

according to Mr. T. W. Russell, "is being gradually squeezed out." But this is due not to conversations, but to the social changes which are causing the expropriation of the landed gentry. As these sell their estates and leave the country, their dependants, who now frequently form by far the larger part of the Church congregation, will disappear, and in many parishes no flock will be left for the Protestant clergyman to look after. The Bishop makes the necessary qualifications of these statements by pointing out that some landlords, even when their estates are sold, may be expected to remain in the country, and that some Protestant farmers will cling to their homesteads. But his conclusion is that "many parishes may be blotted out as organised institutions in the south and west of Ireland."

DISCORD IN THE ROMAN CAMP.—The XIX. *Siecle* published a few days ago a long account of an interview with the Superior of one of the largest religious congregations in Paris, which throws a startling light upon the boasted unity of spirit amongst the Vaticanist clergy. It appears that the rivalry, not to say animosity, between the religious and secular priests in the Church of France, is nearly as fierce to-day as it was in the Church of England and other National Churches anterior to the Reformation. The Superior went so far as to tell his interviewer that the Atheists and Socialist Republicans are not the most dangerous enemies of the French religious orders. "On the contrary," said he, "our worst foes are the secular clergy, especially the parish priests of the Paris churches." If the expulsion of the religious orders may be charged upon "the laity and the free-thinkers," their hindrance in the recovery of their property and in their restoration to their religious work in France is due to "the jealousy of the (parochial) clergy." He said that the income of the parochial clergy in the capital from Masses had increased five-fold since the expulsion of the religious orders. Notwithstanding the outward show of unity which the Jesuit victory at the Vatican Council forced upon the French bishops and clergy, the Gallican traditions are secretly burning below the surface, and may some day break forth in a volcanic outburst.

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH.—Mr. Gladstone has reviewed in the *Nineteenth Century* Mr. Carnegie's Gospel of Wealth. The *Church Times* says, while not agreeing with all his conclusions: We have never seen a more perfect specimen of literary and ethical criticism, in the finest sense, than this essay. The unwonted clearness and directness of style and thought is perhaps the least of its merits. The lofty point of view from which the question is considered is of itself sufficient to mark off this remarkable paper from the ordinary ruck of review stuff. It is entirely saturated with Christian ideals, and penetrated with the aroma of Christian devotion. Our readers will, we trust, make a point of carefully studying it for themselves. It is sufficient here to say that the English statesman enthusiastically accepts the "Gospel" of the American millionaire iron-master. The enormous power of wealth has, he thinks, "been used on the whole not well, but ill." Mr. Carnegie "has confronted the moral and social problem of wealth more boldly . . . than any previous writer." And his gospel is, in brief, to this effect: A wealthy man should "administer" his wealth, that is, bestow it wisely in his lifetime rather than bequeath it at his death. To leave it to his sons is to do them a positive

mischief; his daughters may, indeed, rightly claim a modest provision. To leave it in the form of charitable bequests involves serious moral evils, and Mr. Gladstone endorses on the whole Mr. Carnegie's censures on this method of disposal. "Death-duties" are the wisest of all forms of taxation; and the State may fairly claim a moiety of a millionaire's hoard as its share. A rich man, then, should in his lifetime give away his wealth, and observe strict modesty in private expenditure.

WHERE ARE WE?

The text of the Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment on the Bishop of Lincoln has this week come to hand, and we are able now to lay its contents before our readers. It is an extremely long judgment, occupying nearly twenty closely printed columns of the *London Guardian*, with an additional nine columns of appendices. It is obviously impossible for us, therefore, to give the judgment *in extenso*; we must content ourselves with giving as full a summary of it as possible.

