

things in order, we want none of your interference, the Gospel would have had but poor success in these populous communities. Not guided by a head, their action would have been narrow, selfish, individualistic, obstructive. There would have been no unity. The kingdom divided against itself would have been brought to desolation. And so also a like result of failure would have followed all sinful indulgences, conformity to the world in its excesses and its vices, all lack of earnestness in working, liberality in giving, holiness in life, on the part of the members of the Church of Christ.

Finally, my brethren, remember that in your baptism, when you were entered into Christ's Kingdom, you were sworn to fight manfully against the world, the flesh, and the Devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldiers and servants unto your lives' end. Glorious will be your reward if you fulfil this your oath of allegiance and of loyalty. Your King and Lord needs this service from you. The Church needs it. When all the hosts of Satan are arrayed in deadly hostility against Christ and His Church, and the world and sin are his powerful allies, and every power and every subtlety are used to thwart our King and to overturn, or divide, or prevent the progress of His Kingdom, it is a shame that any should be seen fighting in Satan's ranks, with the sign of the Cross not obliterated from their foreheads! In whose ranks are you marching? Are you with Christ? Do you belong in heart and life to His embattled hosts, fighting manfully against His enemies? Or are you only professedly with Him, really against Him? God grant to us all fidelity in the station appointed for us.

EXTREMES MEET.

In connection with the Pan-Anglican Conference, and without entering here into any review of the substance of its resolution and recommendations, it may be of some little service to the cause of truth to endeavor to give articulate expression to the principles that determine the measure of authority to be attached to utterances of the Church.

The root principle was, I think, revealed by our Lord, when He taught his disciples the Christian mode of dealing with an offending brother. The power to be brought to bear upon such an one was to be increased by successive gradations from an individual up to "the Church." First there was to be the private re-monstrance "between thee and him alone;" then the weight of one or more neutral persons as "witnesses" or reference was to be thrown into the scale; and lastly, if need were, "the Church" was to be called in. It is not necessary to suppose that, in this case, "the Church" means more than the local community with which the members concerned are immediately connected. But whatever the extent of the reference, a principle is sanctioned which will suffice for the determination of all disputed questions affecting the Church. In matters of controversy the appeal is ever from the less to the greater, from the part to the whole, from the individual member onwards and upwards, through any number of gradations, to the plenary authority of the Universal Church. This is simply the affirmation of the Conciliar principle, to which true Catholics have in all ages appealed as the Church's surest protection against the exaggerated claims of individual members. Self-will and self-exaltation have raised their heads in countless forms; have blossomed in heresy, and fruited in schism; and have found expression wherever the pretensions of personal infallibility, in Pope or in pedlar, have been asserted.

The remedy for all this is to be sought in the free and unfettered application of the Conciliar principle on the lines of true Catholicity. The

axiom of Catholicity is the supremely reasonable position that the whole is greater and wiser than any of its parts. The promise of our Lord that the gates of hell shall not prevail, is not to any individual member of the Church, however humble or however exalted, nor to any part or section of the Church, but simply to the Church as a whole. The powers of destruction shall never, totally and finally, prevail against "the holy Church throughout the world." That is the full amount of the Master's promise, and we have no right to read into it anything other or more.

It is interesting to note how naturally and easily, in days when constitutional government was but imperfectly known, the early Church fell into what we might call constitutional methods of procedure. When differences and difficulties arose, a council or synod was summoned to compose or remove them. The Synod of Jerusalem was the precursor of many a solemn Synod of the Church, ranging in rank and authority from the remotest provincial to the unchallenged Oecumenical. And, perhaps, the most marvellous thing in the whole connection was the divinely simple and natural way in which the Church's ordinary constitution was found to meet the requirements of constitutional action and representative government. The Bishops of the Church were not only, by their Commission, the officers of Jesus Christ, but they were also, by their election, the representatives of their several dioceses. When, therefore, there arose a necessity for hearing the voice, and obtaining the judgment of the Church in any matter, it was found that, without the turmoil and excitement of a popular election, there existed, ready to hand, accredited representatives who could testify to the faith and practice of their respective Churches. Questions of faith resolved themselves into the accurate definition of that which had been accepted from the beginning, and could be finally settled by no authority short of an Oecumenical Council, ratified and supplemented by the general consent of the Christian world. There existed, therefore, a double barrier against any tampering with the Faith, namely,—the representative character of the Bishops, and the necessity for subsequent ratification by the consent of the whole Church; and it is a remarkable fact that, of all the additions that have been made to the Faith in particular portions of the Church, not one has passed the twofold barrier. They remain to this day in the character of local or sectional irregularities, which must be removed or corrected if unity is to be restored. The schisms of the Church, unhappy as they have been in themselves, and mischievous in their results, have yet arrested the possibility of over definition in the matters of faith.

