

should not be separated from his spouse too long, and this all the more that there is so much work to be done therein, and is besides one that needs constant supervision.

FREE CHURCHES

have again been strongly advocated by the Rev. W. S. Rainsford, of St. George's. He points out that the system is not only perfectly feasible everywhere, but is also useful to all classes, and, not least, to the "masses," who, not having the time to spend at clubs and being able to afford only a very limited sum as an offering to the Church, feel that they ought therefore to devote some of their leisure to working for a church which gives them everything and leaves it to their honor, so to say, to repay her by their voluntary services. The system brings out the Church's social side as opposed to the social side of the world, wherefore she affords them not only the means of grace and a style of worship on Sundays more or less splendid, but also the church club and the parish guilds, &c. Mr. Rainsford would therefore "anchor our churches and make them free," not moving the congregations up-toyn from the unfashionable to the fashionable districts, and removing all the wealth from the poorer localities and concentrating it in certain rich churches, which the poor never enter. Or, if the congregations must migrate, let the church buildings be left to serve as places of training for the younger clergy, and let a permanent endowment fund be attached to them.

THE ABSORPTION OF PARISHES.

or, as it is more euphemistically styled, the amalgamation of weaker parishes with the stronger, is being rapidly effected in this city, and is apparently very strongly encouraged by the bishop. Up to the present time six parishes have become three, and this on the plea that their mutual proximity interfered with the successful working of each. If so this has been the case simply through the fault of the previous bishops of the diocese, who allowed congregations to plant themselves so close one to another's parishes they could not be—cannot be even yet, inasmuch as then as now the lines of parochial demarcation have never been—cannot be fixed. Even clerical etiquette and courtesy have not always proved sufficient to prevent the building of a new church or a mission chapel within the theoretical lines of another parish. And though the Bishop of New York has canonically power to hinder this for the future, yet the evil effects of the past want of system remain and are daily bringing forth fruit. The amalgamation will certainly save money for sextons, costly choirs, fuel, lights, repairs, insurance and the like. The trouble of it, however, is that the economical vestries and churchwardens hope that it will also save money in the way of cutting down the clerical staff. That is, they hope to be able to do with three clergy, what four clergy or five were not sufficient for, in order that even the minimum of pastoral visiting and church services might be kept up.

THE HEBREWS IN NEW YORK.

seizing the opportunity of Good Friday and its prayers for their conversion in common with Turks, infidels, and heretics, lay all this display of interest in their souls' welfare to a "prejudice against the Jews." The editor of one of their organs has therefore sent round questions to "prominent non-Jews" asking them whether that prejudice sprang up against the Jews simply as such; whether it is not largely due to the Christian teaching on the conduct of the Jews towards Christ, which has begotten in the minds of children an "aversion, if not a loathing for members of the 'despised race';" whether in the social or the business life of the Jews any different standard of conduct ruled than among Christians of the same social status; and lastly, if any suggestion could be made as to the manner of dispelling the existing prejudice. Bishops Potter and Littlejohn and Dr. Dix were thus catechized. Bishop Littlejohn has had no personal experience in the matter, but thinks that the "prejudice will sooner or later disappear before the enlightening liberating influences of modern life." Bishop Potter thinks there is no existing prejudice except against offensive-mannered, rude and uncultured Jews, while Dr. Dix draws a neat distinction between "noble and ignoble" Jewish types. All three emphatically deny that the teaching in the churches and Sunday-schools already referred to in the least tends to prejudice men against the Jews. As to the comparison between the lives of Jews and Christians whose social status is the same, Bishop Potter cautiously remarks:—"I cannot say that I have observed a different standard of conduct as prevailing among Jews and Gentiles. There are those who think that the construction of the common standard by Hebrews is more literal, and that they are not wont to be bound by what most people would regard as an honorable understanding, unless it be 'nominated in the bond.' I am not, myself, in a position to speak as to this further than to say that such has not been my own experience." Dr. Dix, in his usual suave and polite fashion, says: "I may say,

in answer to another of your questions, that I have not observed 'in the social and business life of the Jew, any different standard of conduct than that which prevails among Christians of the 'same social status.'" Bishop Littlejohn again cannot speak from experience. In order to dispel the existing prejudice Bishop Potter recommends the Jews "to organize for success in those directions where the present situation is most unsatisfactory." The rector of Trinity insists that the way to dispel the prejudice is "to cultivate the true Christlike spirit in our hearts, and to pray for God's ancient Israel, who, as we hope and believe, will some day be 'grafted in again' and made one with us in the body of Jesus Christ."

HOBART COLLEGE.

The *General Advertiser* says: "Geneva has had a rare privilege the last past week in listening to Professor Clark, of Trinity College, Toronto, whose course of Lectures on Christian Ethics ended Thursday night. The lectures were delivered in the library reading room of Hobart College, and though more particularly addressed to the students, yet the privilege of hearing them has been very generally improved by the intelligent residents of the town. Taking as the basis of his course the profound work of Martensen, the eminent lecturer, despite the 'embarrassment of riches' which the work affords, succeeded in presenting in a way so luminous and attractive the central thoughts and their connections, that interest remained undivided from the start. Professor Clark is an exceptionally fluent and impressive speaker. A ripe scholar, his learned illusions may at times seem to crowd upon one another, still, as Mackintosh said of Grotius, 'Some leeway in this thing must be allowed to scholars of such dimensions.'" Beside the immense advantage of speaking entirely extempore, he possesses in eminent degree the faculty of making deep things plain, enlisting imagination in the work of conviction by his forcible illustrations, and above all, happy in his secret of reducing to terms of common speech and sense the imposing technicalities of Philosophy. Apart from the profound importance of the subject matter, the lectures afforded to all those in any degree familiar with the field of inquiry, a most interesting intellectual exhibition in the steady grasp, the sure discrimination, the consummate ease and disciplined strength, with which the distinguished Professor marshalled and disposed his abundant material. To give not only the heart and substance of Martensen's learned and luminous work, but to supplement and correct it with the chief forms of later ethical speculation—to do all this in lectures of an hour each—and further, to maintain a general audience not simply at the point of conventional attention, but of enthusiastic interest to the end—well, since the distinguished lecturer has accomplished it, we believe it possible.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

St. Andrew's Brotherhood.

