

Christmas, Easter, Children's Day, and Thanksgiving, it is easily open to the intrusion of such influences. And in instituting this new memorial the Church would have not only opportunity and particular incentive to rebuke the derogatory adjuncts of the bald spectacular and sensuous features which now so often disfigure these other existing memorials (and even continuously agonize to thrust themselves upon the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper); but in a new festival of Whit Sunday the central thought would demand the rigorous exclusion of all such features, and emphasize most profitably the spirituality of all Christian worship. The entire course and method of all religious service might well be expected to receive a spiritual uplift from the proper and jealously guarded commemoration of the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Such an annual memorial service would not be an innovation in Christian worship, being truly in line and identical with the practice of the early Church, in which Whit Sunday was set apart for a commemoration of the BIRTH OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. In now again holding this service, the whole Church would but return to the example of the fathers, whose impulse presumably sprang directly in obedience to apostolic precept and usage. We have here an independent and most worthy authority for this good and noble service, an imperative addition to the Church calendar of Protestant Christendom.

The memorial services of the Christian Church constitute its beautiful robes, in which upon set days it richly clothes itself, and should be the true expression of its spiritual wealth. Such they are when upheld by spiritual life within the body. Then they are acceptable to God, and are full of eloquent appeal to the outside world. The more the Church can support such memorials the more she will dignify both her Lord and herself. But when she clothes herself with vain or tawdry

array, in so much she degrades herself and brings shame to her Master. The memorials employed and the manner of their use by Church, or nation, or individual are necessarily an index of its true character, of its intelligence, zeal, and courage. The Church is incapable of rightly employing the facts which enter into its history and life when it neglects or misuses the memorials of those facts. It thereby shows lack of capacity to comprehend their significance, and also its memorials descend into mere formalism, or are perverted to some base purpose and antagonize the principle they were intended to uphold and glorify. While the Church of Christ cannot be too rich in memorial services, it might be at any particular time too weak and deficient to make a full and sufficient use of them, or any one of them. It does and must meet its spiritual possibilities only up to the measure of its actual spiritual capacity and life at such time; what it cannot use with faith and love, it necessarily abuses and dishonors. Wherefore, the exact measure of the spiritual life in the Church of Jesus Christ is evidenced by the number and character of the memorials it uses to commemorate the grace of God bestowed upon it. Again, it may be said that opposition to the memorial of the coming of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, or failure to observe such a memorial of this wonderful and supremely blessed event, is a positive condemnation of the intelligence, zeal, and courage of the Church. Is it a fact that Protestant Christendom has not apprehended the meaning and glory of the coming of the Holy Ghost? Does it announce and maintain as a fact that it has not been sufficiently educated to appreciate this testimony of the grace of God, and the significance of that notable fulfilment of "the promise of the Father"? Does it relegate the fact of the presence and operations of the Holy Ghost to a place in its esteem so far beneath the work given to creation, the birth of Christ, and His atonement and resurrection, and the