

If the Bishop of Rome was supreme governor of the Church, there was no need to pass a canon empowering him to hear appeals. Such a power would have been inherent in his supremacy.

We are now in the fourth century, and may safely say that any opinions that sprang up at a later period cannot be regarded as Primitive and Catholic. We may return to this subject again, in the meantime we can recommend, as accurate and sober, a small volume entitled "The Papal claims considered in the light of Scripture and History," published in London and New York.

CONGREGATIONALISM NOT THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

SCRIPTURE constantly speaks of the Church as a kingdom; we are consequently bound to assume that the inseparable marks or notes of a kingdom will be found in it—a common sovereign, a generally binding code of statutes (not incompatible with local by-laws), and a body of officers deriving their commission and authority from the crown. But the Congregationalist model is not merely unlike the monarchical pattern, it is the precise antithesis and contradiction of it, for it consists of an indefinite number of tiny republics, which are not even federally united to one another by any constitution, or possessed of any machinery for joint action; since the Congregational Union is in no sense whatever a legislative or administrative body, and bears no sort of resemblance to the Presbyterian General Assembly or the Methodist Legal Hundred. We have a perfectly analogous theory in the political sphere, namely, the Commune. The essential distinction of this theory is the separate independence of each local community, city, town, borough, village, hamlet, whatever it be, in respect of all its affairs, and the explicit denial of the competence of any central government, of whatever kind, or howsoever deriving its powers, to exert control outside the limits of the single commune where it is itself located. Now, this is, of all modes of government which can be imagined, the nearest to mere anarchy, it is the express negation, not of monarchy alone, but of the state and of the nation. It is profoundly anti-national in spirit, it is absolutely incompatible with patriotism, it narrows the horizon upon all manner of social, moral and political questions, and it has found no sterner reprobator than Mazzini himself, although one of the most ardent of republicans. Every political fault which can be laid to the charge of the Commune just matches with a spiritual fault of Congregationalism, which is the negation and abolition of the Church, as the Commune is of the nation.

A further point wherein Congregationalism is in opposition to the divine kingdom, is that popular constitution of ministers already spoken of. In a certain sense, ministers of state are popularly elected, even under the British monarchy, for the party which secures

a majority in the House of Commons holds the reins of government, and the most powerful member of that party becomes Prime Minister, and has the chief voice in nominating all the other ministers. But the largest majority at the back of a statesman would not give him legal possession of the most trifling office under the Crown. The formal assent and nomination of the sovereign is an essential preliminary of lawful status and authority, and it is part of the sovereign's prerogative to withhold such recognition. If this were otherwise, it is plain that the sovereign would be a mere figure-head without a particle of monarchical power, and the republic might as well be proclaimed at once, for all the practical difference it would make. And if we suppose the case of each county, and each hundred in each county and each parish in each hundred, claiming severally to nominate their own officers, judicial, civil and military, and denying even the competence of parliament to interfere, it is plain that not only the monarchy, but the state would be abolished. It would be obvious nonsense to allege that officers so appointed were officers of the crown, or even of the nation. Now, the fact that the Church is the kingdom of Christ makes it essential that the officers of the Church should have Christ's commission, just as it is necessary in Great Britain that magistrates and officers of the army and navy should have the Queen's commission. There are only two conceivable ways by which Christ's commission can be received: His own direct and immediate appointment, as in the case of the apostles, or appointment by persons deriving delegated authority from Him. This is how the matter was arranged in New Testament times: Our Lord commissioned and sent out the apostles: the apostles ordained elders in every city; and the apostle St Paul ordained certain other persons, as Timothy and Titus, to some higher grade than that of elder, which conferred wider powers, including that of ordaining elders, and may be conveniently called Apostolic Vicar or Legate. It is certain that in the time immediately after the close of the New Testament Canon, these wider functions are found exercised by an order of ministers named Bishops, whose title is alleged to derive in regular line of succession from the apostles, and this polity continued to be that of all Christendom down to the invention of Presbyterianism in the sixteenth century. Some element of popular choice entered into the mode of appointment, but while its extent and character have not yet been fully ascertained, this much is beyond question, that it never passed the limits of the example set in the appointment of the seven first deacons, who were indeed elected by the laity at Jerusalem, but derived their commission from the laying on of hands by the apostles. (Acts vi, 5, 6). This is in direct antagonism to the Congregationalist polity, wherein the commission comes from below, and the persons who hold it are thus only man's ministers, not God's, and their undertaking to officiate at all is thus an implicit rejection of His authority.—*Church Times*.

PRIVILEGES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

IN continuation of the address from which we quoted in a recent issue, the Bishop of Argyle said:

But let us now turn from negative considerations to those positive privileges for which as members of the Anglican communion, we have to give thanks, and especially in the present day. For, as in the case of individuals, so also with Churches, it is a duty to call to mind God's many mercies, and to beware lest his benefits are forgotten.

Now, what are those positive advantages for which we should give thanks? Foremost among them I would place the privilege of living in an age of religious revival. During the last century there were, it is true, in the Church of Scotland, and especially among the Bishops, remarkable tokens of faithfulness to Catholic tradition, and notably with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. But taking into consideration our whole communion, in those days much more limited in extent than at present, and not forgetting many stirring instances of individual piety of learning, the eighteenth century appears to have been one of much spiritual deadness and decline. Though there were not wanting books in defence of the Orders of the Christian ministry in general, or of the Anglican Church in particular, though, moreover, Apostolic authority existed and was asserted, little progress seems to have been made, and in the struggle between godliness and ungodliness, between the Church and the world, the world, rather than the Church, seemed to have the advantage.

But, since then, two great religious movements have taken place in our midst, and the results of both are still going on. The first of these, which began before the last century had run its course, has been called the Evangelical revival; the second, which began less than sixty years ago, went by the name of the Oxford movement. Both of these revivals have been connected with the names of prominent preachers or writers of the two periods, belonging, according to popular estimate, to different or even to opposite schools of thought. And yet there was no real opposition. The two movements were, I am persuaded, the work of one and the same Holy Spirit. The first prepared the way for the second, the second was the necessary complement of the first.

The Evangelical leaders of the last century were foremost in awakening our Church from the spiritual torpor into which, at that age, she had sunk. Filled with a holy "enthusiasm," a word which, at that date, was almost a term of reproach, they taught that true Christianity did not consist in the mere cold performance of a round of secular and religious duties, but rather in the exercise of that living Faith, the gift of the Holy Spirit, which finds its object in the Person of a Crucified Redeemer, the only Saviour of lost and ruined sinners. Well did they deserve the name of Evangelical, who preached such a Gospel. May we walk