

night, December 1st, supped on roast beef, plum pudding, and other dainties, at the expense of St. Giles' Christian Mission; in the Mission Hall, Drurylane, London. This society started a quarter of a century ago its work of reclaiming criminals. At the subsequent meeting, over which the Lord Mayor presided, it was stated that of the 21,000 criminals discharged from the four metropolitan prisons this year, no fewer than 7,700 had been brought under the benign influence of the organization and induced to turn over a new leaf. According to the report, the mission has stolen a march upon General Booth, having for the last thirteen years worked upon the lines now suggested by the head of the Salvation Army for dealing with the "lapsed messes." Reference was also made to an article which recently appeared, the writer of which deplored the fact that insufficient attention is bestowed by the society upon the wives of convicts while the latter are in durance vile, and instances were quoted to show that every solicitude is evinced for the well-being of the gaol bird's wife and children. Amid cheers, the Lord Mayor suggested that in future the annual dinner should be called a "supper for the sorrowful" or "the hopeful classes," and not, as heretofore, "for the criminal classes." Among those present were the Lady Mayoress, Sir William Charley, Sir John Bridge, Mr. Sheriff Farmer, Mr. Haden Corer, and Captain Shaw, C.B.

EVERY Sunday afternoon at the Finsbury (Eng.) Polytechnic—a purely Church institution—there is a concert of sacred music, followed by a lecture which may be, and often is, on a secular subject. On Sunday, Nov. 30th, the lecturer was Lady Frederick Cavendish, who told the story of her travels in South Africa. She visited Capetown, Kimberley, Bloemfontein, and Grahamstown. At Kimberley she found her brother, the Hon. and Rev. Albert Lyttleton, who was formerly curate of Hawarden. He was living in a small house built of mud, and containing but four rooms. With characteristic energy, Lady Frederick Cavendish threw herself into his life. After "a good deal of sweeping," she beautified his house, established a sort of *salon* for weekly receptions, made a garden, and taught a class of little blacks in the school. She returned to England from Capetown with the two envoys from the King of Matabeleland in what they called "the great kraal that pushes through the water." Though Lady F. Cavendish was modest and ascribed most of her success to the help of Lord Lothian, it was easy to perceive from her narrative that but for her the two ambassador chiefs would never have gained access to Her Majesty, and that officialism and Court etiquette would have thrown away a great opportunity of pacifying and civilising the most important part of South Africa.

THE LINCOLN JUDGMENT.

(We have received the following from an esteemed correspondent on the Lincoln Judgment.—Ed. F.C.)

After a wise and thoroughly judicious delay for the purpose of completely weighing the abundant historical and liturgical evidence offered during the course of the suit, and for enabling the Archbishop and his five Assessors themselves to search to the very end into the history of every one of the obscure points submitted to them, judgment on the case of the Bishop of Lincoln has been delivered in the Court of the Metropolitan of all England. It is probable that no more weighty and important document has been placed before the National Church since the period of the Reformation, and it is unlikely that there has been any Primate who would have been more patiently determined to arrive at a just and impartial

conclusion, or whose mind would have had, from its own tastes, habits, and training, a more sympathetic attitude for the calm discussion of points of legality in ritual observance. It was long ago pointed out how desirable it was that such matters as these should be argued before an ecclesiastical tribunal, as in other cases of the kind it was understood that the parties whose action was in question had declined to plead their full defence. That defence has now been given in full, and a whole flood of antiquarian light has consequently been poured on a subject that was both difficult and dark. But the great value of the present judgment is not so much to be found in the points which it allows, or in the charges which it dismisses, as in the fact of the determination which it shows throughout to state the exact historical and legal position without any view whatever to policy or consequences. Those who knew Archbishop Benson were confident from the first that this would be the case. He would sift to the very bottom every point or practice brought before him, and his conclusion would be dictated by the preponderating weight of evidence alone. It is an incalculable advantage, in all cases of obscurity and dispute, to know once for all the exact and precise force of the existing law. To persons of calm, theological judgment, the points themselves are of no very great moment. As long as the beautiful Communion office is preserved intact, it does not matter whether the Holy Table is placed, according to the rubric, in the body of the church, or according to the change of Archbishop Laud, against the east wall. The addition of the simple symbolism of lighted candles to churches which teem in every stone and outline with things symbolical, the singing of the solemn prayer to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world in one part of the service in addition to its recital a few minutes later, are points of variation too minute for the serious attention of men of sense. The important thing is that, through the exhaustive labours of counsel on both sides and through the calm and unbiased researches of the Metropolitan and his Assessors, members of the National Church now know exactly where they stand in regard to the points in dispute. And, as the Archbishop points out, if any are dissatisfied with the state of the law, as expounded by the highest and most impartial ecclesiastical authority, it is not in a court of justice they can expect to find a remedy;—for that of course can only declare the actual meaning of existing regulations—but in a successful appeal to legislative authority.

