

... Bishop Moor-
Colonial experi-
the warning to
statement was
enting minister
m. The adver-
g," and acknow-
did not go far
se than he had
ty. The Chief
e weight of his
has thoroughly
e same verdict
up and doing?

FE. The Hul-
y F. I. A. Hort,
ge. 8 vo., pp.
w York: Mac-
ie Copp, Clark

these four lec-
their delivery.
pon them pre-
labouring with
to give to them
but he had to
to fitter editor
life-long friend,
tures are pub-
s Dr. Hort left
he volume form
an a system of
are studies of
g out with in-
d co-ordinat-
l conditions of
ys truly of the
e impress of
7, of absolute
y of such lec-
the lucidity of
ive continuous
r the reasoning
ed in rhetorical

the Diocese of
ion, by Edward
\$1.75. Lon-
n & Co.; To-
Ltd.

e Atlantic the
al topics by the
of peculiar in-
rings us into
of the living
horitative deci-
no run to read
The charge is
es, and we may
allusions, but
practical. It
mon is added,
nd. It is clear
alive to all the
e Church and
but we quote
"Could there
is exhibited by
e? or the re-
n of 'Mass'-
ucharist?"

By the Rev.

TRINE FOR THE
Snyder. New
into: Rowse

ly Nos. 8 and
rch Teaching
s and favour-
since Bryan
anged world
ve shown wis-
first, instead

of recasting it, for the story is a fascinating one. When re-read after a lapse of years it is still so, but the theology and religious discussions attract an older reader, who finds there is more in the book than appears on a first perusal by a story reader.

Church Doctrine is what its title indicates, divided into short, pithy chapters. Mr. Snyder's book is written for the people, and what he says is said in a way to tell with the mass of readers. A merit common to both volumes is that the questions are argued out; the points in favour of the Church are put so as to be easily remembered, and controversial matters discussed are those in issue between the Church and outsiders, not between different sections of it.

THE MUSIC REVIEW. Clayton F. Summy, Chicago.

The March number contains among its numerous and pleasantly written articles, the concluding one in a series on Schumann's Literary Work, translated from Phillip Spitta. Others are J. S. Bach by Ernst Perabo, Hans Huber, a Swiss composer, translated by J. N. Cady, and an amusing sketch by F. W. Root, etc. Also a four-part sacred song, There is Resting By and by, by C. A. Havens.

THE RITUALISTS AND THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. H. E. HALL, M.A., WITH A NOTE OF INTRODUCTION BY THE REV. T. T. CARTER, M.A., HON. CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

(Continued.)

v. I suppose by the words "there is no presence extra usum" is meant, no presence except in the act of Communion. All that has been said above refutes that statement. I need only, therefore, point out here two corroborations of our teaching, which bear directly on this particular point. The first is the direction to cover what may remain of the Consecrated Elements, after the Communion of the people, with a fair linen cloth; and the second is the direction at the end of the service, that whatever does so remain is to be consumed by the priest, and such other of the communicants as he may call unto him. Both these directions bear witness to an abiding objective Presence under the Consecrated Form of Bread and Wine. No such directions exist in the Baptismal Service, the inward part of which Sacrament is in the use. After the service the water is allowed to sink into the earth. The presence of these directions in the Communion Service emphasizes the distinction already pointed out between Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. The use of the linen cloth to cover that which remains after the Communion, is both very ancient and symbolical. Dr. Pusey writes: "As Joseph of Arimathea wrapped our Saviour's Body in a clean and fine linen cloth, so the Church directed that the Sacramental Body of Christ should, when replaced on the Altar, be enveloped in the pure fine white linen." These directions would have no meaning if the Presence had passed away when the acts of Communion were ended.

D. The third and last charge concerns our teaching of Sacramental Confession. Here again I will state just what we do teach, in order that it, too, like our other replies, may be compared with the Church's formularies.