SIR,—The young men of our congregation have formed themselves into a St. Andrew's Brotherhood, and are desirous of communicating with other branches of the society in Ontario, with a view to closer co-operation. We shall be glad to hear from any branches which have been established.

G. C. MACKENZIE.

Grace Church Rectory, Brantford.

Mediation.

SIR,—I have no sympathy with Romanism or Ritualism, and I am quite willing to take the general position of Bishop Lightfoot in regard to the meaning of the Christian Ministry. But I fail entirely to understand your correspondent's objection to the term "mediation" in reference to the Ministry. If it had been said that this idea was fully realized in the Christian Ministry, the objection would be intelligible. Would your correspondent object also to the word Medium? Would he object to speaking of the Ministry as a "Means of grace?" If not, this is precisely the idea which he condemns. If the "husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is of the Church," does not that imply that in some sense the husband stands between the wife and God? This is the whole principle of authority. The Sovereign, the Magistrate, the Bishop, the Pastor, each has authority as he represents God the Source of authority; and obedience is rendered to each as exercising authority in the name of God. Certainly one holding such authority does stand between God and man, not to keep them apart, but to bring them

together. The same may be said of the Bible and the Sacraments. Are they not means, media?

ANGLICANUS.

Questions to Sponsors.

SIR,—In your issue of the 10th inst. is a letter from the Rev. James Gammack asking for information regarding the questions to sponsors at the baptism of infants. His feelings are harrowed because he cannot settle in his mind to whom the pronoun "thou" in the question "Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce" &c., applies to the child or the sponsors. The condition, "in the name," &c., is against its application to the child, and if it is meant to apply to the sponsors it should be in the plural name here and not in the singular. So he argues. I do not wish to discourage honest enquiry, but is there any real difficulty at issue? The question is certainly addressed to the sponsors, as is plainly indicated by the condition just mentioned, and by the address which precedes it, "Wherefore this child must promise 'by you' that are his sureties, &c." Moreover, it is addressed to them individually, although asked but once. Each sponsor must answer for himself. His answer is, "I renounce them all," not "we renounce, &c." The use of the singular pronoun makes him feel that the answer he is giving is a matter with which he has to deal with personally, and not as one of three taken collectively. It is easy in asking the question to apply it mentally to each sponsor. This would minimize the feeling of unreality, if not dissipate it altogether. If Mr. Gammack's Old Country clerical friend who tried to cut the gordian knot by repeating the "thou" for each sponsor, were to apply his rule to the reading of the Commandments, it would land him in considerable embarrassment, especially if his congregation were a large one.

MISSIONARY.

Synod Delegates.

SIR,—The Easter vestries have passed and the delegates to the Synods are duly elected. To us in Toronto it is a matter of thankfulness that everywhere there is progress. To a great extent this is owing to the wonderful growth of the city, which has so multiplied churches that every one may gratify his own taste in ritual, and to the influx of many families which had been centres of life and energy in the smaller towns and villages. But, I fear our growth in Church matters, like business matters, is at the expense of the outside parishes, and that instead of the diocese becoming more united, there is an increasing want of sympathy. For we have now a city with its complex life and attractions allied to a district with a few towns and many poor districts, the parishes in which increase but slowly, while the city clergy and parishes multiply so fast as to threaten soon to preponderate in numbers as well as in influence. For many years the Synod has become more and more a city one, the country parishes, in many cases, being represented solely by Toronto men. This must chill the interest of the diocese at large, the backbone of the country, and no means should be neglected to counteract such a tendency. A very obvious one would be for the Synod to meet occasionally somewhere else than in Toronto, say in Barrie or Peterborough. Unfortunately, the average city delegate knows nothing of his parish, and little more of his clergyman or co-delegates. I might suggest a residence qualification, say that every delegate should reside at least two months in the parish he represents. Were the Toronto man to move his family for two months in summer to the parish, which is now a mere geographical expression to him, I can assure him that his wife and family would enjoy it very much more than a costly trip to Murray or Narragansett Bay. The children would enjoy country life, and he and his wife would acquire a knowledge of the necessities and trials of a country parish, which no amount of theory could ever give, and enable him to be an intelligent unit of Synod, not a mere party voter.

Union of the Church.

SIR,—Too much credit cannot be given to your correspondents who are agitating the question of the union of the Church in British North America. Such union is a consummation devoutly to be wished for. There is an immense power in constant, persevering agitation. There was never an occasion when it was more necessary to exercise this power than the present. All I can hope to do is to give my vote by adding a few lines to the correspondence that has sprung up on the subject, but that little I will do.

It is true that Diocesan independence must be maintained. But it is only necessary to maintain it to a certain point. There are many questions of general concern to the Church which ought to be dealt with in its corporate capacity. Let us not, however, fall into the error of over legislation. Why not substitute a General Council of the Church of