

the vigorous bombardment of pamphlets wherewith they have been assailed; or merely that the condemnation of the obnoxious restriction is too general and too strong to allow hope that it can be disregarded? Any way, we are gratified to find Dr. Wordsworth, the most weighty and respected opponent of the desired relief, not only desisting from moving any resolution adverse to the proposals of the Upper House, but himself coming forward with a new Canon acquiescing in the main particular concerned—which, however, was subsequently merged in the amendment of Mr. Joyce. Parents may henceforth, so far as the Lower House of Convocation is concerned, stand as sponsors for their own children where others duly qualified may not conveniently be had.

The legal point raised was whether, even if the altered Canon should not exclude the parents from sponsorship, the rubric would not be held still to do so—godparents as specified in it being ordinarily understood to be other than the natural parents. Yet the answer given seems obvious and conclusive—viz., that the rubric has been so interpreted because of the canon; and that the removal of the limitations contained in the latter, especially when effected with this point in full view, will leave the general language of the former to its proper and natural significance.

On the whole, we think Convocation has dealt with this weighty matter in a right spirit. God ordained Baptism for the blessing of mankind. "To restrain favours is," as Hooker says, "an odious thing;" to "enlarge them, acceptable both to God and man."

The debate in the Upper House on *Essays and Reviews* was chiefly remarkable for the apologetic speech of the Bishop of London. Dr. Tait is evidently straitened between his personal regard for two of the Essayists whom he has known as pupils, colleagues, or friends for some twenty years, and his own sense of duty to the Church and to the Revealed Truth in which he believes. What falls from a man thus painfully situated should be treated with peculiar gentleness, and construed with every allowance. Certainly the Bishop's speech required such interpretation; and had it gone forth without the comments and explanations which it drew from those around him, might have been exceedingly hurtful. The Bishop of London's chivalrous feeling has in the whole matter a little warped his judgment. He will hardly persuade Churchmen of common sense and intelligence that they have utterly mistaken the purport of Professor Jowett's essay; he has not touched upon the real *gravamen* as regards Dr. Temple's, which lies less in anything actually asserted, than in the conspicuous omissions of a theory which, however fanciful, has pretensions to completeness; and his charity verges towards simplicity when he indulges the hope that Dr. Rowland Williams may be regarded less as the prophet and champion of Bunsenism, than as its mouthpiece and advertiser. Unless Dr. R. Williams is much belied, he has, on the contrary, very considerably expanded and heightened his original. It must be kept steadily in view that the importance attached by Churchmen to this unhappy book does not arise from the opinions themselves which it throws out. Such notions have been entertained