

them one who was perfectly competent to answer all these questions, and he therefore as a citizen of Boston, and as a member of the great fraternity of Christian people, welcomed him, and he need not ask for him their earnest and delighted attention.

Mr. Knox Little was received with generous applause. He acknowledged that he felt very much flattered at the opportunity of speaking to a Boston audience while at the same time approaching his subject and his audience with considerable diffidence. In the first place, if he might make allusion to a very slight thing, he felt, after speaking twice on Sunday, owing to his weak English nature, distinctively "Mondayish." Laughter. And then, again, he was bound to say, seriously, that the subject was one that he was scarcely fit to handle. To him the subjects that were of the deepest interest were spiritual, and when he came to touch upon any subject that went toward questions of controversy, he was ever brought to feel that to be a controversialist required great grace. Again, he could not justly claim the place which the kindness of certain gentlemen in this town had accorded to him, of being a representative man. In early days he was as far as possible from holding the beliefs of those who were now called ritualists, having been brought up in the strictest and closest Calvinism; and though he did not, till later in life, know anything of the representative men of the ritualistic school and owed nothing to them in the formation and development of his own religious opinions, still, as he had long sympathized profoundly with the aims of the movement, and had been more and more entirely agreed with its dogmatic basis, and, lastly, as he was at present the rector of a church where the ritual was used for many years before his connection with it, he was willing to accept the role and speak as a ritualist. Fair play was what ritualists as a whole had scarcely had. No longing could be more intense in every Christian heart than the longing for reunion amongst those who, apart from one another, still named the name of Christ; and in the first step toward and the best chance for such a happy consummation was that men should at least understand each other. If the poor ritualist could be permitted to speak he would have something to say for himself. And, in the first place, the name ritualist and the name ritualism, like Quaker, like roundhead, like carpet-bagger, and, he might even say, like Puritan, were nicknames invented by enemies, tending, and, he feared, intended, to call attention to a minor and unpopular detail of a great movement, away from its real and central principle. For ritualism, so called, was only a consistent expression down to minute particulars, a consistent and complete and honest acting out of the principles of the Church of England. The ritualist claimed the title of Catholic, and he reminded the audience that the Church of England never wrote the word Protestant in her prayer-book. She called herself Catholic; and the ritualist would call himself an English Catholic, not a Roman.

The speaker then proceeded to consider the dogmatic basis, the dogmatic position upon which the ritualistic movement rested. The great bond of the Anglican communion was the Book of Common Prayer, and, in a lesser degree, that which was included in the articles of religion. These latter were supposed to make against the Catholic or ritualist position, but such was not the case. First, because in England they were bound to receive the articles of religion in their literal and grammatical meaning; and, so accepted, every serious student of them began to admit that their condemnations were against Roman, but not against Catholic doctrine, against the accretions of the later papacy and not against the assertions of the Roman Church. Secondly, the articles of religion did not tell against the ritualists, because of any passage in the articles seemed to diverge from the prayer-book, it must be so interpreted as in some way to agree with it, because *lex credendi lex orandi*. Reminding the audience that he was not begging the question about the English Church being right in doctrine, but was simply asking them to consider her doctrines being what they were, whether the ritualists, or Catholics were consistent actors out of the doctrines, he said the Book of Common Prayer was distinct on the doctrine of the Trinity. It asserted that there were three persons or substances in one divine substance: the truth of the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity; that the church was his living body; that admission to communion with the Lord Jesus was by the sacrament or baptism as a real means, whereby, as by an instrument, God gave especial grace to a soul; that in the holy communion there was a real, but a spiritual, presence of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ; that the rite of communion was the central rite of Christian worship, that it was, strictly speaking, a eucharistic sacrifice; that Christ ordained three orders in his church by direct succession from the Apostles, called now bishops and priests and deacons; that to share the gift of apostolic power required apostolic ordination; that the priests have power to consecrate the eucharist and declare and pronounce to the penitent absolution of forgiveness of sin in the name of the Lord. The

prayer-book asserted other things, but the speaker was content with these premises. Now, either the teaching of the English prayer-book was false or it was true. If false it should be denounced and altered; but if true it should be acted upon with honesty, assurance and consistency. Applause. As loyal sons of the Church of England, believing the prayer-book to be true, they set about to act accordingly. The Catholic movement said to the high churchmen that the prayer-book stated the truth, but it added that that truth must be lived and acted and taught to souls. To the evangelical it said it would be spiritual life, and that spiritual life, for Church of England men, must spring out of the doctrines of the Church of England if there was any vitality of the spirit of God in that church at all. He thought that the spirit of God had witnessed that there was that vitality.

