

discourse of Mr. preaching confession would have philippic from the in these happier not to denounce sailants."

extracts from the sense of the they has laid the and outspoken men of Nova earned and re- mention of the t in Absolution," lthy casuistry of king to impress te and pollution

made of what dest Christian Testament. It 'The Teaching s known from Fathers. The nnios, Metro- of the Most antinople, and his edition of at Constanti- 8vo volume, characters. It ed 456 in the he date of the scribe, Leon. ie Manuscript ent, which he as and Igna- rysostom and nd promised

The Manu- s of Clement o the learned nturies these ured bishop ysostom and r with other in publishing hat has been s, in tracing ng in all the evidence of document is ing is prob- some place

The New ctly at the the sectar- endom. It g down the ts of the astical and ceremon- re is a mar-

Its teach- phrased in he honour publish an

the whole is e portions

are not quite clear in their meaning, it is clear that the manner of baptism was regarded as a matter of mere convenience. Running water was preferred, as in a stream, otherwise standing water, as in a pool, otherwise warm water, or, finally, if water be scarce, sprinkling as from a dish. It is not stated that the baptism in the former case was by immersion, though there is nothing to forbid it. But it was not considered necessary, and the language is quite in harmony with the opinion of those who believe that the earliest baptism was by affusion, the candidate standing in the water, by which the feet were cleansed, and having it poured with the hand upon the head; and that total immersion was an early development of the strong tendency to magnify the ritualism of the Church. If, in this respect, our document proves that the immediate successors of the apostles laid no stress on Immersion, if, indeed, they practised it at all, on the much more important point of believers' baptism it appears to take the position now held by the Baptists. There seems to be no hint of the practice of infant baptism. The catechumens who had received the instruction required could hardly fail to include children of believers as well as converts from heathenism."

Our space will not permit us at present to take up other points discussed. The church organization appears to be of the simplest character. In perusing this, as well as the other early Christian writers, one cannot fail to note the marvellous difference between them and the matchless writings of the New Testament. The difference cannot be accounted for by any mere lapse of time or change of circumstances. These were nearly identical. In respect to many things indeed, the former possessed greater advantages. Only one thing can account for it—the inspiration of the Holy Spirit gives the New Testament its unique power and those marvellous characteristics which place it apart from and above all other writings.

It is amusing to watch the efforts of the Ritualists to maintain intact the sacerdotal doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and yet to justify their opposition to those bishops who are not in accord with them. The Rev. George Body, in his evidence before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, had said that, as he could not conscientiously plead before the existing courts; he would feel obliged, if he came into collision with his Bishop, to resign his benefice if he could not obey him, on the ground of the Bishop's superior authority, and he alleged this to be the view of a large number of the clergy. Upon this the *Church Times* comments:

"We do not in the least doubt it, for far too many of the clergy have no intelligent grasp of first principles; but that Mr. Body, who until the last few days was beneficed in the diocese of York, should think it right to give way in such a crisis, is lamentable. Put the case of a clergyman in the diocese of Natal before Dr. Colenso's deposition, yet while he was not only teaching false doctrine himself, but endeavouring to force it on the clergy, and to prevent them from preaching, for example, the Resurrection, as we are credibly informed he did. Mr. Body's view is that the clergyman, in such a case, must submit or resign, if he cannot appeal; but every man with a sound reasoning head will say, contrariwise, that he is bound to stick to his post, and resist the Bishop who is resisting the Church. There is no difficulty in understanding how glad the late Bishop Baring would have been to avail himself of such a temper, had he thought it to prevail amongst the High Church clergy of his diocese. He would simply have directed them to preach against their most cherished doctrines, as well as to lay aside any usages disliked by the Puritan school, and would thus have either put them effectually to silence or driven them from the dio-

cese, and so 'stamped out Ritualism' at his pleasure."

It is curious to observe how the exigencies of their position has driven the Ritualistic organ so far from its logical bearings into the acceptance of the great principles of a constitutional episcopacy. This is still more evident from what follows:

"It is easy to put one's finger on the primary fallacy which has misled Mr. Body. He considers the power of hearing and judging to be inherent in the episcopal office by Divine mission. But Scripture does not say so; nor does the doctrine of Apostolic Succession involve it. Bishops are not successors to Apostolic inspiration, and have never been thought to wield full Apostolic powers, save in the one case of the position created for the Popes of Rome in virtue of the Petrine legend. The power of hearing and judging vests in the collective Church, and *Bishops possess their powers only in virtue of delegation from this Church collective, and no further than it empowers them.* (The italics are our own.) In the ancient Celtic Churches, for example, the monastery, not the diocese, was the unit, and the Abbot was the chief spiritual ruler, keeping Bishops for the purpose of conferring Holy Orders, but having jurisdiction over them. And, abnormal as such a system undoubtedly was, it was not held to unchurch the communions which adhered to it, nor to be beyond their competence to enact. And, accordingly, a Bishop has only just such powers as are bestowed on him in express terms by the Church, the only inherently distinctive power he wields being that of ordination."

