

which put a writer *en rapport* with his readers. Yes, ceremonial was in itself, a fragmentary and mutilated form of the Christian religion, but frequent services, frequent Communion—he need not enlarge on that, for they had so few frequent communicants that his remarks would be personal to seven or eight people—decorated churches, stained glass windows, exquisite sound, and lofty forms of worship—these were means, and he thought legitimate means, when the end was greater than the means, and there were cases in which the means forshadowed the end. We worshipped and believed not in a dead Christ, but in a living and omnipresent Christ, and the Bishop said with emphasis that if a man trusted anyone but Christ, in any feeling, in any formula, any philanthropic mission, any good work or any ceremonial, then he wanted to go back to the beginning; he wanted to have the great familiar words of the Gospel for the Sunday after Christmas ringing in his ears, “His name shall be called Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins.”—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

THE BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR. ON

Reformation Movements on the Continent of Europe.

Dr. Sandford, speaking of the reforming movement in Italy, says:—“The reports which I have lately received of this movement are far from satisfactory. It is wholly confined to the lower orders, it depends entirely upon Foreign support, it makes little or no progress, and it is a protest more against the discipline and the politics than against the doctrine of Rome.”

Upon the movement in Spain and Portugal, he says it is in no sense a national movement, and that it makes slow progress. The reforming congregations in Spain “ask for a Bishop, to be consecrated by English Bishops. But, have Bishops of the Anglican Church authority to take so exceptional a step as to consecrate a Bishop for native congregations in a foreign country, within the limits of regularly constituted dioceses? No doubt our Church has authority, in the present divided state of Christendom, to take this exceptional step for the purpose of providing Episcopal superintendence for congregations of her own people. The patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem have lately expressed satisfaction at the appointment of an English Bishop to supervise English congregations in the East. But it is one thing to consecrate a Bishop for the wants of our own people. It is another, and a very different, thing to consecrate a Bishop for the wants of men who are not our people, and are dissidents from the Established Church of the country of which they are citizens.”

Alluding to the well known words of St. Cyprian, “*Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis pars tenetur*,” the Bishop says:—“If the words of St. Cyprian be interpreted to mean that every individual Bishop has a kind of oecumenical jurisdiction, to be exercised whenever in his personal judgment a case of necessity arises, the door will be opened to endless interferences and disorders. Give this interpretation to the principle, and no diocese will be safe from intrusion of discords and divisions we have enough already in the Church of Christ. But such an application of the principle would multiply them indefinitely, and would strike at the root of all discipline and order. If we hold that Rome no longer retains a valid ministry, that her Sacraments are not true Sacraments, that she has forfeited her right to be treated as a Christian Church having jurisdiction within her own territory, then we shall decide that the case is one of such extreme necessity as to justify our Church in a new departure. But I would remark that if this be the view taken, then we ought to do much more than delegate or consecrate a Bishop for this handful of reformers; we ought to send missions under missionary Bishops to reconvert Southern Europe,

and restore it to Christianity.” Having referred to the second Canon of the Second General Council of Constantinople, which directs that “unless invited, Bishops shall not go outside their own diocese for the purpose of ordination or any other ecclesiastical administration,” Dr. Sandford says “it is to be hoped that no such action as the Bishops deprecate will be taken by any portion of our Church. A departure from that policy which ever since the Reformation we have consistently followed, of not interfering in the concerns of foreign Christian communions, would plunge us into a sea of new difficulties. It would weaken our protest against Roman aggression. It would involve the abandonment of our unique position, on which ardent hopes have been fixed, that our Church might one day be the means of restoring unity to Christendom. It would produce internal divisions amongst our own people, wound the hearts of very many, and frustrate those hopes which of late years we have been entertaining that the different parties within our church were being brought into a closer accord. The Church of England has a great and important part to play in healing the division of Christ's people. Members of the Church of Rome have themselves proclaimed their belief that she is the only possible intermediary in bringing together Protestants and Catholics. But this part of peacemakers she can only play by loyal and resolute adherence to her own position and principles, to her own doctrine and discipline, and to her own historical policy of not intruding as an active propagandist within the province of other Christian Churches.”

THE LATE DR. LOBLEY.

