

-249) and Dionysius always nominated of their own body as if an army of deacons were to whom they knew deacon. Though her refers only to still it may be inferred by the inference is We cannot admit the other evidence

SSIBLE.

words: "Semper eloco collocatum, re are two words ten by the presby- bishop from their n, they nominated her place. Shall or did something call enthroning? nt of ordaining or proof alleged of ut here there is

ASTER.

adduce corroborated begins with Hil- S. Jerome." Now t the presbyters t [presbyteri con- piscopus]." And signant to mean it is much more " Ambrosiaster works are bound were formerly by s that "in Alex- pt if there is no es or seals [Nam gyptum, si desit iat) presbyter]." ence of a custom age of the whole the force of con- either the conse- nfirmation of the

HUS.

he phrase might ers (which we do tion of a Bishop. tter is supported h comparatively uch as it comes triarch of Alex- patriarchal see as follows: "The g with the patri- who should re- d that, when the ht choose one of ead the remain- ould bless him vacant place in ed up, that the nt. "This cus- ease till the time triarch of Alex- henceforth the rch, and decreed ch the bishops patriarch), etc." Eutychius con- n and ordination

MONY.

ren if this view e of the Alex- But he does ustworthiness of a writer so inac- n unsupported, but, as we have we venture to

think that we have seen quite the reverse. Eutychius was the writer for whom we were waiting in order to learn the true meaning of the previous testimonies; and now that he is come, we are told that he would be of no value were it not for his predecessors, whose meaning is so far from clear that it needed his testimony to elucidate it. When, moreover, we consider that this suspicious witness belongs to the tenth century, we have a right to ask whether such evidence would be held satisfactory and sufficient if adduced for the proof of any fact or theory which we might be disposed to resist.

#### BISHOPS IN EGYPT.

Bishop Lightfoot, however, professes to account for the exceptional state of things in Egypt. "At the close of the second century," he says, "when every considerable Church in Europe and Asia appears to have had its Bishop, the only representative of the Episcopal order in Egypt was the Bishop of Alexandria; and thus "it was a matter of convenience and almost of necessity that the Alexandrian presbyters should then ordain their chief." On this point we may quote from the late Mr. Haddan's article on the word "Bishop" in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. "That there were bishops enough in Egypt to consecrate legitimately is evident by the testimonies collected in Pearson (there were above a hundred at one of Bishop Alexander's councils)." He also refers to the case of Ischyras (mentioned too by Bishop Lightfoot) who was deposed as being only a layman because he had been ordained only by presbyters, and this by an Alexandrian synod of A.D. 324 or 325; so that we are reduced, on Bishop Lightfoot's theory, to the conclusion that, at the very time when an Alexandrian synod was declaring a presbyter to be no presbyter, but a mere layman, because he had been ordained by a presbyter, the principal Bishop in Egypt was himself consecrated by presbyters. Certainly this seems a contradiction which it would be impossible to explain.

We must repeat that we have here not only a kind of testimony which is in every way most uncertain and untrustworthy, but it is a testimony which stands alone. If Alexandria allowed presbyteral ordination, there was no other Church of which we have any knowledge which had the same rule; and we should require very strong evidence indeed to prove that Alexandria was an exception to the custom and law of the Church which required the ordination of bishops.

We might answer objections and note the acceptance of the rule of bishops without resistance or objection throughout all ages, but it is not likely that those who will resist the logic of plain facts would be much moved by arguments.

#### REVIEWS.

MAGAZINES.—*The Churchman* (September) begins with a good article by Prebendary Stanley Leathes on the Interdependence of the Old and New Testaments, in which he maintains that our Lord's references to the older Scriptures stamp them with a divine character; and he thinks that Mr. Gore has gone too far in the way of concession. There is also a good article on pastoral work by Rev. F. Parnell. The Dean of Salisbury contributes an interesting paper, in his series on the great Prebendaries of his Church, on the great Dr. Barrow. The difficult question of "baptism for the dead" is ably discussed, if not finally settled by the Rev. H. C. Adams. *Church Bells Portrait Gallery* (September) has four excellent portraits, those of Bishop Wilberforce of Newcastle, Dr. Talbot of Leeds, Archdeacon Thomas of Montgomery, and Mr. Pearson, the architect, with admirable biographical notices. There could hardly be a more interesting publication to Churchmen. Might we suggest that the dates of the portraits should be added in the index or table of contents? It would greatly increase their value. *Littell's Living Age* (Aug. 30 and Sept. 6) begins with a careful and thorough paper from the *Quarterly Review* on "Western China: its products and trade," based upon a number of recent publications on the subject. Every one who remembers the charming pictures of Watteau in the Louvre will read with interest a very delight-