The first point dealt with in the judgment is the charge of (i.) mixing water with the wine, and (ii.) administering the mixed chalice. With regard to the first it is pointed out that the rubric of 1549, ordering the ceremonial mixing of water, was omitted in 1552, and "that there is now no direction on which the continuance of the practice could be based." The mixing, therefore, as a ceremony is condemned as unlawful. But the case is different with the use of a mixed chalice prepared beforehand. That, says the judgment, is a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church. It has the testimony of Justin Martyr, the Clementine Liturgy, and in fact all the ancient liturgies except the Armenian. The practice arose from a desire to do what the Master had done, and the passover rites were celebrated with a mixed cup. The ceremonial mixing is of later date, and arose from the "symbolical sense" which was assigned to the mixed chalice. Unfortunately the older liturgies are not agreed as to the interpretation to be attached to this symbolical mixing. To some it signified the union of Christ and His people, to others the effusion from the Lord's side, to others again the union of human and divine in the Person of Christ. These symbolical meanings, however (to which be it noted the Puritans made no objections), are not touched by the question of the ceremonial mixing. Whether the cup be mixed before the people at the time of the oblation, or whether it be mixed beforehand in the vestry or at the credence, and placed ready mixed upon the altar (as in the principal Oriental rites), does not effect the question of the doctrinal significance attaching to the use of the mixed chalice; and our English Liturgy, by removing the ceremonial mixing, but leaving untouched the question of the mixed chalice, prepared beforehand, has simply reverted to a more primitive and more catholic type.

The decision of the court, therefore, is that (i.) the Church has by her inherent authority (Acts xxxiv.) "removed" the ceremonial mixing, and (ii.) that "no rule has been made to 'change or abolish' the all but universal use of a mixed cup from the beginning."

The next point treated of is the ablution of the vessels after the benediction. With regard to this practice the court finds that the priest is ordered reverently to consume all that remains of the consecrated elements without their being carried from the church; that this consumption is to take place before the congregation leaves the church, because,

if need be, some of them are to be summoned to assist in their consumption; and that, thirdly, without water it is almost impossible to consume all that remains of the consecrated elements. While, therefore, the court is of opinion that the proper place for the ablution of the vessels is "at the credence or in the place where they had been prepared," it does not consider that the priest who "in a reverent way without ceremony or prayers" should thus consume the consecrated elements "before finally leaving the holy table, would have subjected himself to penal consequences by so doing."

We next come to the "eastward position." This is treated of in two sections, the eastward position in the first part of the Communion service, and the breaking of the bread before the people. In the first part of the service the eastward position is allowed, and abundant evidence is brought forward to show that it has been a continuous alternative use of the Church of England, "favoured" by the "Church authorities" at the Savoy Conference. At the same time no doctrinal significance can be attached to the position. "The imputed sacrificial aspect of the eastward position is new and forced, and can take no effect in rendering that position either desirable on the one side, or illegal on the other." "None of the alternative positions which have been mentioned as adopted by different authorities in accommodating this rubric to the present situation of the holy table, convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine."

With regard to the eastward position at the time of consecration, our first thought on glancing over the judgment was that it had been condemned. But a more careful study showed that such was not the case. In discussing the general question of the eastward position in the earlier part of the service, the Archbishop expresses himself as follows:—

"The eastward position is, it was said, a sacrificial position—"the natural attitude for one offering a sacrifice"—and conveys some sacrificial doctrine of the Eucharist against the doctrine of the English Church. There may be ill-informed recent maintainers of this position as essential, who may be found to have alleged something of the kind. If it were true it would apply more strongly by far to the consecration prayer, *where such position is admitted to be lawful*, than to the beginning of the service. But . . . the statement . . . is without foundation. Neither those who approve nor those who disapprove of an action which is recognized by authority can really invest it with any sense contrary to the sense of the authority which recognizes."

It is then clear that the eastward position is taken as being a lawful position during the prayer of consecration. But, which ever position is taken, the manual acts must be so performed as to be visible to the people.

"The tenor of the Book of Common Prayer is openness. The work of its framers was to bring out and recover the worship of the Christian congregation, and specially to replace the Eucharist in its character as the Communion of the whole Body of Christ. By the use of the mother tongue, by the audibleness of every prayer, by the priest's prayers being made identical with the prayers of the congregation, by the part of the clerks being taken by the people, by the removal of the invisible and inaudible ceremonial, the English Church as one of her special works in the history of the Catholic Church, restored the ancient share and right of the people in divine service. Both parties