We greatly regret to announce the death of the Rev. Dr. Loble, formerly Principal of Bishop's College, Lennoxville. The sad event occurred suddenly, after a very short illness, in England, at the vicarage, Sedburgh. We are sure that the many friends whom he made during his long stay in this country will hear of this most unexpected event with the greatest pain; more especially the students whom he instructed, and over whom he won such influence by his clear intelligence, earnestness in the discharge of duty, honesty of purpose, and frank, open manner. Dr. Loble was a very distinguished graduate of Cambridge, having been placed eighth Wrangler in Mathematics and second class in Classics at his degree examination. He was afterwards elected to a Fellowship in Trinity College, which he subsequently resigned on appointment to a college living. His earnestness in discharge of his parochial duties was so highly appreciated that he was asked to accept a Missionary Bishopric. This work he did not deem it right to take upon himself, fortunately for Canada, for when afterwards invited to become the first Principal of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College he undertook the important duties of the position offered, and resigning his Rectory, came to this country. After some years of labor in Montreal, during which, among other work, he acted as Examiner for McGill University, he was appointed Principal of Bishop's College, Lennoxville. After many years of noble service in the College, the Grammar school and in the Church generally he resigned this position and returned to England, residing for some time at Cambridge. In 1887 his College appointed him to the Vicarage of Sedburgh in Yorkshire. It will be remembered that his services in this country were so highly esteemed that when a vacancy occurred last year in the Cathedral of Quebec he was invited to become Rector, but deemed it his duty to decline the offer, although greatly influenced by the many ties of friendship which he had formed in Canada and by the high appreciation of his services to The Church

just shown. While engaged in parochial work in England he did not resign his interest in education, being occupied at the time of his death with the duties of an Examiner in the local examinations of the University of Cambridge.—*Montreal Gazette*.

NOTES ON AUTHORITY AND CONSCIENCE.

(From *The American Church Sunday-School for February*).

By THE REV. W. F. C. MORSELL.

The Divorce of Morals From Theology.

It may be fairly said that a text-book on morals apart from religion is irreligious, and quite as fairly it may be said that a text-book on Theology apart from morals is immoral. Religion and morality are wedded together in the nature of man, and their divorce is the separation of what God has joined together. Those who become religious teachers are too frequently satisfied with the attainment of a few orthodox ideas about the Creed, and leave out of their preparation an equal degree of attainment in moral science. Hundreds of teachers who can handle a manual of doctrine have not looked into a manual of moral science for years. Hundreds of students who are preparing to enter the ministry have the proof-texts of doctrines at their fingers' ends, and yet cannot on demand furnish the proof texts for the cardinal virtues. Our Theological schools have professors of doctrinal theology but none of Christian ethics,

The Symmetrical Relation of Theology and Morals.

The Church Catechism, the teacher's only authorized manual, outside of the Bible, is an excellent model, combining as it does the Creed, the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments. On reflection it is evident that in our Sunday-schools the right proportion between doctrine and practice calls for the exposition of the Commandments as well as of the Creed. Now, the treatment of the Creed in manuals for teachers is usually full and clear, but the treatment of the Commandments is meagre and lifeless. The Ten Commandments can be illustrated by proof-texts from the books of the Old and New Testaments, but how little has been done in this direction compared with the exhaustive Scriptural illustration of the Creed. One of the most striking examples of the neglect of the moral element in Christian teaching is the fact that proof texts of doctrines taken from the New Testament have sometimes been torn from the ethical connection in which the original writer was using them, and have been given a theoretical import instead of their original moral force. Take the often quoted phrase, “The truth as it is in Jesus” and look at the Scripture context and there you find it “As the truth is in Jesus” with a moral import, showing the necessity of “putting off the old man.”

The Materials in Holy Scripture for Moral Teaching.

There are special books in the Bible where the moral aim is predominant; such books are Exodus, Deuteronomy, the Psalms, Proverbs; and in the New Testament the Gospels and such sections of the Epistles as relate to the nature of man, the heart, the mind, the will and the conscience, and above all such passages as describe the work of the Holy Spirit and the progress of the spiritual life in the believer and in the Church. There are few, if any, doctrinal statements in the New Testament separated from a direct moral application in the context. Here the important lesson for every teacher is