

too; little neglect makes more; live rather by this simple rule: "Communion Sunday is coming, and I must live so as to be at the feast." "I am a soldier called under oath."

Excuses—Of course, many, "Hindered by business." But this is your *business*; other things, only your avocations! Die poorer, if need be. You cannot be Dives while you live and Lazarus when you die. "I am not fit." Then fit yourself. You can; I have tried to tell you how. "I do not see the use of it." But the Saviour did; are you wiser than He? "Others do not act as they say." Do you apply this reasoning in other matters? Do you go and do wrong in anything else just because so many others do? "I am a very grievous sinner." I am glad you admit it. Yet, God is divinely forcing you all the while to a better life; help God to help you, my friend. His grace awaits, and is as free as the air you breathe.

Excuses are either real or feigned; if real, go to God with them on the knees and He will remove them; if feigned, they deceive only your own self; they cannot deceive Him who seeth in secret.

Then the ingratitude of refusal. It often angers people to have their invitations refused! They sometimes cease giving them. Not so God. Yet, take care, be on terms with so great and so good a Being; love and obey Him, and He will prove the truest and fastest of all friends.

CONCLUSION.—Aim, then at this, to be holy as He is holy, to fear God, love the brotherhood, give alms, hear and heed the Church, watch and pray, use all the means of grace; come in faith, penitence and charity, in humility, and reverence, in singleness of mind, determined to be blessed, and neither man nor angel, nor power nor principality, nor the foe of souls himself, no being and no thing, in heaven above nor in the earth beneath, nothing whatever, save it be your own faithless self, can stand between you and the blessing of this "most comfortable Sacrament."—*The Living Church*.

TRUE EDUCATION.

True education is the right hand of religious influence, and a mighty power for good through all the avenues of life, moral, social and political. But it is evident that such education does not consist simply and only in intellectual training. It is the training and development of the whole manhood, or womanhood, in its tripartite character of body, mind and spirit. The idea so often expressed in the adage, "Educate the masses and you will elevate the moral tone of the people," is an exploded figment. There is no intrinsic moral tone or character necessarily associated with mental training. "Knowledge is power," but it is power for either good or evil according to the principle, or lack of principle, which guides and directs it. When man fell by transgression, his higher and spiritual life was dead; but his intellectual powers were enlarged; his eyes were open to the knowledge of good and evil. The mental sphere was enlarged, the spiritual was contracted. God's decree and the tempter's prophecy were both fulfilled. Out of this have sprung the evil tendencies of the human race. As an example, take the line of thorough education in mechanics: Two young men enter together, and with equal adaptation, and pass side by side through all the preparatory training to the mastership of knowledge in their chosen vocation. The knowledge and skill acquired is a vast reservoir of knowledge, and capacity for its use—one uses these to build up, and the other to break down, the securities of society—one is ingenious in inventing and constructing the

vaults and combinations for the security of property, the other is equally successful in "laughing at locksmiths," and invents the instruments which give entrance to the safest vault and removes its treasures. It must be remembered too, that the great criminals of our day are largely of the educated classes, not the illiterate. The daily newspapers show this to be true in the lengthening list of financial, political and social crimes of every sort. Men may use their mental power and intellectual training, like Voltaire and Thomas Paine, to degrade manhood and curse their fellows, or, like Howard and Bright and Gladstone, to elevate and bless them. We need and should press literary education for the power and capacity it supplies; but for its value and utility in the formation of manly and womanly character, we need that it should be under the guidance and influence of the higher and spiritual nature, which alone opens up communion with God, brings down His blessing, and so, cleanses, elevates and strengthens all human life, moral, social and political. For these reasons the religious training of the young through the character of the school curriculum, and the personal influence of Christian teachers, is of vital necessity in education. This is the province of the Church rather than of the State, especially in a country where religious teaching cannot be admitted into its common schools; and moral training must, of necessity, limit itself to a condemnation of those three sins against society, uncleanness, falsehood and violence. Beyond these lies the province of religious teaching. This position is illustrated by a comparison of the higher Christian civilization of England, with the socialistic outcome of religious exclusion in France.