As to the Celtic Abbots, Dean Stanley remarks:—"That there were persons bearing the name of bishop in the earliest Christian history of Scotland is undoubted. But it is equally undoubted that they had no dioceses, no jurisdiction, no territorial episcopal succession. Their orders were repudiated by the prelates of England and France. The Primate of the Church of Scotland for the past 300 years of its history was not a bishop but a presbyter,—first, the Abbot of Iona, then of Dunkeld. The succession was a succession not of Episcopal hands, but of a dead Presbyter's relics. Early bishops of St. Andrews, Glasgow, and the like, figure in legends, but they had no existence in fact." This, he says, is acknowledged by all. But he also maintains what some have called in question, "that the Abbots and Presbyters of Iona actually ordained or consecrated the bishops whom they sent forth to England." From these various testimonies and the concessions of the sacerdotalists themselves, it will be seen upon what a slender thread their fine theories hang.

THE CLAIMS OF JEWISH MISSIONS.

We rejoice to observe the growing interest in mission work on behalf of God's ancient people. No field has stronger claims upon us, and in none is the opportunity more pressing. The present is a most opportune time. They have grown weary waiting for a Messiah whom their fathers rejected; many are lapsing into indifference and infidelity, but others are eagerly enquiring for the way of life. Among them, missionary work has achieved successes which should stimulate our zeal to renewed and more self-denying efforts under their behalf.

The Jew has a three-fold claim upon our liberality and sympathy. In the past our indebtedness to him is incalculable. To him we owe the knowledge of the God of Israel and Revelation, the treasures of the Old Testament and the Glad-Tidings of the New, the utter-

ances of the Prophets, and the testimony of the Apostles; above all, of the seed of Abraham and the House of David came the long expected Deliverer. The Light of the Gentiles was the Glory of His people Israel. Their debtors therefore we are, and if we Gentiles have become partakers of their spiritual things, our duty is also to minister to them, not only in carnal things, as St. Paul pleaded when he sought the material gifts of the Christian Churches for their famine stricken brethren in Judæa, but also much more in the same spiritual things we enjoy through their instrumentality.

But we have another and a present ground of obligation to the Jew. He is a living witness to the truth of the Divine Word, an unanswerable attestation of the Divine faithfulness. Their present condition was foretold at the very outset of their career. The predictions embodied in the books of Moses as well as in the later prophecies, have been fulfilled in an extraordinary state of long and aggravated national calamity. Their accomplishment is set forth in numerous facts of history open to all the world. This correspondence between the prediction and fulfilment, becomes the more remarkable, and the utter impossibility either that human foresight could have foretold or human power fulfilled the declarations of the Divine Word, becomes conspicuously manifest, when we consider the unique points in both which they so completely correspond. Their doom was to be dispersion, not merely subjugation or captivity. The decay of kingdoms is wrought in various ways,—by conquest and violent subjugation, by slow decay, and by extirpation and exile. But in the case of the Hebrew nation it is to be a wide-spread dispersion; a dispersion throughout all lands; everywhere they are to suffer unparalleled tribulation, violence, shame, the utmost rigours of cruel and bitter persecution, and yet in the midst of all they are to be preserved and kept intact. Both the dispersion and the perpetuity are unparalleled. They are present in all countries, with a home in none; intermixed, and yet separated; and neither amalgamated or lost; but like those numberless streams which are said to pass through lakes of another kind of water, and keep a native quality to repel commixture, they hold communication without union, and may be traced, as rivers without banks, in the midst of the alien element which surrounds them.

In this history, in a manner without a parallel, opposites are wonderfully combined—destruction and preservation, scattering and perpetual custody. "The Lord," said Moses, "shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end again." "I will scatter you among the heathen and draw out a sword after you." Most explicit was the word of the prophet Amos:—"Behold the eyes of the Lord are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord." (The polity was destroyed, the people scattered, yet preserved.) For lo, I will