

doctrines, but who  
ns simply because  
nd probably prefer  
ther." "Ex-Uni-  
glican communion  
y other sect in  
ionable, but will  
ything to do with  
hand he says :  
s been formed for  
ionable, while St.  
Augustine's, St.  
Tremont street,  
a south and east  
length and honor  
ss surroundings,"  
church is full of  
in its doctrines,  
do not believe in  
eed, which alone  
h every church-

th these views,  
resents his, and  
to the mark.  
every stratum of  
l in the church  
growth is to be  
ongst the poor.  
ne of many an  
ong the poorest  
and in the city  
another cause is  
ething to do in  
clubs, hospitals,  
with the church.  
ses of growth is

scription to long  
ents of belief is  
his body has to  
urch organiza-  
tian doctrines,  
eschatological  
are a desire to  
nd an accept-  
A man has a  
of that creed.  
he most liberal  
stian doctrines  
hurch without

istocracy have  
growth of the  
in the extract  
l one. The  
clear of dog-  
ctive service,  
inds its own

LES.

tables deftly  
errible a fus  
he Congrega-  
new college at  
re statues to  
a Christian  
Bunyan and

others. These statues are placed in "niches." "This word alone used to possess a Popish smack to Protestant ears, but this is not all, for the outward statuary comprises the fathers of the Church, including—*mirabile dictu!*—Athanasius, against whose creed they are never tired of protesting, and which is supposed to be one of the greatest stumbling-blocks to their entrance to the Church which embodies it in her Prayer Book. It is true that, possibly as a corrective, John Bunyan is accorded the place of honor, for we are told that his statue is in front of the vestry tower; but, although the author of "Pilgrim's Progress" was the dreamer *par excellence*, it is difficult to imagine he could have dreamed that he should ever find himself in such company as this, either inside or outside the walls of a Nonconformist chapel.

Why, then, in the name of consistency, is there such a fuss over the St. Paul's reredos? If it is right to have the statues of the saints over the entrance to Mansfield College Chapel, why is it wrong to have a statue to the King of Saints in the Metropolitan cathedral? If it is right to glorify Luther by putting him in a niche inside the building, why is it wrong to honour her, whom all generations shall call blessed, by placing her inside another building devoted to religious purposes? If it is right to place a stained-glass window in the aforesaid chapel "glowing with figures of Prophets and Apostles, with their Master in a halo of glory above," as we read in a sympathetic description, why is it wrong to have the figures of Prophets and Apostles in stone, with their Master in the place of honour among them, in another building? Does the same peculiar distinction between vitreous idolatry and statuary still hold good which was formerly supposed to exist between inside and outside statues? A little while ago these very descendants of the "grand old Puritan" sternly objected to figures in windows, as savouring of idolatry. Coloured glass they might have, but they drew the line at figures. Now they not only have figures in glass, but figures in stone, and nobody makes the least objection. Is it that they have lost their Puritanism, or are the only real and sole descendants of those grand old men (everybody is a grand old man nowadays) the Bishop of Liverpool's friends, the so-called Church Association? But if they are no longer Puritans, their opinions do not yet synchronise with those of the saints whom they have placed over the entrance to their chapel. For, amidst all the vivid descriptions of carved oak stalls, niches, high embowed oaken roof, stained glass, organ, and all the other æsthetic accessories of modern Dissent, there is one important omission. Not one word is said as to the Altar, which should be the centre, the focus, the *raison d'être* of all this embellishment. It is not even mentioned as the Communion Table. All that we read, when the category of adornments is completed, is that "some ornamentation will be necessary to cover the bareness of the opposite end." Now, as there is, as we have said, no mention of the Holy Table, we do not of course know which end is here referred to, but if it be the end where it is placed, the word "bareness" is very suggestive, for the poorest and most ignorant Catholic, as far as secular knowledge is concerned, knows full well that, without the Sacramental Presence, the most elaborately decorated church is bare indeed.

If we could sweep intemperance out of the country, there would be hardly poverty enough left to give healthy exercise to the charitable impulses.—*Phillips Brooks.*

