

notices the complaint that is sometimes made, that the English Church has within her pale two different religions, two different faiths. But he asks, "Can men be said to belong to two different religions, when both classes accept the same Scriptures as the authoritative rule of faith; both believe in the same mysterious, infinitely holy, infinitely merciful Triune God, loving Father, redeeming Saviour, sanctifying spirit; both acknowledge the same corruption of our nature, the same redemption and restoration, through the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ; both join in the same public prayers, partake of the same appointed sacraments, both look for the same judgment, both believe in the same immortality, both expect the same rest in Paradise, both hope for the same home in Heaven?" And he very properly remarks that the deep unity in these great points of common faith is infinitely greater than any differences of detail or of ceremonial can be. And he remarks that the natural result to us in the Church of England, of pressing our own differences to a crisis will be to throw religious men on the one side into the arms of one human system, on the other into the arms of the opposite.

#### RITUALISM.

The Church of England and Ritualism," is the title of two articles Mr. Gladstone has reprinted from the *Contemporary Review*, and to which he prefixes "an observation on a single point, that of attaching doctrinal significance to external usages." He says that whatever he may have written which may appear to have a contrary meaning, he has never questioned the fact that there are external usages which must have a doctrinal significance. What he contends for is this, that when contention is carried to the courts of law, any particular usages should not be interpreted as involving a definite and particular dogma, all the time those usages will, unconstrained, bear any other interpretation. He says the late venerated Dean Hook was "the greatest parish priest of the age;" and he reminds us that the Dean took his part in a decided and public manner against prohibiting the eastward position of the Lord's Supper. But, as Mr. Gladstone wishes particularly to show, it was the farthest from Dean Hook's mind "to exclude the laity from their full participation in the solemn act;" and he cites a passage from a private letter which the Dean addressed to a young clergyman in 1842, when questions of outward usage were debated with what all parties now feel to have been very unnecessary heat and violence. His words were these:—"I am afraid that many in their zeal for the Church forget Christ, and in maintaining the rights of the clergy, forget the rights of the laity; who are, as well as the clergy, priests unto the Most High God, and who indeed have as large a portion of the sacrifice of prayer and praise as-

signed to them in the prayer book as the clergy." Mr. Gladstone wishes to show by this extract "how innocent must have been in the mind of this admirable man, the use of the eastward position, and how unwise and unjust it would have been in his case among others, to attach to it the 'doctrinal significance' of an intention to exclude the laity from their share in the Eucharistic offering." Indeed it must not be forgotten that the northern position has been recommended with much authority and learning as being best adapted to give effect to the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper. If the Mosaic ritual is to have any authority in determining the doctrinal significance of a position, then certainly the northern position rather than the "eastward" involves the sacrificial principle. And in looking eastward the priest may be considered as the *leader of the people*, while in the northern position, looking southward, he may be supposed to be performing a religious act in the presence of the people, and in which they have no concern.

#### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe in a letter addressed to the *London Times* says he sees no reason why war on the one side and an injurious dismemberment of Turkey on the other should not be avoided by British influence. England has the right he says, by the Treaty of Paris, to act with the other parties to it when Turkey is concerned. There may be no reason to distrust Russia at present; but he thinks it should not be forgotten that Russia is one of the same triumvirate that dismembered Poland, and she might consider the retirement of England as furnishing her with an opportunity to do the same with Turkey. The moral influence of England would be decisive in the councils of five or six powers, while she would insist on peace, the preservation of Turkey, its administrative improvement, and the equality of all classes of its population. The policy of England has always been defensive as to the Danube and the Bosphorus, conservative as to the existence of Turkey; and the execution of reforms proposed by all the powers and recommended by England, would not be objected to by the Sultan. He thinks the difficulties would by no means be insuperable in having a superintendence of mixed organization internally, and a joint conventional pressure from without. All this would amount to a tutelage. But Turkey has long been virtually in that state, and the Viscount says that if these arrangements had been steadily enforced as of right, the Porte would have been saved from its present embarrassments. He complains of the want of foreign co-operation to give a right shape to practical reforms, and a want of foreign intercourse to enlighten the native classes, and above all, of a sustained influence not to be trifled with on the part of friendly

governments. Some stress has been laid on an article in the Treaty of Paris which appears to bind the powers not to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey. This engagement however is conditional; and other rights belong to the powers, especially to those who sided with the Porte in a moral sense, and to those who spent their money and shed their blood in the Sultan's cause in the Crimean War. The engagement moreover was an act of reliance on the Sultan's honor as well as on his power to administer reforms, and it is resumable on the failure of the pledge.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL have given their decision in reference to the title "Reverend." It appears that it was attempted to put an inscription on a gravestone, with the words "Rev. H. Keet, Wesleyan Minister." The Rector of the parish objected. The Bishop of the diocese sustained the objection, as did their Chancellor, Mr. Phillimore, and his father, the Dean of Arches. But the Privy Council have decided that the title is a very harmless one, that it indicates nothing of a positively sacerdotal character, and therefore may be applied to any body that desires it. It may be true that in assuming the title of Reverend, the "Methodists willfully depart from the intention of their founder," and that he would have sided with the Bishop of Lincoln, but the authority of John Wesley is one which is equally ignored by the Privy Council and by the modern Methodists.

THE CLAUSE in the Supreme Court Bill which the Imperial Government disallowed is the following:—"The judgment of the Supreme Court shall in all cases be final and conclusive, and no error or appeal shall be brought from any judgment or order of the Supreme Court to any Court of Appeal established by the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, to which appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council may be ordered to be heard, saving any right which Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise as Her Royal prerogative." The object of this clause is evidently to sever, as soon as possible the last link which binds us to the mother country, and we are therefore glad it was disallowed. The saving clause at the end is simply nonsense, supposing as it does that the Court of Appeal has anything to do with the Queen's prerogative, and also that any Act of the Canadian Parliament can either limit or extend that prerogative.

THE DEATH OF JOHN FORSTER, who has been very well known as an extensive contributor to modern literature, is announced as having taken place, Feb. 1st. He was born in 1812, was a very intimate friend of Charles Dickens, and succeeded him on his retirement from the editorship of the *Daily News*. His "Life of Dickens" disappointed