

piety of the Church at the first Council of Constantinople. When Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, denied that God became man in the person of our blessed Lord, it was a general Council, and not a system of persecution or reviling, that put him and his heretics to silence.

Thus invariably in those early days were heresies rebuked and cast out. And as error will ever creep into all things in which our weak human nature is concerned, and yet the promise remains that the gates of hell shall not prevail against God's Church, we may surely infer that as none but general authority can ever be accepted as decisive against generally received errors, this special kind of authority must reside in the general Councils of the Church. It was by Councils that modern errors were cast off at the Reformation. It was also by Councils that Antinomian innovations were suppressed at a later date. Since the reign of Charles II., however, no Council has been held, and it is only of late years that Convocation (which does not fully represent the Church,) has been assembled. Meantime Satan has not been idle, and if we may credit the publications of extreme men on both sides of the Church a formidable crop of errors is now ripe for the weeding process. Strange to say, however, one branch of extremists, (the most loud in proclaiming the dangers—the growing apostasy of the Church)—refuses as a body to take part in the Council which is now about to be held for the purpose of considering and remedying such evils, by the help of God. Church Councils and Synods and Commissions of inquiry are not to their mind. Finding the Archbishop of Canterbury state his opinion that no change would henceforth be made by the secular Parliament in the laws or ceremonies of the Church, without consulting Convocation, Lord Shaftesbury, an avowed extremist, is furious. (How would he fare among Dissenters or Romanists?) Like SS. James and John, our extremists would fain call down the fires of persecution on those who will not join them,—not knowing what spirit they are of. Persecution has already within the last few years, been faithfully tried in London, and in that very diocese at the present moment ritual excesses prevail more than anywhere else, in England or out of it. Extremes beget extremes.

A good deal is said now-a-days about extreme ritualism being alien to the protestant sympathies of Englishmen. So it may be, but in putting it down, beware lest you invoke another evil equally abhorrent to the Anglo-Saxon. If there is one attribute of manhood which John Bull admires more than another, it is that which is known to him by the familiar name of "Pluck." If there is one thing which he detests, it is that schoolboy cowardice which consists in bullying your antagonist if you can, but keeping at a safe distance, and shouting ill names at him, if you can't. John Bull's protestantism is sturdy and sound, but his love of fair play is equally strong, and so surely as he finds one party in the Church holding aloof from the manly contest of open debate, and yet abusing at a safe distance those whom they will not venture to meet, his sympathies will soon unmistakeably manifest themselves. Councils, Convocations and Synods are the fair and open arenas on which our ecclesiastical disputes have now entered, and woe betide him who prefers the fish-wife's system of warfare, or depends on the interference of spectators to save him from his opponent's more manly weapons.

All experience shows that in Council, under God, consists the safety of His Church. "Where no counsel is the people fall, but in the multitude of counselors there is safety." Let us, like wise men, commit our cause to Him who has promised to cleanse and defend His Church, and let each hold out to his brother the two hands of charity and forbearance. This, we are persuaded, is the spirit in which the bishops of our communion are now about to meet, in what will prove to