

the Sultan's Government, and give the Christians of European Turkey an opportunity of carrying out their future destiny without any external interference at all. The memorial did not entirely meet the views of Lord Derby, although he sympathized with the main object the League had in view. On the same day, he received a deputation on the Eastern question of forty members of Parliament and five hundred and seventy-one others, in favor of strict neutrality, except when it may be possible to interpose friendly offices to mitigate horrors, and to hasten the close of the conflict.

We are under no apprehension that the British Government will render the slightest material aid to Turkey, unless to counteract any direct assistance Russia may give to the Christians. What we cannot understand, however, is this: There are at least two recent treaties in existence between Turkey on the one side, and the great powers of Europe on the other, in which Turkey stipulates to give the Christians equal privileges with Mahometans throughout the Empire. The articles of the treaties have been broken—the Christians have been as much oppressed, persecuted, outraged, murdered, as ever; and yet England insists that the contest arising from so barbarous a state of things shall be fought out by the oppressed Christians and the Turks alone. This, we say, is what completely puzzles many, until they recur to the fact that the integrity of the Turkish Empire is one of the first axioms in the creed of the British Statesman.

IS OUR POSITION A COMPROMISE.

It has often been asserted that the Anglican Communion was a compromise. Undoubtedly it did not go far enough in the way of reform to suit the Puritan party. It retained many usages, which, to that party, appeared to be tainted with Romanism. On the other hand, the Romish Church considered its changes to be a fatal departure. But a compromise is a state of things in which each extreme considers itself to have retained the essential point it desires, while parting with some things it would gladly keep. That the Anglican position was not a satisfactory one to either Puritan or Papist, is the best proof that it was no compromise. It sought for the central truth of the Church, and for truth only, without regard to expediency.

This extraordinary statement—that the Anglican position is a compromise—has been sought to be sustained by a comparison between the Articles and Liturgy of the Church. Everybody is familiar with the well-known saying, that the Articles are Calvinistic and the Litany Arminian. While it is easy to meet this by the reply that the forms of prescript worship must be considered as controlling the sense of the Articles wherever the latter are deemed susceptible of a double interpretation, and

that harmony rather than variance, must be the object of all proper reasoning. It may be seen by any honest investigation that the Liturgy itself, which is not the work of any special period, but the continuous voice of the Church in many ages, sets forth in turn the different truths which, singly, have been made the shibboleths of party. These are the truths which, taken together, make up the sum of truth; taken singly and exclusively, they are easily perverted into one-sided errors. Calvinism is based upon the doctrine of God's sovereignty. But in that iron system of pithless logic, it is so insisted on as to destroy all human freedom. On the other hand, the current Arminianism has struggled towards some evasion of this sovereignty in order to maintain the rights of the will. Each side has its favorite proof-texts; each ignores the bearing of those cited by the other.

The Bible, meanwhile, to the candid reader, presents itself asserting both truths fully, fearlessly, and independently, just as it does in the case of all other contrasted revelations. It does not hesitate to put the Saviour's humanity as distinctly as words can put it, while it as clearly asserts His divinity, strongly as it is in the power of language to express a supernatural and Divine fact.

It might suit a critic of the modern German School to pull the Prayer Book asunder, and find traces of two conflicting schools in its formation. Fortunately, the facts are plain enough, and the history of the different portions too well-known to admit any such dissection.—*Hartford Churchman.*

"ONE IN CHRIST."

At a recent "union meeting," this motto was put up in a conspicuous place "One in Christ." We have every confidence in the sincerity of this and similar expressions, so far as the intention of those who use them is concerned. But that does not make them any the less unreal or false in fact. "One in Christ," used under such circumstances, means that those who adopt it for their motto are intending to remain not one in their several organizations, and to make an invisible and intangible imaginary unity the excuse for not doing their duty in practical unity. The "union meeting" is not intended to remove differences, but to perpetuate them. It is to do away with the uneasy feeling that sects are bad, by an opiate of occasional association. "It is a lovely thing to see different denominations of Christians meeting together in harmony," is often said. It is not a lovely thing at all, but very unlovely. If the differences are unreal they ought to be abolished; if they are real they ought to prevent this pretence of harmony. What would be thought of an army of which the various regiments should all say that they fought under one flag; but never act together or in concert, save upon mere parade; and scatter each to separate battle-fields whenever any fighting was

to be done? "One in Christ" does not mean divided in Christ's kingdom.—*Hartford Churchman.*

THE DUTY OF SUBMISSION.

The Divine eye sees not as we see, He may have designs for the development of His truth totally different from our designs, and of which we at present know nothing, but which we shall see in good time. We have done our work according to the best of our knowledge and wisdom, but that may not really be the best, nor may what we should call success really be success as regarded by the mind of God. If we sincerely believe in God, and in his ordering of events for the good of His Church, while we, on our part, are doing our best according to our lights, in thorough honesty of purpose, it is surely a monstrous anomaly for any of us to lose heart, no matter what happens. It is selfishness, not genuine Christianity, which makes us dissatisfied and dispirited, if we do not witness the results which we expected as the reward of our efforts. All we have to think of, as Churchmen, is the work which, as we believe, is divinely appointed for us to do in the Church. When we have done it, or are doing it, well and good—results are not our affair, but God's. We cannot say that He has not given us enough to encourage and reward us already, and therefore to allow ourselves to be cast down when difficulties and checks arise, is surely the height of unfaithfulness.—*Church Times.*

PLAIN LECTURES ON THE PRAYER-BOOK.

BY DIAKONOS.

LECTURE No. VIII *Continued.*—I shall conclude this lecture by a consideration of the first word Credo, or Creed, or I believe—quoting almost entirely from a very excellent standard Church work—"Pearson on the Creed." The word, the personal confession and profession, *I believe*, is to be understood as if repeated before every article of the Creed. Nor only before every separate article, but it is understood as affixed to every part or single truth contained in each article, as, for example, in the first article. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth. I believe in God. I believe that God to be the Father. I believe God the Father to be Almighty. I believe God the Father Almighty to be maker of heaven and earth. *I believe*—what do I mean? I believe in these doctrines because I readily give my assent to that which is credible, or worthy of credit. *What is it to be credible?* Some things may be proved scientifically, some things are self evident. These doctrines contained in the Creed are credible, because of the authority of the testimony on which they depend. *What is the testimony on which they stand?* Testimony must depend upon the authority of the testifier, and the authority of the testifier upon his knowledge and his goodness. One