

Ireland, with their Colonial and North American off-shoots.

Of the forty Bishops forming the "Bench" in England and Ireland, twenty-three were members of this Conclave. The remaining fifty-two Bishops belong to either the Anglican Communion in Scotland and the British Colonies, or to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the latter numbering twenty-three. For convenience of calculation and memory, we might say that one-third were English and Irish Bishops; one-third, Colonial (including the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland) and the remaining third, Bishops from the United States of America.

Some of the most eminent members of the English Bench countenanced and attended the Conclave—the Primates of both England and Ireland, Dr. TRENCH (of Dub'n), Dr. TAIT (London), the venerable father of the Bench, Dr. SUMNER, the astute and eloquent WILBERFORCE, the accomplished Biblical scholar ELLICOTT, with others of lesser note. Conspicuous for their absence were, his Grace of YORK, Dr. PHILPOTTS (Exeter), Dr. BARING (Durham), the learned Dr. THIRLWALL (St. David's), Dr. BICKERSTETH (Ripon), and the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of TEAM, with others not so well known to fame. It is conceded that as to both number and influence, the United Church of England and Ireland was well represented. Whatever of weight and ability may be in the Episcopal Church "in Scotland," was present, for out of eight Bishops, six put in an appearance. The Colonies, as we predicted, were in full force; three METROPOLITANS out of the five upon whom this honour and responsibility have been conferred—those of Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa—leading the way. The Bishops of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and Colombo were each of them *non est*. The distance, expense and difficulty of undertaking a journey from India to Lambeth, influencing them, no doubt, in their decision to stay away. The Episcopal Church in the United States was represented by its unquestionably ablest Bishops.

In the present condition of the Anglican Communion, we had a right to expect from so much assembled wisdom and piety, deliverances that would allay to some extent at least, the anxiety which is widely felt in regard to the future of this large and influential portion of the Christian Church. Whether as to Doctrine or Ritual, ex-

treme views are both held in theory within this "Branch of the Church Catholic," and carried out in practice. Moderate Anglicans are distracted on the one hand by the teaching of COLENSO and his sympathisers; and on the other by the practices in worship of the Bishop of SALISBURY, Dr. PUSEY and their followers; practices, moreover, which are significant of their acceptance of Romish *dogma* also.

Let us see what these seventy-five "Pan-Anglican" Bishops have done in defence of the Faith. Chiefly, they have published a letter or "pastoral," addressing it to "the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons and Lay Members of the Church of Christ in Communion with the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic." Whether it is meant to designate all Anglican Priests Deacons and Lay Members "faithful in Christ Jesus," or to single out such of them as are "faithful," or to extend Episcopal counsel and prayers to all in the other Branches of the Church Catholic who are or may be supposed to be thus "faithful," does not appear. It is noteworthy that there is not a word for the seventy Bishops who would not or could not join their brethren! Yet the pastoral extends its commendations and counsels to the "Priests, Deacons and Lay Members" of the Dioceses of these absent Prelates, some of whom will think that their Right Reverend brethren have transcended their province in assuming the pastorate over Ministers and Congregations which are under their own more immediate control. But let this pass! The absent Bishops can take care of themselves and of their flocks, without help from us.

The substance of the Pastoral is as noteworthy as is its address. For ambiguity and many-sidedness it is remarkable. For common places, it is scarcely worthy to rank with an ordinary homily. Any man in the Church of England from Dr. McNEIL of Liverpool on the Evangelical side, to Mr. MAURICE on the Broad Rationalistic, or Mr. MACCONACHIE on the advanced Ritualistic side, could subscribe to it. There is an aping of Apostolic phrase and style to which we ought not perhaps to object, since it is issued by "Successors of the Apostles."

But there is no pronounced utterance in favour of the doctrinal basis of the English Church, as laid by its fathers, the Anglican Reformers. The Bishops content themselves with a general exhortation "to keep whole and undivided the Faith once deli-