

intellectual training which looks only to man's power of thought.

We must note, moreover, that man is body, as well as soul and spirit; and that a complete education must recognize his physical powers no less than his mental and intellectual. There is, perhaps, some danger at present of the importance of physical education being exaggerated. An athleticism which makes muscular development the main business of life is certainly a very ignorant and foolish business. But the body has its rights, clearly defined by its own constitution and by its relation to the mind, and abundantly recognized in Holy Scripture. The "sound mind" can hardly be found save in the "sound body;" and S. Paul prays (1 Thess. v. 23), "The God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be presented entire, without blame, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

But, once more, *education should have a religious character*. This proposition can be gainsaid only by those who deny the existence of God, or who assert that we cannot attain to the knowledge of Him. If there exists a God, an eternal being by Whom we were made, in Whom we live and move and have our being, then it is not only a necessary part of education that we should know something of God, of our relations to Him, of the privileges and duties which spring out of those relations; but, furthermore, this knowledge of God must be the key to all other knowledge, even as all other knowledge leads up to that which is supreme and all-embracing.

And this fundamental aspect of the subject is made clearer by other considerations. Thus, as a matter of fact, man is actually a religious being. He is sensible of his dependence, he craves for the knowledge, guidance and communion of a supreme being, a God. It is impossible to say this better than S. Augustine has said it: "Thou hast made us for Thyself; and our heart is restless, until it rest in Thee." There is hardly a race on the face of the earth which has not manifested religious longings and efforts: and these have not disappeared along with the entrance of civilization. By means of education and culture men have grown only more conscious of their need.

And all this is very simple and reasonable, if we believe what Holy Scripture teaches that man is made in the image of God. Nor is this the Biblical doctrine alone: it may be said to be the outcome of the teaching of the philosophy of the last century. From Kant to Hegel, and to the new English followers of the great German masters, the testimony has issued with increasing clearness. The foundation of all existence is Spirit, is Mind; and that Mind is reproduced and represented by man alone. What shall we think, in presence of thoughts like these, of that theory of education which professes to do its perfect work without an allusion to God, or to man's relation to Him?

And how is this religious education to be carried on? Here we approach a question which can, in this place, be dealt with only in the most general and cursory manner: and the reader will understand that the writer is responsible for no more than he says, and not for inferences which may seem deducible from his statements.

In order to religious education, then, there must be distinctive religious teaching. Nothing can be more absurd and intolerable than the nonsensical chatter about undenominational or

undogmatic instruction. You cannot teach without dogma. A dogma is a doctrine promulgated by authority. If you go no further than to say, "I believe in God," you have affirmed the most awful of dogmas. We must, therefore, clearly make up our minds to teach certain doctrines as revealed by God.

How this may best be done—whether by separate schools, or by having instructions given separately, at a certain hour, to children of different denominations, or by drawing up some formula of agreement between the principal reformed Churches, we cannot at present discuss.

No attack is here intended upon what is called our national system of education. If any one should represent it as the ideal, then indeed it would be a very easy thing, and almost a duty, to pour ridicule upon such a notion. If it be accepted as a necessity of our circumstances, perhaps, as far as it goes, it may be worthy of considerable commendation; although many who are by no means hypercritical have discerned serious flaws in its methods and processes. But, whatever judgment we may form of our educational system, at least it makes no adequate provision for religious instruction; and this is a matter which must receive further consideration, or we shall suffer for it.

#### THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Every effort to ameliorate the condition of suffering humanity should be regarded with sympathy. And even those schemes which are not the product of absolute wisdom should be spoken of at least with toleration and considered with patience. A society, therefore, which sets itself to cope with the evils of poverty, has a preliminary claim upon us for not merely a fair, but a generous hearing.