ful though brief paper on his life and work, taken from *Temple Bar*, written by Esme Stuart. Another article in the same number, a Voice from a Harem, some words about the Turkish woman of our day, is of special interest not only for the revelations which it makes, but also as being an "absolutely genuine" production, the first attempt at writing on the part of a young lady who has been shut up in a harem for ten years. In the later number the principal papers are on "Political and Social Life in Holland," "Heligoland—the island of Green, Red, and White," the Novels of Wilkie Collins, and Amelia Opie. *The Expository Times* (September) sustains its high character and closes its first annual volume. In the "Notes of Recent Exposition" there are many interesting paragraphs, on the new edition of Delitzsch's Commentary on Isaiah, on Bishop Westcott's Commentary on Hebrews, etc. A good paper on "Preaching and Poetry" is by the Rev. P. J. Forsyth. The Great Text Commentary has for its subject 1 Cor. ix. 24-27, the expository notes being from Godet, Lias, Ellicott, Edwards; and the sermon outlines from Cardinal Manning, Dr. Maclaren, and Dr. Dale. Every department of this excellent publication is well kept up. *The Church Review* (July) is a number, rather a volume, of unusual interest and excellence. The very complete paper on King's College, Windsor, is brought to a conclusion, and will be read with much interest by many besides those who are immediately connected with that excellent institution. An elaborate paper on "Church Colours" by the Rev. Arthur Lowndes, shows how diverse were the usages of the mediæval English Church. It seems, however, that there is a possibility of discovering what those uses were; but it would be very difficult to get a principle out of them. We must confess that, if we are to have colours, there is nothing which seems to us so intelligible and reasonable as the modern Roman use. The other principal articles are on the religious history of Mexico, on the fundamental elements of religion, on the origin and significance of the eastward position—a very thorough treatment of the subject, on prayers for the dead and on "Lux Mundi." Some of these subjects will receive separate treatment from us. The reviews, long and short, seem to be done with great care. *The Pulpit* (September), in its third number, keeps on its way successfully. We have a good sermon on the Prodigal Son, by Rev. Magee Pratt a Methodist; one on the Bible, very thoughtful and clever, if not entirely satisfactory, by Dr. Lyman Abbott; one on the Atoner by Rev. C. B. Symes, Congregationalist; one on Spiritualism, by Rev. H. R. Hawes [Haweis?], together with some others in outlines and in condensed form. *The Literary Digest* (August 30, September 6) has two excellent numbers, of contents so varied that it would need almost a column to enumerate them. We may remind our readers that this most useful paper gives the outlines of articles from reviews, magazines, and journals of many nations and languages, together with copious extracts from the same. For literary men, editors, and reviewers, as well as for those who wish to follow with intelligence the political history of their own times, the periodical is indeed invaluable. As specimens we may refer to articles, in the earlier number, on the Nationalizing of the Railroads, on the American Silver Bubble, from the English Quarterly, the same subject being treated by an American in the following number. Some good remarks on Divorce are from the *Westminster Review*. In the latter number we have the Race Question again, the Two Mr. Pitts (from Macmillan), by Prof. Goldwin Smith, the Social Problem of Church Unity from the *Century*; but this is only a beginning.

#### CARDINAL NEWMAN.

It will be interesting to our readers to read a few of the principal testimonies of the public press to the great man so recently taken from us. We have selected them from every school, merely reminding our readers that they all speak for themselves.

(From *The Times*.)