It is satisfactory to find that, while ancient and harmless customs for which since the Reformation there is sound English authority are allowed, the introduction of any distinctly new ceremony is forbidden. That water should be mixed with wine before the service is one thing; that it should be mixed as a ceremony in the course of the service is an unwarrantable liberty. That, after all the misunderstandings with regard to the position of the ministrant at the Holy Table since the time of Archbishop Laud, he should still be allowed to stand before it, is clearly in harmony with sound reason; but that he should conceal the manual acts, after the Romish fashion, as if he were performing a miracle, is against both the letter and the spirit of the English Liturgy. That hymns should be sung in our services is a matter left by common consent to the discretion of the minister. That candles should be lit before the service as an ornament has many Protestant English precedents; their lighting as a ceremony during the course of the service is illegal. There is no provision at all in our Liturgy for making the sign of the cross except in Baptism, and the practice has been dismissed by implication; for making the sign of the cross, especially in absolution and benediction, has no ancient precedent at all.—*Family Churchman.*

THE OFFICE AND THE PERSON.

Another fundamental cause of error respecting the Christian ministry has arisen from confounding *persons* and *functions*. Thereby many have fallen into the sophistry of arguing the *abuse* of a thing against its use, and its deterioration against its institution, and of thus making the office accountable for the sin, or weakness or unworthiness of the officer. So early as the beginning of the 5th century it was remarked that the Christian ministry had especially suffered from this false mode of reasoning. 'There is,' says St. Isidore of Pelusium, 'this difference betwixt the Ecclesiastical ministers or magistrates, and ministers or magistrates of State; if these (the latter) offend the whole world can distinguish betwixt their *persons* and their *functions*; no disparagement falleth upon any but the offenders: but if Ecclesiastical persons become obnoxious, then people confound their persons and their functions; and transfer the shame of the faults of *some*, even upon *all*, yea, upon the whole Order itself.'

To say nothing of the manifest injustice of this confusion as regards the clergy generally . . . it is an occasion of much serious evil to all who fall into it—when men are led to undervalue the office of the Christian minister, they are sure to undervalue the spiritual blessings which that office is made a visible and appointed channel of conveying, and so to incur the risk of robbing their own souls, and of becoming involved in errors tending to every kind of dissension. Of differences thus arising, it may be said in the words of Bishop Hall when speaking of certain disputes concerning Church government: 'These ill raised quarrels would die alone, if men could as easily learn as Christian wisdom can teach them, to distinguish betwixt *callings* and *persons*, betwixt the substance of callings and the not necessary appendances of them; betwixt the rules of government and the errors of execution.'

But unhappily, the statement of this distinction is easier than its practical observance. The difficulty arises, . . . from mistaking the nature of the grace communicated by a divine commission; but the *social* position of the Christian minister may . . . be noticed as one cause of it—standing as he for the most part does, in not only a *public* and *official*, but also a *private* and *personal* relation to those under his charge, the person and office are so blended in consequence of personal and official acts, proceeding from the same individual that it is scarcely possible to honor the office and not the person, or to slight the person and not the office. The minister of God, ought indeed to be treated in every case with a regard for Him whose servant he is: and where his conduct is in accordance with his office there can be no excuse for acting otherwise.

The authority with which Christ has invested His ministry is not for the benefit or glory of those who minister, but for the comfort and edification of those ministered unto. The efficiency of ministration does not depend on what is in man, but upon a secret blessing and energy coming from God. This is a truth which tends to humble the man, just in proportion as it exalts his office; while it contributes to the largeness of the privileges of the lay members of the Church, by showing them to be *not* dependent on any natural or acquired powers of man but upon God only: 'that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.' The Christian minister ought always to hold himself subordinate to his office, nor can any fondness for personal display under whatever name it may be veiled fail to degrade the man and to dishonor his function. . . . Even when any personal qualification is put prominently forward there is danger of the person of the minister being