

THE FISHER SIMILE.

MARSHAL BOOTH, in defending the strange proceedings of the Salvation Army, made use of a simile or illustration which is very badly worn. He said that when two men went out to fish one might be perfectly equipped in dress and implements for exercising the art of a fisherman and yet catch not a fish, while another with the rudest, most simple costume and weapons might be most successful in landing his prey. The moral is transparent, that mere outward, mechanical gear do not supply the entire essentials for any work of skill or moral effort. But there the moral ends and it is not worth much. Singular enough this line of argument is used to defend the very features in the Salvation Army which are mere matters of outward show! If outward show is of so little moment, why does the Salvation Army make so much display of banners, uniforms, ritual, processions, and the like? Surely because these outward displays are found essential to its mission. It finds after all that when a man has got to draw fish within reach of his bait that he must have the requisite attraction, for it is no use fishing in empty waters! The apology of the Salvation Army, which seems to be accepted as sound by all the evangelical religious bodies, covers a much wider field than the Army and its eccentricities. If success is to be the sole and supreme test of the rightfulness of means employed, then the wonderful success which followed and still follows the extreme ritual evangelists, was and is ample justification of their extreme measures to arouse attention and to excite devotional observances. He who admires the Salvation Army yet condemns Ritualism is very inconsistent. The Salvation Army after all is a mere revival of the "Ranter" system, which became obsolete owing to Methodism becoming too respectable for the noisy methods of the "Primitives," who did a good work in their day and preserved the original spirit and tone of Wesleyanism, which have now both vanished. General Booth is doubtless "a character;" he has secured about thirty millions of dollars to be invested in his own name. Wesley never achieved such a wonderful catch of fish as that represents! But Wesley lived before the "dollar age" when everything is tested by a money standard; when "churches," so-called, are ranked in honor not for their fidelity to the faith, not for their perpetuation of the divine life of the Body of Christ, but mainly because of their financial standing; so that, in this day, the claim of a "Church" to credit is precisely the same as that of a trader—a question only of capital and income! And for "fishing" purposes, these are attractions most potent. The fishes simile is defective in not regarding the obvious fact that there are fishes and fishes. It is poor sport to catch such small fry, or such offensive creatures as are useless for food or even for bait. The "churches" that are so busy angling for crowded audiences and popularity, catch, we fear, many a basket full of what do not repay the time, trouble, damaged tackle, and lost bait they have cost. The

Church of Christ, putting down her net in the quietude of a calm faith in His promises, needs not to worry over the fisherman's equipment question beyond care that the work given her to do is done with all diligence, in a spirit of love, obedience, and trust. "At Thy command we let down the net," is the Church's sole law and warrant, obeying that the draught will surely be such as the Master sends and will keep.

A REASONABLE SERVICE.

THE distinctive feature of the Anglican rite is in the great prominence given in the Oblation to the action of the whole body of the faithful in connection with the devout and intelligent preparation of the holy gifts, that in them and with them they may, with the whole Church, be presented as a sacrifice of a sweet smell, well pleasing unto God. Anglican ritual is not satisfied with mere æstheticism or ceremonial, or outward form and expression, however magnificent they may in themselves be. It asks for an intelligent apprehension and understanding of the thing one, and the offering in connection with it, the grateful devotion of the heart in thanksgiving. Man is a complex being, made up of body, soul and spirit. It is the part of true religion to give to each of the component elements of his nature the satisfaction it craves in entering into union and fellowship with his Maker. The senses have their place in offering unto God just as much as the reason and the imagination; and the religion which ignores sensible representation will infallibly degenerate into barren and idle speculation, as Calvinism has done. But the religion which has regard only to the senses, and does not seek to lift the worshipper up to an intellectual and spiritual apprehension of the thing first represented through the medium of material symbols, will assuredly degenerate into a low and grovelling superstition. It is not the fault of the Greek and Roman churches that they use pictures as an aid to devotion; it is their fault that they do not seek to educate the masses of the people committed to their care up to an intellectual and spiritual apprehension of the things represented by the picture, and do not call into action, as a safeguard against materialism and fetichism, the aid of the logical faculties to discriminate between things that differ. A religion, it is true, may be too mystical, just as it may be too intellectual and doctrinal; but it is also true that it is the bounden duty of the corporate Church to preserve in her worship the balance between the sensible, the intellectual, and the mystical, and to give to each its own place in the great act of corporate worship. Preaching without prayer is a mistake; so also is prayer without preaching. Choral Matins without a celebration is like an elaborate grace before an empty feast. A mumbled mass, where there is no attempt to prepare the mind of the worshipper for an intelligent and devout participation in the solemn function, is little more than fetichism.—*Am. Church Review.*—April.

EVENING AND MORNING.

OUR objectors say again, 'If the terms "evening and morning" are not to be taken as referring to the natural day, which is caused by one revolution of the earth, and which is marked by the natural phenomena of the sun rising and sun setting, what, then, do they mean?' We answer, firstly, that our English translation does not give the correct meaning of the original. In the Hebrew it is expressed thus: 'There was evening, there was morning—one day,' and so on in the case of all the other days. It is also to be noticed that the expression is not 'The darkness and the light were the first day,' or 'The night and day were the first day,' as we should expect it to be if by day was meant the period of a single revolution of the earth on its axis. The expression, therefore, 'There was evening, there was morning—one day,' does not signify that evening and morning constituted one day in respect to its duration, but rather that in each day's work was a state corresponding to that of evening in man's working day, *i.e.* to a state of rest; and also another period corresponding to that of morning in man's working day, *i.e.* to a state of activity. The successive epochs in which God carried out His creative work by gradual stages, were marked off and divided from one another with sufficient distinctness to be capable of being compared with man's days, and of being called 'days.' But while there is an analogy in this respect, there is another aspect in which they could not be compared. Man's day, by reason of the revolution of the earth on its axis, is divided into two periods, light and darkness. This feature cannot belong to God's day, for to Him Who is Light there can be no darkness: therefore, although light and darkness constitute each of man's days, the same cannot be said of God's days. There does remain, however, yet another analogy between [them. In man's working days, though rightly called *working days*, the whole time is not fully occupied with work, but an interval of inaction and rest separates the work of one day from the work of the next day. In this respect it is possible for God's days to be like man's days. Each day saw a new creative act or a new manifestation of creative energy, but the work of each period did not occupy the whole of it, and did not touch or overlap the work of the preceding or of the following day. But when the creative work was done for one day, then there was an interval of comparative or absolute inaction before another day's work, or fresh manifestation of creative energy, was begun. It is plain enough that the use of the terms 'evening and morning' instead of 'darkness and light,' or 'night and day,' is intended to signify that God's creative days were not the same as man's natural days, marked off in two divisions of time, and two conditions of light and darkness, by the sun rising and sun setting. It was not the time that distinguished and constituted the days, neither was it the alternation of light and darkness, but the fact that each day had two marked and contrasted seasons or divisions of