We believe that "our Lord has given power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him." That this absolution is not merely declarative and hypothetical, but in the words of the Homily "hath the promise of forgiveness." That it is exercised in its fullest and most efficacious way after a sincere and complete confession of a person's deliberate and conscious sins. That such confession is not compulsory, but voluntary, the decision as to its use resting with each person's conscience. That forgiveness, though truly conveyed to the soul by absolution, is not limited to absolution, but may be obtained by true contrition and prayer. That this confession and absolution, commonly called the Sacrament of Penance, though not a sacrament of the same dignity or necessity as the two Sacraments generally necessary for salvation, is in a true sense, as being the conveyance of a definite spiritual gift by means of an external ministerial act, a sacrament. Now this teaching is so obviously the teaching of our formularies that one cannot understand easily how any person can ever gainsay the doctrine. The morning and evening service, the first exhortation in Holy Communion, the Articles XXV., XXXIII., Canon 113, the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, and the words of Ordination of a priest, absolutely and beyond dispute authorize our teaching. It was the reading of the exhortation in the Communion Service which, in a great measure, as Dr. Pusey often told me, restored the more general use of confession amongst us.

Only two passages in our formularies, so far as I know, are urged against the doctrine. The first is the prayer which follows the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, in which forgiveness is still asked for, thus, as it is suggested, casting a doubt on there being anything more than a hypothetical declaration in the Absolution. But this prayer is based on the Scriptural teaching of "wash me more and more from my iniquity." We might with equal justice say that Nathan's message of forgiveness to David was hypothetical, because David after it wrote that verse to which I have just alluded. Absolution, like all other Sacramental ministrations, requires correspondence on the part of the recipient for its full benefits to be operative; ever deepening contrition is at once a common fruit of the restoration effected by absolution, and also the safeguard of its grace, but certainly does not argue that the absolution took no effect. The other passage, which is thought, and on first sight might fairly be thought to argue against our teaching, is a passage in the second part of the Sermon on Repentance, in which the authority of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine is adduced as censuring Auricular Confession. Now, first of all, since the Homily relies on those two Fathers, both of whom explicitly taught the truth of the ordinance, it is obvious that all that it says is intended in a Catholic and Patristic sense. Further it must be remembered, that the term Auricular Confession was, as Canon Carter has pointed out, a term employed at that time to denote the special Roman system of Confession, including particulars which were rejected by our Bishops, and are not part of our system now. One main point of the abandoned system was its compulsory use. Our system being voluntary, our people being free to go to any priest they like, our Prayer Book making constant reference to a use of Confession and Absolution, it is certainly more reasonable and consistent to suppose that it was not the Prayer Book system which was being written against, but the Roman. I do not think that fair discussion can long be continued over the certainty that the Church of England sanctions the doctrine of Confession and Absolution. The only question can be as to their use. This, as I have stated, we consider a matter of counsel. By counsel I mean that we do not regard them as of universal necessity. On the other hand, we may not regard them as of indifference, as a thing which we may ignore, but as a means of grace which we must each face from time to time, in our preparations for Communion, and for the hour of death.

There is one point on which we may feel in more agreement with our critics, and that is on the possible danger in young and inexperienced priests hearing confessions. The remedy, however, is one which I fear might only arouse still more controversial bitterness, as it is the insistence on clergy obtaining an additional and special faculty or license from the Bishop before exercising this part of their ministry. While such a rule does not exist, however, if young priests are to have personal intimate dealing with souls at all, I certainly think the possibility of harm is lessened when such dealings are in church, often in the open church (i.e., coram populo), and with all the solemnity of a religious ministration. But this last point is a matter for fair discussion, and no part of the charges I had to refute, and offer some explanations upon, which I trust I have satisfactorily succeeded in doing.

E. In conclusion I make these three remarks.

1. It is often feared that we are desirous of reunion with Rome. So in a sense we are, but not at the expense of truth. We neither conceal nor palliate the differences, vital, essential, between us, such as the Rule of Faith or the Papacy. These definite issues must be challenged patiently, courteously, historically. It is by such means that we seek reunion. To desire it, as we desire it, is to desire the triumph of truth, on whichever side it may be found, and the fulfilment of our Lord's yearning. We believe that reunion with Rome would enrich us both with spiritual grace; at the same time we would respectfully try, by persistent reference to Holy Scripture and antiquity, to point out to Rome where we cannot but firmly believe that she has departed from the true lines of that two-fold rule. Our desire for reunion with Rome is in no degree whatever less praiseworthy or less honest, than a parallel desire which exists in the hearts of so many Churchmen for reunion with Nonconformists. In neither case do we wish it at the cost of principle, but we desire to foster it by truth and love.

