

A LESSON TO MEDDLESOME NEIGHBOURS.

IT is highly amusing to see how certain ministers who have not, in any recognizable way, an interest in the Church of England, continually concern themselves with our affairs. Whenever any trouble arises from the erratic, lawless conduct of any of our laymen, certain ministers of the sects come out of their tents who valiantly berate Mother Church for not letting her children make just what row and trouble pleases their wayward natures. Every person who knows ought of city life, somewhat in the rear of its best streets, knows how difficult is the lot of those poor mothers, who having fallen behind in the race of life, are compelled to live amidst uncongenial neighbours of a lower caste. The children of these mothers soon begin to acquire the irregular habits of those around. When the domestic rod, metaphorical or actual, comes into use to restrain these rebels, the neighbours cry "Shame;" upon the anxious mother who is doing her duty in keeping her young in order. But although this reproach is bitterly felt as a cruel wrong, these good mothers do not abandon their course. They have the sense of God's support in duty done; they have, too, the hope that ere many years have gone, that their children will rise up to call them blessed for their loving discipline; especially for having been taught to prize their own home above all other habitations. Even so is it with the Church. Laymen of erratic, wilful, self-assertive dispositions, boiling over with the spirit of "bossing," set the domestic order and peace of the Church at naught. They know better than any one else ever did how to run a Church family, and all authority, custom and convenience, they treat with sublime indifference in carrying out their own selfish fads. When complaint is made, then out comes some neighbour who praises the rebellious youngsters, calls them into her house, gives them "taffy," and lets them hear their good mother sharply censured for endeavoring to keep her children in good order. This is too transparently real to be an allegory proper, for who has not seen lately one non-conformist divine repeatedly in public encouraging the Blake-Howland-Wycliffe rebels in their attack upon the domestic, parish discipline of the Church? They have been given unlimited applause; or, as the boys say, "taffy," in the houses of non-Churchmen. Indeed, because of their defiance of "home rule," they have been praised as little heroes, and urged to keep up the fight against Mother Church's discipline.

"Never you mind what your old mother says, you do as you like, and if she turns you out, come over to my house, but mind, bring your wages with you, and I'll let you run those little affairs you are so fond of." That is what our neighbours are saying to Churchmen who are setting the Church authorities at defiance. Let us suppose the case reversed. As it stands, a prominent Wesleyan minister is frequently applauding our rebellious laymen whose proceedings draw our people away from the

Church and surround them with anti-Church influences. Suppose a Wesleyan layman were to seduce a number of Methodists away from class meetings; to draw them entirely from under the influence of Wesleyan order, rules and life. Suppose, let us say, that estimable man, Dr. Potts, saw his flock being split and numbers being led away into strange pastures by a Methodist layman, and his work and position as their shepherd ignored. Would Dr. Potts give "taffy" and applause to such a layman? Would the Methodist body delight to honor a Methodist layman who drew its members away from that communion? Would the severance of the pastoral ties between Sunday school teachers, class leaders, and young converts be regarded with delight by other Methodist ministers? Yet, when all this mischief goes on in the Church of England, the leading Wesleyan minister in Toronto is so enraptured that several times he has asked large audiences to applaud Churchmen who have created trouble by setting Church order at defiance! Pray were such a disturber of the peace of Methodism to arise, what would be thought of any of our clergy who went out of their way to encourage those giving trouble to the Methodist body? It is no secret that such offenders have been summarily ejected by the Wesleyan body. Yet our rebels draw their best support from Wesleyans, and because a protest is made on behalf of the Church it is treated with scorn as though the Church were so dead that its defence of discipline should be treated with contumely.

Canon Dumoulin had sound reason on his side in asserting his parochial rights. Our condemnation of the work of the notorious Mission Hall, is based upon a perfect knowledge of what is being done there to induce our young to neglect Church ordinances, and to break down all regard for Church authority, teaching and influence. *It is no answer to our indictment; it is rather strong evidence in its support, that this work of disunion is regarded by Wesleyans with satisfaction.* The Methodist body has all to gain by the work of these rebellious Churchmen; they are sowing a crop which Wesleyans will reap. But it is an error in judgment as well feeling for our zealous and hopeful neighbours to display such interest in this work. Neighbours should mind their own households, and not go out of their way to encourage in disobedience to domestic discipline their neighbour's wayward, home-neglecting arrogant-tempered children.

EMERSON ON THE CHARACTER OF JESUS.

IN a lecture upon Emerson by the Rev. Dr. Hague, he relates the following conversation which followed an address by Emerson on "Religion." Dr. H. said: "I regard your tracing of the character of Jesus as marvellously just and beautiful. Yet I am puzzled to know what relation does the testimony of His miracles, affirmed by Jesus Himself, sustain to your line of thought? There is a good story told of bees settling upon Plato in his cradle

and shedding honey on the lips of the child. Suppose Plato had gone forth as a teacher throughout Greece, and on the strength of that reported incident claimed that his teachings were divine communications, what would you have said of Plato?"

Mr. Emerson replied: "I should have said that Plato was a great charlatan."

"Well then," Dr. H. asked, "why do you not say outright the very same of Jesus? Why do you not speak of Him as a great charlatan, seeing that this was exactly what Jesus did throughout Palestine? He claimed that His teachings were divine, and were divinely attested by miracles which you, Mr. Emerson, regard as never having taken place as stated by Jesus and the Evangelists."

The brilliant essayist is described as assuming a meditative air, but no answer was vouchsafed to this pointed home thrust. This conversation puts the Unitarian position very concisely and fairly. The moral grandeur of Jesus compels even the admiration of infidels. But the Unitarian goes further; he claims to be a follower of the Master, but only as far as one man may be a disciple of a fellow-mortal, and blinds his eyes to the terrible dilemma presented in the above anecdote—*Jesus was either Divine*—or a charlatan. If He was Divine, then the Unitarian does the Lord of life and redemption infinite dishonor; he blasphemes in speaking of God manifest in the flesh as a creature, a mortal, an impostor, pretending to work such works as God alone is capable of performing. But on the other hand, if the Unitarian is right, we are idolators; we are paying divine honors to a dead mortal; we are deluding ourselves and the world by pretending to have such spiritual communion as can only be between God and creature, when we celebrate Holy Communion and the whole basis of our Church fellowship, of our Church life, of our Church's very existence is an imposture! Verily this is indeed "The great dilemma." But there is another parallel dilemma which is this. How can we hold Christian fellowship with those who esteem our Master to have been a charlatan? Yet we are bidden to this task. So large is the conception of some, who would fain be thought teachers of the bounds of Catholic, *i.e.* of Christian truth, that within the last week the acknowledgement by the worshippers of Jesus Christ of the Christian brotherhood of those who regard Jesus to have been a deceiver, has been spoken of as a proof of "Catholicity," and this sentiment was cheered by those to whom any dishonor of Christ should bring the deepest pain.

What wonder we find teachers of the Emerson school speaking of this dreamy philosopher as "the successor of Jesus Christ, he inaugurates a new era." Yet with those who thus thrust our Lord aside as one whose teaching has been superseded by higher wisdom, we are asked to fraternise, and such fraternisation is modern "Catholicity."

In the lecture we have quoted from is another anecdote of Emerson. The author said to him one day, "I have heard that you and your people have renounced the observ-