

portion of them are negligent or remiss in the performance of their duties. But—let them be careful how they handle the newspapers.

RECTORY OF ST. JAMES', TORONTO.

All friends of the Church of England must sympathize deeply with the congregation of St. James' Church in their present state of bereavement. They have suffered a great loss—nay two, nay three great losses. The incumbents of St. James' have all been men of ability and distinction. Dean Grasett wielded an influence among his people and throughout the city such as men of this generation hardly understand. Canon DuMoulin, labouring to widen the views and sympathies of his people, at first against a considerable weight of opposition, in fact transformed the character of the congregation, and gave to the Church a commanding position in the diocese and in the country. It is hardly possible to estimate the value of the work done by the present Bishop of Niagara in St. James Church. Only he can tell all that it cost during the 14 years of his ministry; but all know the affection and gratitude with which he was regarded and the regret which all experienced when he left. It is not too much to say that his work was worthily continued by Bishop Sullivan. The late rector of St. James' was probably somewhat more of a partisan than his predecessor. We are doing him no wrong, and showing no disrespect to his memory in thus writing. Canon DuMoulin was as free from party spirit as can be imagined. If we called him an Evangelical Anglican, we should probably be as near as we could come to a just designation. Bishop Sullivan did not pretend to such a position. He was not merely Evangelical, like his predecessor, he was An Evangelical. But he always declared that he was quite impartial in the administration of his diocese, and we thoroughly believe that he worthily followed in his predecessor's steps, and did his very best to improve the services of the Church during his incumbency. The present able organist of the cathedral, Dr. Ham, has borne grateful and affectionate testimony to the Bishop's constant desire to second all his efforts in this direction. The introduction of Hymns Ancient and Modern into the church during the last year is the best proof of the Bishop's freedom from party bias. He did what he honestly thought best for the worship of the Church. And now, it can hardly be disguised that there is great anxiety as to the future; and earnest prayers will ascend to God, that the Bishop of the diocese and his advisers may be so guided that such an election may be made to the vacant rectory as may tend to perpetuate the work of the previous incumbents. A man is needed who shall be an able preacher, a good administrator, and a diligent parish priest; and a man of no narrow sentiments or sympathies. To put an extreme man, on either side, into such a post would be almost a crime; it would be an act most mischievous in its consequences for years to come. Surely the right man can be had in

Canada, or in England, or in the United States—a man who has proved a successful parish priest, an attractive preacher, and a good administrator. If he can also be a man of theological learning, so much the better, but this is not so important. Most clergymen, who fulfill the other requirements, are sufficiently equipped in this respect. We pray God that these our aspirations may be fulfilled for the good of His Church.

THE DUKE AND THE ARCHBISHOP.

Some time ago we drew attention to the charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and more especially to his remarks on some modern theories of the Eucharist. We then pointed out the theological error of identifying the so-called doctrine of Consubstantiation with the so-called "Ritualistic" theory. And now the Archbishop is called to order by the Duke of Argyle, who equally objects to his representation of the Presbyterian doctrine—or perhaps, we should rather say to division of Churches (from this point of view), into two classes. We recommend the whole of the Duke's letter to the consideration of theologians. He is most respectful to the Archbishop, of whom he speaks as "one of the best and truest prelates that has ever sat on the throne of Canterbury;" but he criticizes (and in our judgment properly), the loose manner in which Dr. Temple employs the word "supernatural," and he demurs to his judgment on the teaching of Presbyterians, which, he declares, differs in no essential respect from that of the Church of England. "The Puritans," said the Archbishop, "denied that there was in the Sacraments any special grace conveyed beyond that which by faithful men was always attained by prayer and hearing the word." To this the Duke replies: "I deem it my duty, in so far as the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and Ireland are concerned, to denounce the whole of this language purporting to describe our Eucharistic doctrine, as nothing better than a broad and inexcusable misrepresentation. We had in Scotland since the Reformation two authoritative Confessions—one sanctioned in 1567 by the Reformation Parliament, and the other drawn up in 1649 by the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Of the first of these it is enough to say that its chapter on the Eucharist teaches what may be called the highest sacramental doctrine." "In fact," the Duke says, "it uses phrases which are not easily distinguishable from 'Transubstantiation.'" And the authors of the Confession indignantly clear themselves of all suspicion of lowering the power of the Sacrament: "And therefore," they say, "Whosoever slander us that we affirm or believe sacraments to be naked or bare signs, do injury to us, and speak against the manifest truth." "This Confession," the Duke remarks, "has never been cancelled or withdrawn; and in the Westminster Confession the validity of the earlier Confession is set forth and the same doctrine is maintained. The Chapter on Holy Communion closes as follows: 'The Body and Blood of Christ is as really but spiritually