It is entirely in this spirit that we would approach this subject. But the very fact that we are eager to co-operate with those who are endeavouring to reduce the amount of human misery, should make us careful to understand rightly what we are taking in hand, and in what manner we may best accomplish it. Suppose, for example, a society should be formed for the extinction of disease, it would be the duty of all reasonable men to ask whether this meant the hiding of the manifestations of disease or the destruction of its causes. If the former, it might only be a kind of quackery. If the latter, then this is the great work of government, philanthropy, Christianity.

It is the same with the extinction of poverty. If our purpose were merely to see that no human being was so poor that he should suffer for it, then we must protest that such a measure would be of very questionable advantage to suffering humanity. Poverty and disease are, both of them alike, admonitions of the existence of other evils from which they flow, and are, in truth, benefactors of the human race. To do away with poverty, leaving men slothful, idle, intemperate, without any loss or suffering ensuing, would be the worst of all boons to bestow upon the race.

There is a real danger in vague talking on subjects like these. We raise expectations which we cannot possibly fulfil; and thus inflict the greatest injury by making the disappointed less contented with their lot. Does any serious thinker believe that the amelioration of the condition of the poor can be otherwise than slow and difficult? Does any one in his senses believe that it is to be accomplished by any one class, or by the promulgation of any new theories, or by the clearer enunciation of principles already recognized? We

know perfectly well, if we are willing to face the truth, that the evil can be moderated only very gradually, and this again by getting to know the causes of poverty and by dealing with them resolutely and in the spirit of Christian brotherhood.

What are the causes of poverty? Primarily, sloth and intemperance. Secondly, disease and what are called accidents and misfortunes. Thirdly, the want of justice and generosity among the wealthy. These points will cover almost the whole field, we think. With these points, then, we must deal. It is of no use at all to indulge in vague and ambitious platitudes about the evils of modern society, and the calling of the rich to account. We do not say that the rich are not to be called to account. Readers of history will see plainly that they always are called to account—yes, and punished in a very effective manner. There is no escaping the fruit of their work, on the part of any persons, or of any classes. The rich cannot escape any more than the poor. The poor cannot escape any more than the rich. The French Revolution, with its destruction of the *Noblesse*, is not merely an historical fact; it is also a parable of universal application, and its lessons will never be exhausted. They apply to the American millionaire as well as to the English landowner. We need be in no hurry to cry for vengeance. That will not tarry. Some practical measures we will consider in another article.

#### SOME LITURGICAL STUDIES.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 6.

What is known as King Charles' Prayer Book of 1637, intended for adoption in the Scottish Church, is of more than passing interest in our studies upon the English Communion Office. It is acknowledged that this book had a marked influence upon the revision of 1661, and it is the source from which both the later Scottish and American Communion Offices had their origin. It will also have its weight when at any future time a revision of the English Prayer Book is taken in hand. This is not the occasion for attempting to disentangle the skein of Scotch politics and ecclesiastical reform that encircled the inception of this Liturgy. Its compilation appears to have been Scotch, its moulding influences English. When it was found that the national temper would not brook the introduction of the English Liturgy as it stood, the Bishops of Ross and Dunblane were entrusted with the compiling of a new Liturgy which was more likely to be popular, and they seem to have acted strictly in communication with Laud, Juxon and Wren, the English prelates. It is to Wedderburn, however, Bishop of Dunblane, the most learned Bishop in Scotland, that the Communion Office is credited, and we can easily trace the models on which he performed his work. It is needless to say that the whole book is moulded on the lines of the English Prayer Book, but the Communion Office shows by itself that the compiler was no servile copyist. He followed neither the Office of 1604, nor that of 1549, nor Knox's Book of Common Order of 1560, but he probably used all three, and the feeling in 1637 ran too high for his work being ever tried on its own merits. It was thrown aside at that time with violence, and it attracted little attention for nearly a century, when the Non-jurors began to operate upon it with no little freedom. Its first noticeable divergence from our present Office, which is practically the same as that of 1604, was in a new set of Offertory Sentences, but that of especial