

ENGLAND.

THE *Standard* says the Bishop of Winchester has issued a Pastoral in which he explains that he has not held a visitation this year, because he felt he had much to learn concerning his new and extensive diocese, and because he had hoped to hold a diocesan conference, which he had been prevented doing by the rapidity with which the scheme for instituting a new bishopric had been carried forward in Parliament. Turning to more general subjects, his lordship while insisting that there have always been two great schools of thought, and that their presence side by side has been a blessing, canvasses the assertion that the English Church holds within its bosom two different religions. "Can it 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, 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 believe in the same immortality; both expect the same paradise; both hope for the same home in heaven?" Through life, his lordship says, that he has laboured for nothing so earnestly as the union of the Churches of Christ; but no corporate union is possible with Rome while she is bound by the Vatican decrees; while, on the other hand, he cannot believe in the Evangelical Alliance, much as he may sympathise with the spirit that gave rise to it. The very word "alliance" seems to indicate that we do not care for unity. Each school must be allowed fair latitude, fair freedom of thought and action; and remembering that the wisest of men will have unwise followers, must be fairly tolerant of unwisdom and extravagance. But we must try to keep all schools reasonably within those limits which are absolutely needed for the preservation of unity and order among members of the same body. Only a sect can exist without freedom, and a Church will become a wilderness if it loses order. His lordship condemns "the forming and uniting with societies, for propagating the opinions of one party, and persecuting those of the opposite, the conventional use of such words as 'Real Presence,' 'Sacrifice,' 'Altar,' 'Priest,' which convey different meanings to different people; as also the inaccurate, and often offensive use of the words 'Catholic,' 'Protestant,' 'Reformation,' and such like. If the English Church is Catholic, its members are Catholics, and its practices are Catholic practices. The Bishop protests against an exaggerated significance being attached to the vestments or position of the celebrant, and contends that the chasuble and eastward position have not properly or essentially any sacramental or sacrificial significance. He knows many who desire a distinctive vestment at the Holy Communion, to show that it is the chief religious service, and the eastward position, because when we all pray to God we should all look the same way. He urges that both parties should agree, as the only common sense view of the matter, that neither vestments nor attitude have in them any doctrinal meaning whatever. He states, however, that he is unable to reconcile the judgments in the *Purchas* and *Mackonochie* cases, and after a lengthened, legal, and historical argument he concludes that there neither is nor ever has been any authority for placing the altar east and west, and therefore dissents from the arguments of the Dean of Bristol, Canon Tre-

vor, and Mr. Morton Shaw, as to the meaning of the words "before the table." He believes the north side position really the more suited of the two to symbolise both sacrifice and Sacerdotalism. After an exhaustive review of the Ornaments Rubric, his lordship expresses a hope that a rupture may be avoided by Churchmen reconsidering their position and moderating their passions. After all, there is more agreement between the two parties now than there was in the period of the Stuarts. Evangelicals are anxious for decency and order, and even beauty of Church ornament and service, and ready to obey Church authority. High Churchmen have none of that Pelagian element in their theology, from the charge of which, so great a teacher as Jeremy Taylor was not exempted. If you listen to many a High Church teacher now on the doctrine of human sin, or of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, you would say that there was nothing to choose between his teaching and that of William Wilberforce, or Henry Venn, or Charles Simeon, except that it was somewhat more practically pointed—like Baxter rather than Romaine. Can there be no peace between such as these? And let us remember that a disruption will not rest with a few extreme men only. It will shake the building like a house of cards; you cannot tell which next will fall. And again, is there so much to complain of? Is it not true that each school in its turn has gained a victory? Surely, reasonable men on either side will acknowledge the debt which is due to the opposite side. "I believe that every wise man on the High Church side will feel how deep is our obligation to those who, when a spirit of slumber and worldly forgetfulness had so crept over the land, that it was hard to distinguish Christian theology from Deistical indifference, raised the standard of faith in Christ crucified, and won back the wanderers to the fresh pastures of the Gospel of God. The Evangelicals will surely not deny that in all periods of our history those High Churchmen who have been from time to time suspected and accused of sympathy with Romanism, have not only been the great thinkers and writers in theology and Christian faith—such as Hooker and Pearson, and Butler and Bull and Waterland—but have left us the strongest and most enduring defences of the Reformed faith against the assaults of Rome and Jesuit error. Let me name Hooker, Andrewes, Ussher, Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, Cosin, Sanderson, Hammond, Leslie, Bull, Beveridge, Barrow, Stillingleet, Wake, even Laud himself." As to disestablishment, his lordship says a bishop is supposed to dread it, because it would be likely to reduce his social position and to diminish his wealth. "I do not on this account dread it in the least. I believe that no one would really gain by disestablishment so much as a bishop. If my feelings were only for the aggrandizement of my order I would work for disestablishment to-morrow. I do indeed depreciate disestablishment, but for very different reasons. Disestablishment would be a revolution of so extensive a nature that it could not but carry other revolutions with it. No one institution has been so strongly interwoven into our national life as the national Church. For at least twelve hundred years the Church has been as much England as the State has been. Notwithstanding the great changes from the time of Augustine to the time of Anselm, and then to the time of Cranmer, and still again to our own time, yet no national institution has changed so little as the Church. There was a time when England had no single sovereign, when it had no true Parliament, when all the rela-