# THE REV. PRINCIPAL GRANT ON CHRISTIAN UNION.

THE following passages are from Principal Grant's address before the Evangelical Alliance. He said, "Christian Union, is it possible?" The question refers not to the invisible, but to the visible Church. It need not be complicated with the discussion whether Scripture refers to that Church which is visible or to that Church which is invisible. In case of an invisible Church union is not only possible but exists. It exists, too, independently of us or of anything we can devise or do. Our question, however, is a practical one. It is concerned with human effort, human duty, human responsibility. It asks whether the divided state of Christendom is a normal and only condition possible; whether Churches now divided, rival, even hostile, could not and should not meet on common ground; also by what methods and along what line and to what extent efforts should be made. Admittedly the Church was normally one for the fifteen centuries between Moses and Christ, though society then was disunited by causes that no longer exist, and the political tendencies were towards tribalism or the formation of small States. Israel departed from Egypt as a united host. Not a hoof was left behind. Had there been no union there would have been no triumphant exodus. Invisible unity alone would have availed nothing. During the centuries between Joshua and David there was apparent chaos, but round one name tribes could be rallied. The disruption of the Davidic kingdom led to the destruction of the kingdom of God on earth, and for seventy years there was no visible Church at all. The Church was one in apostolic and sub-apostolic ages on the basis of toleration of differences, both of thought and practice, more than sufficient in the opinion of modern sectarianism. The mother churches of Judea believed and acted on the belief of the perpetuity of the Jewish Sabbath and other holy days, the perpetuity of the rite of circumcision, the perpetuity of the Mosaic law, sacrifices, and institutions. These positions were held to the letter of the Scripture, and the whole Scripture that they then had was in favour of their views, and no command of Jesus could be quoted on the other side. Yet on all the points named the Gentile Churches felt warranted by the spirit of Christianity in taking up opposite and antagonistic positions. Seeing, then, that the normal state of the Church for 300 years was that of unity, it seems hardly necessary to ask whether unity is possible. Under various political forms the tribal government of judges or prophets raised up to meet emergencies, government of Kings, and government of holy men under various ecclesiastical forms; a Congregational, a Presbyterian, an Episcopal, a Patriarchial, a Papal unity has been preserved. One form fitted into the other to suit the times. Each was substantially a wise, a necessary, a democratic choice of members of Churches. That form to which the Protestants were most opposed—the Papal—admittedly served a most useful purpose in preserving a common and staple centre of intelligence to Europe. Grotius says without the primacy of the Pope there would have been no means of deciding and ending controversies, and of determining the faith. We should know more of the glorious epoch between the 6th and 13th centuries, instead of dwelling all the time on the abuses that characterized the 15th and 16th. What then shall we say of the last three centuries, the epoch in which we live? The characteristic of this period has been the protest in favour of individual rights and national rights against unspiritual usurpation on the part of the Church. Hence conflicts in

which both sides have erred, and both occasionally taken extreme positions, one side identifying Christianity with its own organizations, the other side practically exalting schism into a virtue.

Is there need for unity? Whether we look at Christendom in Europe or America, or at the non-Christian world, there can be but one answer. In France they were erasing the name of God from the public buildings and the school books. In Italy the spirit was the same. In Germany the Church is little more than a Government police. Not one man in ten dreams of going to the house of God. Millions of men are armed with costly machinery for murdering each other. Think of the social questions unsolved that the Church has hardly contemplated—of the organized strife of capital and labour, the mass of hopeless pauperism, the projects of anarchism to overthrow society, and then acknowledge that the Church has not delivered the people at all, neither have the inhabitants of the earth fallen. What of your own country? Let me quote from a report of the Maritime Provinces by a home missionary. He is dealing with the "hindrances" to the Gospel. He mentions, first, "sharp-edged sectarianism. In a settlement of fifty families four sects quarrel and fight. Outside there is unbelief. On all sides acrid narrowness." This testimony is true. The baneful shadow of sectarianism hangs over our villages and towns, as well as country settlements, killing our true religion, nurturing noxious substitutes, wasting men and money at a rate that our children and grandchildren will say is both scandalous and sinful. Generous young minds are driven into revolt as they see sectarianism peering out through every window, and hear the whistle of scandal at the street corner or tea table. Religion that should unite is that which divides the community. The Church is alienating from itself the strongest and the most refined minds. Do we not need a new baptism of the Spirit in Canada as well as in Europe? And that was of the non-Christian world? No ground has been gained since the 16th century; no nation or race has been gained for Christ. The Mohammedan world, the Hindoo world, the Buddhist and Mongolian worlds, as well as the Pagan world of Africa, occupy the same ground that they occupied then. How will unity be brought about? Not by old methods of violence. Both sides tried that for many a weary year, and after inflicting tortures and shedding rivers of blood, both have admitted that that is not the way. Not by the new method of organized proselytism. That is a meaner way than the old, and its failure will be even more conspicuous. Not by argument and drawing up formulas of concord. These proceed on concessions made with a view to bring about agreements which can only be nominally secured, and when secured cannot last. In a word, unity will not be brought about by compulsory uniformity, nor by fancied unanimity, nor by inspiring hatred and fear. It will be brought about by love, trust and mutual confidence. Unity will be brought about not by human devices or inspired by a desire for political or ecclesiastical aggrandisement, but by the outpouring of the Spirit of Christ on His Church, by the rising of the tide to such a glorious fulness that we shall no longer keep our barques sheltered by the banks of little inland creeks, but shall sail boldly out and join as one fleet on the broad ocean of God's love with the old crusader's cry, "God wills it, God wills it!"

He submits himself to be seen through a microscope who suffers himself to be caught in a passion.