

In this article, as in the former one, he lays down as his main principle the fact which has, he says, never been controverted, that, in the United States at least, "the chief historical Churches have long been reacting towards the Protestant Catholicism expressed in the English Prayer Book."

He takes up separately replies which have been received from representatives of the different forms of Church government under the heads of Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational.

While we may not agree with all his remarks, yet, on the whole, the paper is a fair and able effort towards that much to be desired end of Union.

He bears full and frank testimony to the value of our Liturgy as a basis on which Union may be consummated, and recognizes in the idea of the Historic Episcopate that element of Church government which is needed now, and needed especially in the United States, and, we may also say, in Canada. In his own words :

"I venture to hope that in any union to be devised, the historic Episcopate can be retained, if only as one remaining bulwark against the well-meant, but lawless evangelism which is running wild in our churches, and bringing all the Divine Institutions of religion into contempt. When earnest and gifted preachers of the Gospel, like Mr. Moody, decline to become ordained ministers of any church, while everywhere exercising ministerial functions, with learned and faithful pastors sitting at their feet, and the whole order of God's house set aside, can we wonder if the popular inference should be, that the ministry itself is but a human convenience, if not already a failure. Is any transient good done by them to be weighed for one moment against the lasting evil of overthrowing the most sacred ordinances and institutions, to say nothing of feverish excitements, whose track is often that of the simoon through the fairest pastures or Christ."

And again he says :

"There is also a large and growing class of minds in all Churches for whom the historic Episcopate, as now associated with the Prayer Book, seems practically the only guarantee of a pure Scriptural Worship."

We gladly welcome these articles on Church Union, feeling sure that the recognition of the principles of doctrine and polity laid down in our Prayer Book and Articles is the only basis on which any true Union of Churches can be formed, and that the more the question is agitated and pondered over, the more will this ground be taken up. Assuredly we of the Anglican Church have nothing to fear from any part of our doctrine and polity being investigated and placed in its true light before the world.

Everybody remembers that very clever piece of work that came out several years ago,—"*Helen's Babies*." At the time of its publication it was one of the two famous books of the year,—the other was "*Daniel Deronda*,"—and

had quite a phenomenal circulation. The author has, comparatively speaking, disappeared from public view since his clever book was published. We do not know that anything he has done since has attracted particular attention. But a day or two ago we noticed in one of the great New York literary journals an observation to the effect that Mr. Habberton had written many better books than "*Helen's Babies*." And it caused us to reflect: If the critic's words be true,—what is fame?

In these days we see a great deal of cheap notoriety: men become known the world over for utterly worthless performances, for bringing out such aimless nightmares of books as "*She*," for wearing long hair and knee-breeches, and having a *penchant* for sunflowers; even for living in defiance of morality and law. They sink out of sight, indeed, very quickly again, but—they have been famous.

The desire for fame is the frailty of noble souls, and such a desire is not to be condemned so long as it does not govern the life and become the sole aim. But if man can overcome the strong desire to become known and appreciated, and can pursue his way unwarping in this direction or that, by any temptation to pander to the applause of the multitude, he will have shown greater nobility.

It does not follow that because a man has become known in the world, therefore he has deserved to be known; and again, it does not follow that because a man is not known and famous in the world, therefore he has not done anything for which he deserves to be known. A man may be undeservedly famous, or on the other hand, he may be undeservedly obscure. The unaccountable tastes that take possession of the public, one after the other, each to run its short course, often baffle long continued effort to meet the popular approval, while sometimes an individual opens his eyes in the morning to find himself—perhaps involuntarily—famous. In many cases—very many—it is only after the hard worker has passed away to "that bourne whence no traveller returns," that men recognize the good work he performed. So uncertain a thing is fame.

These remarks were suggested by the circumstance of Mr. Habberton's best work being unappreciated, while his inferior work became very famous; and possibly some wearied workers may obtain a slight degree of comfort from this fact, in the assurance that, though perhaps unappreciated, they are doing good work.

We are aware there are proverbs which contradict this conclusion, and which would suggest that the critic was quite mistaken in his estimate of Mr. Habberton's later work, for example, that one which holds that "if you have any good in you the world will be sure to find it out."

But proverbs, as gentle Charles Lamb has shown, are often fallacious.

There is in the December *Century*, an article entitled "The Sea of Galilee," by Ed. L. Wilson. Coming as it does at this time, when we are all looking forward to