2. It is sometimes said that we are undoing the work of the Reformation. But the Prayer Book is the work of the Reformation, and the whole object of my article has been to show how truly we have learned our belief from the Prayer Book. It is well that the work of the Reformation is something so definite and so accessible in that hallowed and familiar Book, that all may test these questions by it.

3. But if the Prayer Book is so clear, how is it that these disputes arise? I believe the answer is as follows: in addition to the dogmatic proposition

of the Church, which was conducted by theologians, there was also a change in temper and tone of thought in which much popular feeling and passion, aroused by reaction from mediævalism, had a large sway. This temper was far more revolutionary than the theologians could approve or adopt. It was strongly developed and reinforced by foreign influences from Switzerland and Germany, until, under the Commonwealth, it became the triumphant party, and after the Restoration remained as the Puritan tradition. This has long served as a gloss upon the Prayer Book. Slowly and patiently the more Catholic tradition, enshrined in our formularies, has made its voice heard, often regarded indeed as an intruder and a bastard, but still making good its claim. The long struggle for the revival amongst us of belief in Baptismal Regeneration serves as an illustration of what has happened, and an encouragement under misunderstandings now. The hope for the Church rests on mutual conference, and explanations, great caution of expression both in teaching and in criticizing, respect for each other's deep convictions, and an intense desire to promote brotherly love and the victory of the Truth.

(To be continued.)

LETTERS FROM BISHOPS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH, U.S., ON A PROPOSED "EXCHANGE OF PULPITS."

H. K. Carroll, LL.D., recently wrote a letter containing a proposition on the basis of the Chicago-Lambeth Articles, in which he calls upon the Church to show its sincerity in proposing these articles by repealing the canons which forbid "Ministerial Reciprocity." He asks: "Why cannot our Episcopal brethren make this contribution to the noble cause of Christian Unity?"

A copy of this letter was sent by the publishers of "The Independent" of this city to each bishop of the Church, and replies were received and published from twenty-eight. The bishops answer as with one voice that the canons cannot be repealed, and give the reasons. We have space for only the following brief extracts from their convincing letters:

Bishop Williams states that the canons in question rest back upon the Preface to the Ordinal, which "stands on the same ground as the Book of Common Prayer, and is itself far above any merely canonical provisions. Moreover, this Preface has remained unchanged in the formularies of the Church of England and the churches in communion with her, for a period of nearly three hundred and fifty years. It could not be repealed now, or even changed, without stirring up strife and division. And surely, it would be an unhappy step to begin a movement for unity by disturbing and dividing our own household."

The gift of unity, "lost to the Church through sin," can, he says, "best be restored by prayer."

Bishop Clark says: "I do not think that the agitation of the question referred to would, at the present time, tend to advance the cause of Church Unity, any more than it would to ask the Presbyterians whether they would renounce their distinctive name in accepting the Historic Episcopate."

Bishop Whipple says: "I do not believe that the interchange of pulpits will promote, but rather hinder, unity."

(1) It substitutes courtesy for principle, and places a truce in the stead of unity.

(2) I fear it would widen, not heal, our differences.

We believe that the ministry of the primitive and Catholic Church is a threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, and that it rests on the same proofs as the authenticity of the Scriptures and the Catholic faith. Shall we invite teachers who honestly believe we are in error? . . . We will try to speak no word and do no deed to wound other hearts. We will pray and work and wait. Unity will come, not in our way, but in His way; the prayer of our Lord will be answered that they all may be one."

Bishop Neely says: "A chief reason why Episcopal pulpits are locked against ministers of other churches is that, in the judgment of the Episcopal Church, such ministers are not duly commissioned, have not the apostolic commission to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Church of Christ. Only such a conviction and the obligation to guard her children against the possible peril of hearing false or perverse teaching from our own pulpits, could justify such restrictive enactments as are quoted from our canons."

Bishop Tuttle says that "Ministerial reciprocity would do no good, but rather disorder and disunity would be promoted. For large numbers in the Episcopal Church are convinced that no man is a validly commissioned minister of the Lord Jesus Christ who has not had the hands of a member of the Historic Episcopate laid upon his head, and such persons would be obliged to protest against practices which stultified their convictions."

Bishop Doane shows that "adapting the Historic Episcopate or altering and amending the law governing the Episcopate, is a very different thing from