tions of noble to peasant, governor to governed, man to man, were utterly unlike what they are now; but the relations of the Church to the people amidst all corruptions and reforms, has ever been substantially the same. I am certain that you cannot rend the Church out of its national life without shaking every other institution to its base. As I am a loyal subject to my Sovereign and as I believe in the liberty of an English citizen, I do not wish to see the English Church cease to be part of the English Constitution. I am prepared, if Providence so orders it, to accept a Republican Government and a Disestablished Church. I think the Church politically would then be far stronger than it is now; but I do not think the nation would be happier—I feel sure it would not be so free, I fear it would be less religious. The extreme schools who wish for all this would be far less likely to find toleration for themselves when they had had their will. I confidently expect if I live to see disestablishment, that I shall see, after some throes and struggles, the Church settling down again on its true basis, as a reformed Catholic member of the one great body, its more sound and moderate adherents being strong in the ascendant; but I know that it will be obliged to entrench itself more firmly than heretofore, and that, therefore, it must narrow its borders; that so it will inevitably become more exclusive, throwing off the stragglers from either side. Thus those who are compassing the disestablishment of the Church are really working for their own exclusion from its pale."

A CORRESPONDENCE has passed between Mr. Theophilus Smith, of Ely House, Richmond, and the Bishop of Winchester, relative to the refusal of the Rev. C. T. Procter, the Vicar of Richmond, and his curates, to attend the dedication service of the newly-erected Nonconformist mortuary chapel in the cemetery, on the ground that it was altogether contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England for her clergy or faithful laity to attend a service in a Dissenting chapel. Mr. Smith wrote to his lordship:—"As a member of the Church of England and as a worshipper therein during upwards of half a century, I would ask your lordship, as the Bishop of this diocese, whether I or any lay Churchman would lay ourselves open to any spiritual censure or ecclesiastical penalties if we were to attend a service in a Nonconformist mortuary chapel? Are we to be debarred from being present at the obsequies of a Nonconformist relative or friend, lest by so doing we should forfeit some of our privileges as lay Churchmen? As I feel very anxious on this subject I shall feel thankful if your lordship will inform me." In reply, the Bishop wrote as follows:—"Farnham Castle, Dec. 6. Dear Sir,—I cannot find fault with the view of Mr. Procter, that an English clergyman cannot with propriety attend a Nonconformist service. There is every reason to feel with kindness towards all Christians, though in some points we may think them wrong; but it appears to me that no well instructed Churchman can attend the services of other communions, for if the English Church is not the true Church of this land, she is a usurper and an imposter. I am far from wishing to burden any one's conscience, or to say that a Churchman may not with propriety attend the funeral of a Nonconformist relation. This is quite another matter. The Church does not and cannot accept the theory that Christianity ought to consist of a multitude of differing sects; therefore, she must desire to bring all men into the one body—the Church—of which, in England, the