

tive to young men, and enrolls many of our young ministers. It is not only difficult to understand this school, it is more difficult to describe it in a few words. It is superior to the old rationalism, and is defended by many able men, but it cannot claim to stand on the Bible.

The supernatural birth of Christ and His eternal pre-existence are not admitted, His resurrection is considered indifferent, the atonement finds no room. Many people think this new theology will bring another era of rationalism over Germany, but for that the real life in our churches is already too strong.

The practical mission work done in our churches is not officially the work of the church. Foreign and home missions are all in the hands of free agencies.—*Ex.*

Editorial Articles.

CHURCH UNITY.



EVER the idea comes up, as something to aim at and to pray for, that the divisions in the Church of Christ to-day might be healed and done away with. A remarkable series of letters appeared in the *N. Y. In-*

dependent of March 8th, from no fewer than twenty-eight bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. Dr. H. K. Carroll had written a letter to the *Independent*; and a copy of this letter was sent to every bishop of the Episcopal Church. The point of Dr. Carroll's letter is, that whereas the bishops in Lambeth (England), and in Chicago, sighed for church unity, and expressed themselves willing to do anything reasonable to that end—the Episcopal Church should repeal the rule that prohibits other minis-

ters officiating in their pulpits. This, as a beginning, and as an earnest in the matter of desiring to come nearer together. This letter, and its proposition, *then*, was the basis on which the bishops were asked to write.

They have written; and egregiously unsatisfactory as the letters are, it is better that they have written, that it may be seen what and where the difficulty is. One thing has struck us in reading these twenty-eight letters—the utter want of appeal to the Scriptures. The Ordinal, and its preface, the canons, and the Common Prayer, are all referred to, over and over again; but not one of the twenty-eight bishops quotes a single verse of the New Testament, as giving light or instruction on the point of duty before him. Suppose, instead of being a case among ecclesiastics, it had been a case among lawyers. Some rules of Court were sought to be repealed, that were held to be obstructive to freedom and equality among the lawyers; while all the lawyers expressed themselves anxious for more professional fellowship. And now imagine twenty-eight judges—each presumably made a judge because of his eminence in the law—discussing whether these rules were a barrier or not, and whether they ought to be repealed, and never once quoting and applying the Statutes, under which the Courts and the Rules were established! Why, the intention of the Legislature which established the Courts, the nature and function of those Courts under the Statute, and the extent of the powers given to the Courts to frame and amend Rules would be the first and main subjects of discussion! But we were speaking of lawyers, not churchmen.

If the New Testament is the "Constitution" of the Christian Church—and if it is not, where is the constitution?—then let it be understood that whatever ecclesiastical rules or forms are made, are of the nature of "By-laws" which must always be within the limits of the Constitution, and which may be amended at the discretion of the party who makes them. The whole of the twenty-eight replies are to the effect that the fourth "plank" of the Lambeth "platform," the acknowledgment of the "Historic Episcopate," cannot be departed from. Bishop Neely says, "What is meant by such recognition is, and is well known to be, a recognition of the Historic