

ring pension of at least £100 a year—an object which many of us know full well to be a very desirable one, both as a measure of relief to aged workers, and also to long-suffering parishioners. There used to be—and for aught we know still may be—a very useful organization in Canterbury and the adjoining Dioceses, which was successfully started and worked by Rev. Christopher Hodgson, of Margate, by which clergy could, at a remarkably reasonable rate, make provision for themselves, their widows, the education of their children, &c.; and the details of this scheme might repay examination.

The recent meeting of the Canterbury Convocation gave rise to many discussions of interest. In the Upper House the Bishops gave very decided expressions of opinion on the subject of Confession, and agreed, on the motion of the Bishop of London, to ask the concurrence of the Lower House in a declaration on the subject adopted by their Lordships in 1873, a document which lays down the view taken by the Church upon confession, and the pith of which may be found in the concluding sentence: "This special provision, (in the visitation of the sick), does not authorize the ministers of the Church to require from any who may resort to them to open their grief, a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins, or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion, and to enjoin or even encourage the practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life." After some discussion the Lower House concurred in this Declaration.

The Bishop of Lichfield presented a memorial, in which the subscribers, chiefly men of the moderate party, the Centre of the Church, declare their belief in the right and duty of the Bishops to decide questions of ritual and of the clergy to obey the Godly monitions of the Bishops. A memorial was also presented from Mr. Ridsdale, praying to know whether the Bishops do possess the power of granting dispensations from the written law of the Church, and that Convocation would set forth a law of ritual and would institute, or at least indicate, the Courts by which it would have the clergy tried for ecclesiastical offences. In the Lower House an important debate took place on a draft of a new ritual rubric proposed by Archdeacon Lord Alwyne Compton which was finally adopted by 41 to 5, in the following form: "In saying any public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments and other rites of the Church, the minister shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf and the hood of his degree: and in preaching he shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree, or if he think fit, a gown with hood and scarf. Nevertheless, he that ministereth in the Holy Communion may use, with the surplice and stole, a cope: provided always that such cope shall not be introduced into any church, other than a cathedral or

collegiate church without the consent of the Bishop."

Dean Stanley is, of course, provoked with the narrow exclusiveness of those of his brethren who wish that the Church service only should be heard in Churchyards, and is grateful to the House of Lords for taking a broader and more liberal view of the question. But is the Dean prepared to carry out to the full that "perfect equality before the law" which dissenters are so fond of demanding? The *Nonconformist* boldly, but logically, repudiates Lord Harrowby's compromise, and claims for "the Jew, the Positivist, and the Secularist" absolute and entire freedom in the use of such services as they may desire: and they are justified in doing so. If the corpse of an Englishman has a prescriptive right, *qua* Englishman, to burial with service in his parish Churchyard, his friends may fairly object to be tied down to the use of a distinctively Christian service. And, further, if every Englishman has rights in the Churchyard, why not also in the Church? Those who have separated themselves from the National Church have hitherto acquiesced in the necessity of supplying themselves with places of worship; and if they went to the Parish Church they knew they must listen to the Liturgy of the Church. But it is reckoned a monstrous thing that they should also provide burial places for themselves, or that if they use the churchyard they should have to listen to the Church's service. They contribute to the support of neither, but they claim rights in one, and probably will soon in both. If the Lords' amendments to the Burials Bill had become law every respectable nonconformist would have been buried by his own minister, and over the riffraff of all denominations the parson would have been compelled by law—for all relief was refused to him—to use the beautiful but inappropriate service of the Church. This is called "religious equality."

Another instance of the pleasures of "religious equality," as applied to an Established Church, is just given. Hertford College, Oxford, is a recent development of the Magdalen Hall of our youth. It is not denied that the endowments of the old or new college existing at the time of the passing of the Tests Act in 1871 are subject to that measure; but it was held by high authority to be capable for private benefactors to endow the new college with benefactions specially reserved for members of the Church. Accordingly, Mr. Thomas Baring spent some £50,000 in this manner. A judgment has, however, just been given which at once dissipates this misconception. A Nonconformist wished to become a candidate for a Fellowship, designed expressly by the donor for Churchmen only, and was naturally refused. The Court of Queen's Bench upholds his claims, and quashes the election of the Churchmen. Charitably disposed people may well pause before they give any endowments to a Church

which, being by law established, seems to be the only society that is by law incapacitated from holding property for its own benefit or from managing its own affairs.

THE NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

THE discipline of the Christian course, the advantages enjoyed, and the temptations endured, are vividly brought before us in the Epistle, together with the principle that the instances of failure given by the ancient Israelites were recorded for the admonition of those who have come after, so that we come not short of success in our high calling as they did, but reach the goal and secure the reward.

The Israelites were indeed the typical people of God, in that all that shall be done in the Christian Church to the end of time has been already done in type and figure by them "of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came." St. Paul particularly notices that the Church of Israel were all "under the cloud;" that is, under the care and providence of God, securing His presence with them day and night, and compassing their camp, as a wall doth a city. The feast of tabernacles, the feast that is, of coverings, was instituted to admonish them of the Divine protection exhibited to them by the cloud. At one time it was contracted into the dimensions of a pillar; at another time it was spread out as a cloud. It covered the mount, it covered the seat of the congregation, and it covered the tabernacle. It was used as a pillar to guide them in their journeys. When spread out as a covering it was a cloud shadowing the camp, and preserved them from the heat of the sun. As a cloud it also defended them from their enemies; and so it stood between the whole host of Israel and the Egyptians, and was a cloud of darkness to the latter, so that they came not near the Israelites; it must therefore have been large enough to darken their whole camp. The Baptism in the sea answered to that of water, and the Baptism in the cloud to the Baptism by the Holy Ghost. The spiritual meat and the spiritual drink are types of the Body and Blood of Christ upon which the Christian lives, and the spiritual Rock that followed them, says St. Paul, was Christ. But notwithstanding all these privileges they were disobedient, and their sad example is a perpetual admonition to the Church that we tempt not Christ as some of them also tempted; that we murmur not, as some of them also murmured; that we be not idolaters as some of them were; and that we listen not to the inclinations of the flesh as some of them did. "Wherefore," says the Apostle, "let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

The real lesson to be taught by the parable of the unjust steward is that we should use our wealth, if we have any, with a wise reference to our soul's future existence; and regarding it as a treasure given us in trust, while we ourselves are stewards, amenable to our Divine Lord, so spend this mammon of unrighteousness in the cause of God, the