

marks: "It is, indeed, evident that in all sections of divided Christendom profound dissatisfaction with the existing anarchy is not only felt, but expressed. Reunion is in the air. The nonconformist bodies are drawing together in federation." "A review of Christendom certainly suggests the conclusion that in consecrating his life to the cause of reunion, Bishop Wordsworth rightly divined the aspirations of his own generation, and indicated the direction in which those aspirations may possibly be satisfied."

The Church and Denominations.

Steps have been taken recently by one of the American religious newspapers to ascertain the attitude of three representative Bishops of the Episcopal Church towards the recent evangelist movement. The three Bishops, Hall, of Vermont; Huntington, of Central New York, and Seymour, of Springfield, have replied separately to the enquiry; and their replies, showing the reasons why an attitude of reserve is and ought to be maintained by the Church, are so full of instruction to members of the Church everywhere, as to the line which should be adopted by Churchmen towards the movement, that we gladly take the opportunity of presenting them to our readers; the subject being one of much importance at the present time.

Bishop Hall.

The Bishop of Vermont says that the question is as to principles. Churchmen do and must regard the theory of undenominationalism as practically amounting to an acknowledgment that our Lord did not intend to establish a visible Church, with its officers and rites empowered and guaranteed from above, into which men and women, as they became His disciples, were to be gathered; but that He left His disciples, if they pleased, and as they pleased, to form themselves into churches, the organization and creed and ministry and rites and discipline of which are legitimately matters of human arrangement. The Church cannot seem to sanction such a position; because, while ready to sacrifice anything which is merely a matter of preference, she cannot abandon principles, or seem to treat them as open questions.

Bishop Huntington.

The Bishop of Central New York (while expressing his sincere desire that every honest experiment should be fairly tried, and that every claim for religious attention put forth in the Master's name should be treated with respect), remarks that the methods, and, to some extent, the phraseology used, are to differ from ours, that any visible or formal co-operation would be embarrassing and probably without much spiritual profit; that the temper of mutual criticism might almost put out of mind the Lord's own declaration, that they who are not against Him are on His part; lastly, the Bishop is sure there is a belief that any system of preaching, which disparages or subordinates the two sacraments, denies the fulness of the Lord's teaching, and mutilates the integrity of His Gospel.

Bishop Seymour.

The Bishop of Springfield states at the outset that his convictions are based upon the standards of our Church, printed in the Book of Common Prayer, as interpreted by our canons, regulating our administration of sacraments, rites and services. Our Church maintains that her ministry is official in its relation to God, and represents something behind and above it, and is capable of effecting what of and by himself no human being could accomplish. Investiture of office by a Bishop's hands is absolutely required as a qualification for anyone to have the cure of souls among us, and to minister at our altars. The non-liturgical communions for the most part regard the sacred ministry as either personal, resting upon the man himself alone, or else as representative of the people or congregation; and, as a consequence, they do not demand from their ministers anything more than a mere man can do or effect; their sacraments, as they teach, have no intrinsic value, and their ministers have no official words of power to utter or offer. Therefore the Church cannot meet and act on equal terms with non-liturgical communions, for whom it is impossible to compromise their theory of the ministry, since, as they consider it, it is personal, or dependent upon the will of man, and hence they can go on any platform, or exchange pulpits and altars without the slightest risk of inconsistency or stultification; they cannot in any event lose anything. With the Church, on the contrary, the case is radically the reverse. Our fundamental principle is that the laying on of a Bishop's hands in ordination clothes the recipient with an office from God, which authorizes him to do and say things, with power, which he could not do or say as a mere individual. If then, we allow men, who have not received episcopal ordination, to enter our churches on the same level with our clergy, we stultify ourselves, we surrender our position, we throw overboard our constitution canons and rubrics, we give up the vital principle of our polity, we go out forever as an episcopal communion, and return as liturgical congregationalists, and our Prayer-Book in our hands would give the lie to our position on almost every page. The loss resulting would be not ours alone, but, if we are right in our belief, the whole world's, since we are trustees of God for all mankind.

Street Preaching in Cities.

Canon Liddon, preaching one Sunday afternoon in St. Paul's, held up the Salvation Army to admiration for one virtue at least, that they are not afraid of bearing open testimony of their faith. Ought they alone of all the religious sects to have the monopoly of preaching the Gospel to the poor in the streets and alleys of crowded cities, thronged with the ignorant and poor, who (as they think), have no welcome waiting for them in the churches. The experiment has recently been tried by some of the Fathers of the mission of St. John the Evangelist, in Boston, U.S. A paper of suggestions, by one of these priests, forms instructive reading for any who

grudge the captains of the Salvation Army their monopoly of street-preaching, and who like to see how this work can be accomplished on Church lines.

Coming into the Church.

We very thankfully record the fact that three prominent Presbyterians have been admitted to the diaconate in the diocese of New York, the Rev. Dr. McIlvaine, the Rev. Dr. Shields, professor at Princeton, and the Rev. Dr. Edward Robinson, professor at the Union Theological Seminary, of New York. Let us thank God and take courage. The famous Methodist, Dr. J. P. Newman, recently deceased, who occupied a high place in the councils of that body, stated that it was his firm conviction that not many years would pass before the Christian denominations of the world would number no more than three, the Roman Catholic Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Baptist; that the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists will be drawn to the Protestant Episcopal Church; the Baptists being kept out only by their distinctive doctrine respecting immersion. God grant it may be so, in His own good time!

THE DREYFUS CASE.

It is possible that this famous (or infamous), case may have passed into new phases before these lines come into the hands of our readers. At the moment of writing, which is some time after the promulgation of the verdict, the whole world stands aghast. Horresco referens. The London Times is not too strong when it says: "We do not hesitate to pronounce it the grossest and most appalling prostitution of justice the world has witnessed in modern times. All the outrageous scandals, which marked the course of the trial, pale into insignificance beside the crowning scandal of the verdict." There is no different judgment, that we know of, outside France. Those who have followed the mode of proceeding in French Courts of Justice will have been partially prepared for the "outrageous scandals which marked the course of the trial." We venture to say that not one sentence in ten would have been allowed by an English judge as "evidence." As regards the conduct of the judge or judges the less said the better. One or two very simple statements will explain to our readers our reasons for statements so strong as those in which we have indulged. Let it be remembered, in the first place, that the Court of Cassation, the highest court in France, declared that Dreyfus was condemned on insufficient evidence, and ordered a new trial. This decision was arrived at partly on account of the discovery of the forgeries of Colonel Henry, who committed suicide, and partly on other grounds. At any rate, a second trial was ordered, and we are sure it would not have been ordered unless it had been necessary. Now, the very simple question arises: Were any facts brought forward at the second trial which tended to prove the guilt of the accused? This is really a point to which anyone who wishes to understand