriptures themselves. There we must look for the key that alone can reconcile the apparent contradiction in the different orthodox "uses" as to the employment of color in symbolizing the great doctrines of the Church of God. Had writers on the ecclesiastical colors taken more pains to supply the first principles of the subject, instead of taking the possession of this knowledge for granted, there could be little room for complaints as to the alleged contradictions between the various methods of employing color. I think we should rather wonder at the remarkable agreement as to the symbolical use of color between the various sections of the orthodox Church, than see in their occasional divergence indications of carelessness or mere wanton caprice. Indeed the alleged divergences are more apparent than real. I am convinced that as the traditional red of English village churches is a survival of the Sarum Rule, so is the Sarum Rule itself; and the Roman and the Eastern Rules themselves survivals of an earlier Rule which was universal in the Primitive Church. It was universal in the early days of Christianity because it was the Scriptural Rule as exhibited in numerous passages concerning which there could be no dispute.

I understand that the absence of plain directions on this subject, in the early days of Christianity, was owing to the fact of their continuance from the prescribed use of the Tabernacle and Temple ritual, which, being so well known, left any directorium altogether unnecessary.

Briefly stated, the following appears to be the key of the symbolism of color:

The triad of color—the primitive Blue, Red,

and Yellow symbolize the respective persons of the Holy Trinity, and the combinations of these colors in the Church's seasons symbolize with wonderful exactness the doctrines those seasons are designed to inculcate.

We cannot know whether the sacred colours were named in accordance with our recognition of their appropriateness or not, but it is a remarkable fact that in every instance they are the very colors which of all others best agree with our ideas of fitness and propriety. Thus, had a pious Israelite been asked to name a color which should invariably remind him of the Almighty Father, he would without doubt have cast his eyes upward toward the blue vault of heaven, and answered without hesitation, "Blue." In this decision we should all agree, for no other color could possibly be so appropriate.

If Blue were the divinely-appointed color to represent the Almighty Father, we might reasonably expect to find this color largely employed in the service of the Tabernacle. And so it actually was. In the description given in the Septuagint of the curtain and ornaments of the Tabernacle, and the holy garments of the High Priest, Jacinth (dark blue) was set apart as a sacred color symbolizing the Father Almighty. Whilst the sacred scroll containing the words, "Holiness unto the Lord," was fastened upon the mitre with a blue riband, the robe of the ephod—the sleeveless and seamless vestment which enveloped the High Priest from head to foot—was made all of blue, which is very significant. Then the Israelites were bidden to wear upon their garments a fringe of blue. The late learned Bishop Wordsworth, after enumerating the many places in the Tabernacle ritual where blue was used to represent God, wrote concerning this color: "It adorns the livery of God's servants, and the uniform of His soldiers." By consulting the passages referred to, one is deeply impressed by the preponderance of blue in the worship of Almighty God under what has been called, "The Dispensation of the Father."

The subject will be continued next week.

C. E. T. S. ANNUAL MEETING,
TORONTO.

THE annual meeting of the Church Temperance Society was held in the Pavilion, Toronto, on the 13th May. The Bishop of the diocese presided, and in his address explained the dual basis of the organization, in order to ensure the success of which he held it essential that all classes of workers should be held in equal honor. The Bishop condemned the too general use of exaggerated and heated language by temperance advocates which alienated many from the cause. The next speaker was the well known Wesleyan, Dr. Potts, who gave the Church high praise for its good work on behalf of temperance, and urged that this cause could only be triumphant by Christian influence. Dr. Potts quoted amid much laughter the old pledge, "I swear to abstain from intoxicating liquors except at weddings, banquets, and other great occasions." The Bishop of Algoma

claimed that their society was Catholic and Evangelical. He found no direct injunction in Scripture to abstain, but the Gospel principle of self sacrifice for others was regarded by him as a nobler influence than obedience of a positive command. He urged personal efforts being made based on this principle. The Bishop of Huron looked with hope to the gradual development of a higher social code than now prevailed on this subject; this progress he marked as evidenced in the custom of men now to apologize for drinking on the ground of health requirement, throwing the responsibility of their drinking upon a physician. Dr. Baldwin made a singular statement that drunkenness was a modern vice; that our Lord never met with drunkards; the assertion met with silent but very decided negatives from those in the audience who remembered the old Testament narratives, and the history of English social life. The meeting on the whole was successful in numbers and in the spirit which prevailed. No little comment prevailed in regard to the absence of prominent Church of England laymen as speakers. Whatever may have been the reason for their absence, it seemed unfortunate that the lay element in the Church found no representative at a meeting where their advocacy would have been especially valuable. If we have laymen equal to this duty, for a duty we regard it for laymen to throw their talents and influence into every good work the Church either takes in hand or which it ought to sustain, such laymen have a further duty, that is, to take care that opportunities are provided for the exercise of their gifts and the open assertion of their principles. If the Church has no such laymen, it is a reproach, a weakness, even a scandal. But it is not so, those who are familiar with public life know well that some of the most effective lay speakers in the Diocese of Toronto are members of the Church of England.

CANADIAN PATRIOTISM.

WE love our land; we are proud of it; we take an honest and abiding interest in its welfare. We love it largely because we have made it what it is, and I think we love it the more because of the enormous difficulties we have overcome in taming its wildness, and making it subservient to our use. We have some reason to think that in the process of subduing the country (I do not mean subduing our fellows, but subduing the forest, the lake, the river, and the sea) we have developed the hardiest, the healthiest, and the most intelligent of the peoples that occupy the Continent.

What was this portion of North America when we or our ancestors came to it? Let us try to picture it to an Englishman. If he can imagine England, as at one time it certainly was, wholly covered by forests and swamps, without a mile of road, without a field, farm, church or house, with not a single village, town or city through its length and breadth, without a bridge over its rivers, and without a harbour on its coasts, its sole inhabitants being wandering savages, its woods filled with wolves, bears