present to the faith of believers as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.'" The Duke remarks: "There is an old proverb that it is a hard thing to kill slander. And religious slanders are worst of all. So many men are predisposed to listen. So many others think it a duty to repeat. And surely this is a strong case. John Knox complained of the slander in 1567, and did his best to kill it. He would have been surprised indeed could he have foreseen that more than 330 years after his denial it would be repeated almost in the same words by one of the best and truest prelates that has ever sat on the throne of Canterbury." Here is something which we may all lay to heart—lesson useful for all to learn.

ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT, BY DR. EBERHARD NESTLE.

(No. 2).

C. von Tischendorf (died 1874), devoted his life to the study of the New Testament, taking as his starting-point the principles of Lachmann, but subsequently approaching the text of Griesbach. His work consisted more in collecting than in scientific criticism, and it was he who unearthed rich treasures both in the West and in the East, and gave the learned world access to such important manuscripts as the Cod. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. During a period of over 30 years, besides a great deal of other work, he published about twenty editions of the New Testament, each of which differed from the preceding one—often indeed in a remarkable manner. The most meritorious is the so-called ed. VIII., critica major, 1869-1872, which presents a comparatively usable text with the greatest possible collection of various readings for every verse. It is easy to understand how he, as discoverer of the Sinaiticus MS. (1844), should have invariably, and often, without sufficient cause, given preference to its readings, a point which is especially noticeable wherever it differs from the Vatican. In addition to a hasty and unsound method of working, he possessed a vain and selfish love of distinctions and public honours, a trait for which he has frequently been blamed, and with justice. With hasty energy of mind, and not by patient and conscientious work, did he seize upon the laurels of philology. It is true that his largest edition, to which, after his death, Gregory added the "Prolegomena," will for a long time be indispensable for scientific purposes, on account of its unequalled critical apparatus; but as H. Holtzmann says, truly, though with reserve: "The question might be asked to what extent has he studied the writings of the Fathers, which he quotes, and how much has he read of the translations which he uses?" What he really deserves credit for, is his untiring zeal in collecting, which enabled him to give to the world a critical apparatus, which without him would never have attained such completeness. In later years, England has sprung to the front in the field of New Testament criticism. After twenty years of careful preparation, S. P. Tregelles (died

1875), an earnest at 1857 a large and co along the lines of sought to bring th into conformity wit Next to Tischend splendid work cont and systematically variations; but in and never-failing tr pendix of criticisms vance of that of Tis translations, in whic reliable, were thoro les, with the aid of ty with the greatest ca edition of his book well for the scientific ed. Still greater res two Cambridge prof F. Hort, who worke years. They worke of Griesbach. The t lication contains the plete critical appara of their principles of commentary on all t which more than on of the text, and, fo which govern critici manuscripts can be f "Genealogical Meth this system, we have channels of traditio believed to have bee the north-west of Sy year 200, and from t Western Europe, re Italy (i.e., the Latin time of Jerome), an Justin and Irenaeus, which is supposed t the original, repres Vatican. 3. The Al older Uncial codices and the Vatican), at tion. 4. The later S; a levelling process c by the later Uncials sives and translation tion, directed partly method, partly again ference given to the hardt says: "If these rect, the firm found of the New Testam stand, once more a meantime, let us w we possess is replac In spite of all these science to produce as intelligible and as immediate result is ed, for the old Tex use among a great r dents. In spite of tl of such men as H. H Foreign Bible Soc ent day distributed handsome and cheap untrustworthy text, false readings of th