

Wood, President of the English Church Union, so that the members of what may for the sake of distinction be termed "the Highest School of English Churchmanship" will now have a forcible and eloquent advocate in the House of Lords.

The Bishop of London has been presented with a service of plate, valued at £600, subscribed for in his Lordship's late Diocese of Exeter, in recognition of his services to the Church and the diocese during the sixteen years of his connection with it. The presentation was made by the Mayor of Exeter at a public luncheon in the city.

At St. Agatha's Church, Landport, recently, the Rev. Richard B. Boyle, who for some time past has been one of the priests at Portsmouth Roman Catholic Church, was formally received into the Church of England. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Robert Linklater, late vicar of St. Agatha's, who was assisted by the Revs. E. W. Sergeant and C. I. Black, of Winchester College Mission.

The Bishop of Worcester has, by a characteristic act of munificence, led the way towards a solution of the difficult question of clergy pensions, so far as his own diocese is concerned. He has expressed his desire to give two sums of £1,000 each to form the nucleus of a clergy pension and insurance fund for the archdeacons of Coventry and Worcester. The beneficiaries will be clergymen holding livings or curacies in either archdeaconry, and the benefit will take the form of assistance towards the payment of annual premiums to the institution or company guaranteeing the pension or sum at death.

AMERICAN BUDGET.

The working people of New York have deposited in the savings banks of that city six millions of dollars within the past six months.

The will of Susan Maria Edson, of New York, leaves \$3,000 to Assistant Bishop Potter, \$10,000 to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and \$5,000 to the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

A large number of Chinamen connected with the Sunday-school of Trinity Church, Fifty-eighth street, went on a picnic Monday morning, August 17, to Mr. Erastus Wiman's woods, of Arden, Staten Island. Each Mongolian had a basket of luncheon, and was accompanied by a lady companion, after the Melican fashion. It was the first fete of the kind ever witnessed on the island, and all hands are said to have had a thoroughly enjoyable time—with no whisky-drinking, no disorder, nor anything of the kind.

General S. B. Buckner, who was one of the two Confederate pall-bearers for General Grant, had a very remarkable staff during the war, and his military family has furnished the Church with three Bishops—Galleher, of Kentucky, who was a Lieutenant-Colonel and Assistant Adjutant-General, is now Bishop of Louisiana; Elliott, another Kentuckian, Captain and Aid-de-camp, is Bishop of Texas; Harris, of Georgia, Aid-de-camp, who is a Bishop of the Michigan Diocese, was first promoted to this high dignity in the Church. Another clergyman who came from the same strange training school is Shoup, a West Point graduate, who left the old army and went South. He is now a D.D., and famed for his sincere and earnest piety, as he was in the old times far daring and reckless courage.

Most of the shadows that cross our path through life are caused by our standing in our own light.

"THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE."

(From "Copy," by Right Rev. Hugh Miller Thompson, Assistant Bishop of Mississippi. Thos. Whittaker, Publisher, New York.)

I.

(Continued.)

Here it is: "We hold that the reason why so many who have the open Bible hold unscriptural views is because they either never read it at all, or read it without seeking explanation from above; we also hold that the smallest school-girl can know more about God, if she reads His word prayerfully and humbly, than the most learned divine studying it in his own wisdom and intellectual power."

Surely, this is modesty in excess! We differ from a gentleman on some question of religious doctrine. The gentleman appeals to "the Bible, and the Bible only." We accept the appeal, and prove, according to our conscience and intellect, that his notions are not in the Bible at all, and that our view has plain Scripture in its favor, and, instead of our shaking, in the slightest degree, his self-complacency, he turns about and tells us we do not say our prayers! If we were illuminated by wisdom from above, we would perfectly agree with him. We do not agree with him, and therefore we are not so illuminated. For he is! In other words, the claim is that he is divinely inspired to interpret the English Bible correctly. That, we suppose, expressed or unexpressed, is the way in which the mass who have taken "the Bible, and the Bible only," that is, the Bible and their private reason upon it, explain the fact that people differ from them. It is a very curious culmination of private interpretation, and the charity it begets.