Here is a plea, strong enough we think, for our people, one and all, to bend their energies, and bestow their best endeavors, and their largest wealth, in the founding, maintaining and endowing of schools which shall live and work upon the principle that the young people are God's children; and while developing to the fullest extent the intellectual powers, infuse them with the highest attributes of loyalty to Him, and their commission as His instruments for the cleansing, uplifting and salvation of the land and "all the inhabitants thereof."—*The Church Year*.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S TRIAL.

[CONTINUED]

(From the Correspondent of the Church Review)

On the Court resuming on Thursday, 6th of February, Sir Walter Phillimore continued his argument, showing that credence tables and divers colored Altar cloths, which had been previously condemned as illegal, were distinctly allowed by the Privy Council in the case of "Westerton versus Liddell."

The learned counsel said that their lordships were well aware that these usages, forty years ago considered illegal and a slavish imitation of the Church of Rome, are in common use in the Church of England. Having shown that the principles proposed to be applied would not work, he would grapple more closely with Sir Horace Davey's argument that nothing might be done in church not actually mentioned in the rubrics. Sir Walter then drew attention (a) to some legal things never ordered in terms in any one Prayer Book; (b) to some legal things, always legal, but not ordered in earlier Prayer Books; (c) some legal things ordered at first but omitted in later Prayer Books; and (d) some illegal things forbidden in terms in the earlier Prayer Books the prohibition of which is omitted in the later. Under the first heading he mentioned the fair white linen cloth on the Altar, omitted in the First Prayer Book

and ordered in the Second, which contained the lowest standard of ritual. There was no mention of credence tables or organs in any Prayer Book Canon. Again, it may be remembered was actually article by Smart forming an organ the "kist o' whistles" being as objectionable to many of the Reformed faith as a surplice or vestments. There was no direction as to hymns. What more telling or significant of doctrine than hymns? Yet, according to my friend's arguments, there being no direction for hymns, they could not be used, and as a matter of fact they have only been in general use for forty or fifty years.

The Archbishop: Are you showing that hymns are illegal?

Sir W. Phillimore: That they are as declared by Lord Stowell in the case of "Hutchings v. Denziloe." He maintained that by continuous usage hymns were part of the common law of the Church, though not ordered. The learned counsel further contended that in the First Prayer Book there was no direction as to the position of the minister in the early part of Matins or Evensong, or the Marriage Office.

The Archbishop: Was he not standing?

Sir W. Phillimore: Very likely. As your Grace says, he would fall back on the former usage. The repetition of the words of consecration when more bread and wine have to be consecrated was ordered in the Communion Book of Edward VI, forbidden in the First and Second Prayer Books, and ordered in the Canons of 1603 and in the present Prayer Book.

The Bishop of Oxford: Was there statutable authority for the Communion Book of Edward Fourth?

Sir W. Phillimore: There was Communion in both kinds, so that some provision must have been made. Probably it was authorised by proclamation. The learned counsel referred to the trial of a clergyman named J. Mason in 1573, who was sentenced to imprisonment for one year for not using the sign of the Cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, and the words of institution before the consecration of additional bread and wine, none of which practices were ordered by the rubrics. The unfortunate man, who died in prison, wrote an account of his trial, from which it appeared that the Bishop of London and the Dean of Westminster, two of the commissioners before whom the case came, referred to the *dicta* of St. Augustine and other ancients, and appealed to the continuous practice of the Church. He instanced further the varying directions as to the placing of the elements on the Holy Table, the use of the *Gloria* before the Gospel—the Bishop of London claimed that he did not think it common when he was young, and Ward told him of J. H. Newman's pleasure at finding it in use at St. Mary's Oxford—and the presence of a second clergyman at the Altar, and others, as showing the impossibility of requiring a rubric for every detail of the service.

The Bishop of London doubted whether the cases cited came under the designation of rites and ceremonies, and a lively discussion took place between his Lordship (who was frequently convulsed with laughter) and the learned counsel. After a long consultation between the Archbishop and his assessors, and conversation with counsel as to whether the question of Altar lights having been forbidden by the Privy Council the matter could be re-argued the Court decided that Sir W. Phillimore might throw any fresh light on it he could. The learned counsel contended that Altar lights were either like flowers or music, a mere subordinate accessory to the service—much less so than music—and were not ceremonies, or if they were, they were covered by the Ornaments Rubric.

The Court adjourned at two o'clock till next morning.

(To be continued.)