His history is the history of religious opinions, and of actions based on them. We trace the workings of his mind as he passes out of the evangelicalism of his boyhood—an effective school for the re-

ligious emotions—into the historical and logical stage from which grew the "Tracts for the Times." The story of this central moment of the modern religious history of England is always fascinating, and to those who have any personal links with the Oxford of that day it still has a curious and a powerful interest. It has to be told over again from the point of view of each actor in it—of Keble first, then of Pusey, lately, in a much-read book, of William George Ward, and now of Newman, the chief of the band, the head and front of the offending. And yet, from the standpoint of to-day, how incredibly remote it all seems! It divided educated England into two hostile camps; it filled the English world with the noise and the smoke of controversy; it led a grave University into a number of scandalously intolerant acts; it ended by threatening the disruption of the Church of England. The controversy was professedly historical. Yet of history, in the modern scientific sense, there was very little in it; and neither side seemed to suspect that behind the question whether the Fathers thought and wrote so-and-so lay the question of the grounds on which the Fathers formed their opinions. But sufficient for each age are the controversies thereof. In 1840, or thereabouts, the question which concerned the religious mind of England was the question whether what was called "Catholic Truth" was attainable within the Church of England or not. We know the way in which Newman decided it, in his converse with Pusey and others, in his published writings, and in the almost cloistral solitude of Littlemore. He would have rejoiced to carry a greater following with him, but that was not essential. His own path seemed marked out to him and he took it, leaving many friends behind him—leaving Pusey to become gradually the head of a great Anglican community, to the outside spectator scarcely distinguishable from the Roman, and yet separated from it, if we are to believe its spokesmen, by the most vital differences; and leaving Pattison to go his solitary way in the pursuit of pure knowledge entirely unfettered by formulas or creeds. From the moment of that great step Newman became, to the bulk of English people, a mere memory.

(From the *St. James Gazette*.)

On Cardinal Newman's place in the history of the Anglican and Roman Churches it is even now perhaps not yet possible to speak with any confidence; though, no doubt, before the century is out it will have been fixed clearly enough for most people with any pretensions to the historic sense and eye. At the moment, however, the great convert to Catholicism is suffering somewhat, we think, under the reaction to which the absurd exaggerations current down to about a dozen years ago among certain of his contemporaries or sub-contemporaries, with regard to his change of creed, so naturally gave rise. The preposterous assertion—preposterous, we mean, to be made forty years after the event—that his secession from the Church of England dealt a blow to Anglicanism "under which it still reels," has shared the common fate of all such rhetorical extravagances. It has led a certain number of people to lay an undue stress on its contradictory, so that we should hardly now be surprised to find that not a few enthusiastic Anglicans would be prepared to uphold the adverse paradox, that the Church of England is actually the stronger for Newman and those who followed him having left it. And they would doubtless point to its modern "evangelizing" activity, and to the decided lead which it has taken over all other English denominations on the social side of religious work as a proof of their case. Upon this exaggeration however, as upon the other, its appointed Nemesis of reaction waits. We have got to see what this feverish activity of missionary effort amounts to from the definitely religious side; we have got to see how much of it is mere "Robert Elmsmerism," mere negation and dilution—the negation of all distinctive dogma whatsoever, and the dilution of Christianity into a sort of mystical altruism, which differs only from the system preached by the Positivists of the Chapel in substituting the name of Christ for that of Comte. That is to say, we have yet to learn how much of Cardinal Newman's Old Church will be left to existence by that "new spirit" which impels the modern Churchman, lay and clerical—and especially clerical, not to say Episcopal—to hold out one hand to the Agnostic and the other to General Booth; how much, in fact, of the new spirit the old bottles will contrive to get rid of without bursting. Our own impression, our own hope and belief, is that they will get rid of a good deal of it, and that after the present period of fermentation has exhausted itself, the Church of England will revert to the position which it held before the Tractarian movement began—at any rate, before it was carried by those eager spirits of whom Newman was the chief, to unpractical if strictly logical lengths. There will always be a place in English life—and in the best kind of English life—for that sober, cultured, moderately rationalistic form of Christianity of which the Church of England is eminently—is, indeed,