Having now stated the dogmatic position of the Catholic movement, the speaker presented, as the most interesting point of study, the line of action. When the Catholic movement began vast masses of the middle classes of England, and the poor with them, had fallen away from the mother church into prodigal heathenism. The church had become the school of respectability, and if there was one thing, as it seemed to him, that Jesus of Nazareth scorned, it was respectability. Applause. The ritualists determined that they would try to know holiness unto the Lord and not respectability. Their line of action was missionary work. First of all they laid great stress upon preaching; they saw that there must be earnest, thoughtful, heart-stirring, true, honest preaching to awaken men to serious realities. Hence came open-air sermons, hence they distributed all sorts of tracts, then there were classes instituted for teaching, and men set to work in downright earnest. The love of God, the horror of sin, the possibility of goodness through grace of the Holy Spirit, and the power of pardon, were deeply felt by those who were struggling in that moment. They felt that there were multitudes who were being lost for want of knowing Christ; that if the church held and taught it; that Christ was the very centre of Christian life. Then there came the determination amongst them to deal with souls one by one. It was a strong feeling in the movement that men could not be saved in multitudes, or even in couples. Some sort of spiritual relation to the soul was a necessity, and it was out of that feeling of the need of dealing with the individual sinner that the use of confession rose. What did they speak of confession? For the same honest reason that he had given for everything else that they did—because the Church of England did it. The Church of England had taught them to get up in Church and to say to their people before communion that if there were anything on their minds, scruple or doubtfulness, or difficulty, or sin, which they could not get satisfaction about alone with God, then to go to some minister and open their grief, that they might receive the benefit of absolution with godly counsel and advice. Now, they argued, again, either that meant something or nothing; if it meant nothing, as earnest men give up the Church of England; if it meant something, do it; and they did it. They said to men there was one source of forgiveness, Almighty God, and one means of forgiveness, the precious blood; and they said to men, further, that the Lord had spoken mysterious words about being with His Church to the end; that He had said to His apostles, and that he could not have meant those words were to be restricted only to the apostolic age, as if he cared about no other age of the world, that whose sins they forgave were forgiven, and that he meant that, as in other things, he used means toward bringing to him the seal of his pardon, so he used means in that. They argued to themselves that the Church of England was according to Scripture. God seemed to think that it was good for Adam and Eve to have their sins told to them; he seemed to think the same of Achan when Joshua told him to confess, although he knew it. Those people who attended the mission of St. John the Baptist came confessing their sins. Those people who attended the mission of the apostles in Ephesus showed their deeds. Christ seemed to think it was good for the women of Samaria to get out of her, what he perfectly knew before, the confession of her own sin. And in English law it was recognized and in English society it was accepted, that it was a good thing for a criminal before he died, although men knew well enough that he had committed a murder, to confess it with his own lips. And so they argued that confession of a fault was a real excuse for and a moral benefit to any living soul. And as to the question of absolution, they said the Church spoke plain: "If a man is dying you are bound to move him to make especial confession of his sin, if there be any weighty matter on his mind, before he go before the eternal God." And so at communion she put into their mouths the strongest words of absolution that had ever been used in the Christian Church. Therefore they said, as in the pulpit they carried a message for God, as when they consecrated a sacrament they were doing a work for God for his people, so,

when they gave absolution, they were simply means. The speaker testified to the blessing confession had been to his own soul, and to the knowledge that many others had been helped by it, even when they knew they had already received forgiveness through the precious blood. He claimed that the American prayer-book did not discard confession, first, because the American Church remained in communion with the Anglican Church, which taught it plain and straight; and, second, because omission of certain statements in her prayer-book was not prohibition.