The Baptist thinks that if the Presbyterian would only "seek explanation from above" he would stop baptizing infants. The Presbyterian, in his secret soul, believes the Baptist would baptize his children if only he would pray heartily for help to understand the Bible. There is a vague feeling that if men would only ask for heavenly illumination, they would see the true meaning of the Bible, and, therefore, since they differ from us, who have the true meaning, it is certain they do not say their prayers heartily, and therefore do not get that illumination.

It is very curious, however, as the end of the thing, that we should all conclude that those who differ from us, or, as our friend says, "who hold unscriptural views" (for differing from us and "holding unscriptural views" is the same thing, of course,) either do not read the Bible, or do not pray!

John Wesley knelt down, Bible before him, and prayed for an explanation about "election." He got up an Arminian, and staid so till he died. George Whitfield knelt down at the same time, Bible before him, and prayed for an "explanation from above," and got up a high Calvinist, and staid so till he died. They are both, we trust, in Paradise now, and have learned that Calvinism and Arminianism are about equally valuable in this universe, and that the world can get on very satisfactorily without the poor rags and tags of either dead *ism*. Their earthly experience, however, is not very encouraging to either the theory, the charity or the humility contained in the extract above.

II.

How shall we know that the Bibles we have are genuine? We mean, suppose there is no question but that a Revelation was once made, and that it was committed to writing by inspired men, how are we to become certain that the writings we now have are true copies of

the originals? Granting that St. John wrote a Gospel, that St. Paul wrote various Epistles, to the Romans and others, how do we know that the writings we now have under the names of St. John and St. Paul are the actual productions of those Apostles?

This, it will be perceived, is a very different question from that of inspiration or authority. It is a question about a material fact, a question of the identity of a visible matter. Are our Bibles genuine Bibles? Do they contain the writings which were first published under the names of Apostles and Prophets? This question is one of fact, we say. Clearly, it is not a question which "the Bible alone" will settle. There is in the Bible itself no table of contents, no inspired summary of the books and chapters. And if there were, we would have to go outside the Book itself to decide whether the books and chapters in our modern Bibles are those which were contained in the Bibles of the second, third and fourth centuries.

This question of fact—are our Bibles genuine copies of the original?—must be settled by outside testimony. We must appeal to the ancient writers in fact, that is, in other words, to the early fathers. We find these men speaking and writing about a Book—the Bible, the inspired Word of God, the Old and New Testaments. We find them quoting it, mentioning its authors, citing short passages and long passages from St. John or St. Paul or St. Luke, by name. We find them doing this in Rome and in Carthage, in Alexandria and in Jerusalem, in Constantinople and in Gaul. All over the world, men writing in Greek, in Latin, in Syriac, men divided from each other by vast spaces of territory, separated in language and in nationality, we find quoting the Bible. In sermons, in formal treatises on theology, in familiar letters to friends—in all sorts of productions and in all connections—we find them referring to, talking about and citing the words of a certain Book.

We have a Book which professes to be the same. Is it? We appeal to those early writers to find out. Manifestly, there is no other way. We cannot expect any miraculous interference to assure us of this question of fact. No mental or moral illumination can be expected to tell us whether our Bible is the real primitive Bible. We therefore appeal to the fathers. And that appeal assures us of the truth and genuineness of our present copies of the Word of God. It is clear they had copies identical with our own. What we read, they read. They had the same Gospels, the same Epistles, the same Acts of the Apostles, the same Revelation of St. John. They quote as we might. They cite the words as they are before us, and in the same connection. We decide that they had the same Bible identically. The extent to which this identification may be carried is beyond what most people think. It has been said that if the Bible were lost—that is, if every copy now in existence were destroyed—the entire volume might be restored from the writings of the first four centuries. It was so quoted, so preached; so commented on, that it actually passed *bodily* into the Christian writings of those ages, and remains there.

Such identification is possible in the case of no other ancient writing. We are quite certain that our copies of the *Æneid* are genuine, that our "Commentaries on the Gallic War" are the very "Commentaries" written by Cæsar, but that certainty is founded on comparatively slight proof. These books are indeed mentioned, quoted, and described and attributed to Virgil and Cæsar, respectively, by writers from their own day down; but for one writer who testifies to them, a score testify to the Bible, and for one line quoted from them, chapters are quoted from the Old and New Testaments, and for one author who comments on them, fifty comment upon, explain and cite whole books of the Revelation.

To decide this matter of fact, then, we ap-