In matters of administration the smaller Synods or Councils of the Church have possessed all the power that was needed. They have been able to pass regulations on matters of administration or detail which are sufficient within the limits of their respective jurisdictions.

It would be impossible for a Universal Church, if we could suppose it modelled on the lines of Presbyterianism, to act in this easy, and, as we might almost say, this automatic way. The questions of precedence and representative authority, which in the Catholic Church, find their natural solution in the Episcopate, would lead to no end of agitation and convulsion, perhaps disruption. With what we inherit as the divinely appointed order of the Church, the Bishops meet, and the representation of the Churches is complete. In this way, while the Pan-Anglican Conference does not lay claim to strict Synodical authority, the moral weight to be attached to its decisions must be commensurate with the variety of thought and interests, and of conditions that are embraced in the Churches that they rule over and represent.

It is curious to note how extremes meet in

the departures that are made from the Conciliar principle. In whatever direction they set out, they end at last in the one man power or usurpation. The most eminent Seceder in Scottish History, the worthy dame who found herself compelled by her doubts of the doctrinal soundness of her fellows to narrow by successive successions her ecclesiastical connection till her "Church" consisted of only two, herself and another, was constrained at last to question the soundness of even that other. And that is the necessary goal of the private judgment which places itself above the authority of the Church. It is the same, with, of course, many differences of detail, in the case of his Holiness the Pope, who, from affecting to be the mouthpiece of a Council representing the Church, has climbed into the position of speaking by his own inherent and personal infallibility. It is, in every such case, the one man usurping the place of the Church, and making himself the supreme and final authority. The only difference is, as to who the one man is to be.—T. T., in *The Scottish Guardian*.

THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER ON REUNION WITH PROTESTANTS AND WITH ROMAN CATHOLICS.

There are dangers on both sides of the question which must be carefully avoided. On the one side there is the danger into which the Roman Church has fallen of making no concessions, but demanding submission to the dictates of authority. Disunion in the Western Church is due to the Church of Rome. We ought to take warning from this, and being ourselves a great Church and a strong Church, from which concessions may be asked, we ought to make all concessions that can be made, and it is our desire to do so as long as it can be done lawfully and rightly. On the other side there is the danger of losing our own catholicity by making concessions which compromise our own position as the Church of Christ. In asking our brethren to join us we wish to give them all the blessings that belong to us as Churchmen. "Let him that giveth, give with simplicity," or as it more rightly means, with liberality; but if we give up our gifts we cannot offer them to those with whom we should unite. We cannot give up for instance the three Catholic Creeds, or our Orders and Apostolic Succession; if we did we should show ourselves on a parity with those who dissent from us, but should not be able to give the blessings we wish to bestow on them. If we compromised our orders by lapse of future ordinations, or allowed our Creeds to fall into disuse, we should lose the power of conciliating others. With regard to the great Church of Rome, all our Christianity and Church principles have come down to us from this channel, and I would not have any one speak with disrespect of a Church to which our father's owed so much. I do not, however, see how anyone who holds the Catholic faith could join with it when it holds such a heresy, if one may call it a heresy, in Church organization, as the absorbing of all Church order into one man who shall be absolute, but who is really a slave to others. I do not see how a Church which lets Episcopacy merge into the Bishop of Rome can be united to us; or, again, a Church which accepts the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary; for if they believe that human nature was healed by the Virgin Mary before the birth of Christ, I see no hope of our uniting with them. They will not allow union; it must be unconditional surrender. Still, putting all this aside, we may hope that things may so come about by the grace of God, that union may take place both between us and other bodies, and also with the Church of Rome. We ought to act with perfect generosity, liberally, and kindness of feeling, but also with wisdom and moderation.—*Selected*.