Considering further the line of action of the Catholic movement, the speaker said that it sought to deepen the spiritual life and hence classes were formed for preparation for confirmation. Then came the question of their treatment of the Holy Communion. The Church of England, as an ancient Church, had put it forward under two aspects. First, it was the showing forth before Almighty God of the Lord's death till he came; and second, it was the receiving of His body and blood in a great mystery to support spiritual life. That was the great central act of Christian worship, the great means of receiving the blessings derived from the incarnation, passion, death, resurrection and ascension of the Lord. What the ritualists felt and what the Church of England taught was that to be a Christian was to be one with Christ, therefore that sacramental doctrine was the very ground of spiritual religion; that this sacrament was not a separate ordinance, but a means of being brought to Christ. For himself he never could receive the sacrament again unless he knew he was going to receive his Lord's body. "Christ in you the hope of glory," was the apostle's statement of the Christian's life. Personal communion with the Lord was the soul and joy and blessing and hope of the Christian, and therefore the sacrament took its prominence because it was Christ's own presence and Christ's own ministration and commemoration of his sacrifice. What the ritualists wanted was vital religion. That was what Wesley wanted, but the persistent stiffness of the Church of England drove him out. The ritualists were determined to have it inside the church. That was the head and front of their offending, because they gave people instruction in spiritual life, and established, to this end, fraternities, guilds and societies in which young men were brought together for prayers and to serve God. There was nothing very popish in that. The Church of England had been all too stiff, wrapped up in buckram and filled with starch. What the ritualists wanted was to tear the red tape to pieces and to wash the starch out of her, and to substitute something vital and devotional.

The speaker in closing spoke of the persecution to which the ritualists had been subjected, and sketched in a half serious half humorous way the history of the action of Church and state in regard to them. He claimed that while disobedient to an unconstitutional law, they were obedient to the constitution; while disobedient to the Privy Council, they had never been disobedient to a canon. When his Bishop spoke in the power of the Holy Ghost, he would obey; but when he spoke as a servant, as a flunkey of the Privy Council, he did not feel bound to obey. The prayer-book in black and white was before them, and they were strictly and earnestly carrying out what it taught. In regard to vestments, the speaker claimed that they were symbols, as a nation's flag was a symbol, standing to a principle. He thought the tendency of the movement of the ritualists had been towards liberality, and hoped that he had shown that they were not struggling for a cloth or a candle, but for the salvation of souls and the future of that great Church which they believed best adapted to the Anglo-Saxon race.

The invitation was sent to Mr. Knox Little by ministers of various denominations: Messrs. A. A. Miner, D. D.; E. H. Capen, D. D.; W. A. Start; Henry M. Dexter, D. D.; D. O. Mears; A. J. Canfield; Joseph T. Duryea, D. D.; Joseph Cummings, D. D.; Geo. Whittaker; Wm. R. Alger; H. A. Shorey; Wm. J. Potter; L. J. Livermore.

On the platform were Bishop Clark of Rhode Island, W. W. Newton, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston; President Capen, of Tufts College; Rev. A. A. Miner; Mr. Clark, Congregationist; W. A. Start, Universalist; etc., etc.

Diocesan Intelligence.

TORONTO.

SYNOD OFFICE.—Collections, &c., received during the week ending Dec. 11, 1889.

WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.—For the widow of a deceased clergyman. —Wyebridge, 2.05; Trinity Church, Colborne, 3.00; Parkdale, on account, 1.00; Dysart—Guildford, 1.03; West Dysart, 17 cents; Weston, additional, 1.95; Sunderland, 1.00; West Brock, 2.05; St. John's, Danforth, 1.02; St. Peter's, Toronto, 17.95. October collection.—St. Mark's, Otonabee, 4.50; Alliston, 91 cents; West Essa, 1.36; Fisher's, 40 cents.