

Kingdom of the Son of God, and an ever growing desire that it may fully come.

Suffer then, this word of exhortation. The Lord has ordained that those who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel. What are you doing to help carry out this Divine order?

*The Standard of the Cross*, [Cleveland O.] well remarks:—

The roots of Church life strike far deeper than the soil in which surprises and sensations, that comprise so much of what is called church news, flourish. The fantastic ritual of this innovator or the eccentric preaching of that, does not disturb the waiting of faithful congregations upon the ministry of good pastors. The seed of righteousness produces its fruit in due season. Habits of reverence do not change with the fashions. Forms of sound words knit themselves into hearts insensible to vain doctrines. So is the Kingdom of Heaven unmoved amid the changes of time.

*The Church Chronicle* in reference to the Church and the Sunday-school says:

What ought the Church to do with the children? Is not this the most blessed work; the bringing of the child to a knowledge of the love of God and Christ? and is it not a great reflection on the Church that she so often denies the school competent teachers, and has to hunt so hard to find willing teachers? Is there no one willing to take this opportunity? Why have we no more men in this work? If our men have the hearts of men, why do they let a few faithful women do the work, and they stand by and look on? If there are to be found those who for the sake of Christ and the love of souls go regularly to the Sunday-school and to the Church's work, ought not the Church to stand by them and give them the necessary conveniences and money to carry out the work? The Church owes it to the Sunday-school to make the Sunday-school prosperous in every possible way. Those who have this thing at heart will be found enquiring about the school, seeing that their children do their part in getting their lessons and coming regularly to school. If the Church's heart is in this work, if she has this motherly feeling and a real desire to save these souls, our people will not be heard to say, "We have done enough for this," and stand aside with folded hands.

Woe to the Church which disowns this relationship, and blessed is the Church which realizes it and which provides willing men and women for the work, to see that the children are led by the Church to the Church's Lord.

*The Family Churchman*, London, says:

We commend to the attention of American Churchmen in particular, and to English Churchmen abroad in general, a letter on unity agreed upon by the English Archbishops and Bishops in the spring of this year, when expressing their inability to accede to the request of some Churchmen in Natal that they would select and consecrate a successor to Bishop Colenso. The passage is well worthy of quotation:—

"If there is one thing more than another which the daughter Churches of the Church of England in foreign lands require to possess, it is the note of unity. One in the Apostolic Faith, one in Apostolic Order, one in the essential points of ecclesiastical discipline, using the same Book of Common Prayer, strengthened by the same sacraments, building up all teaching on the same Divine Word of God, surely no minor question of property or temporal rights ought to separate those who on so many and such vital grounds are called upon to regard each other as brethren."

The italics are ours. It is to be hoped their application is sufficiently obvious.

## THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN (LORD PLUNKET) ON THE TITLE AND POSITION OF "THE CHURCH OF IRELAND."

That portion of the visitation address of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, delivered in November last and having reference to the Church of Ireland is of more than local interest, and it ought to receive as wide circulation as possible. We take from a copy of the *Belfast News* forwarded to us by some kind friend. The following report of the Archbishop's remarks on this matter:—

### TITLE OF "CHURCH OF IRELAND"

And with such a view, the first question that stands, as it were, on the threshold is this—What is our position in this land? We call ourselves the "Church of Ireland"—what do we mean by such words? It is not for the purpose of assailing others that I deal with this question. It is from a simple desire that we ourselves, with God's blessings, may be edified and encouraged and fortified in the discharge of our own duties, at a time when every such help is sorely needed—at a time, moreover, when we ourselves are driven into an attitude of self-defence. Nor do we ask for ourselves that which we are unwilling to concede to others. Let others come forward and prove, if they wish, their right to the position which we claim. We invite honest criticism, and are fearless as to the result.

### WHO ARE THE "IRISH PEOPLE?"

But it may be said—Why proceed further with this inquiry? Why claim for your Church the title of Church of Ireland, when you yourselves have no right to be considered as a portion of the Irish people? That such a misgiving should be possible may at first sight appear strange; and yet when we find not only the so-called National Press in this country but even leading journals at the other side of the channel continually making use of the term "Irish people" as applicable to one section only of the inhabitants of Ireland; when we find eminent men of letters building up splendid ethnological theories upon mere hearsay in their studies, whereby this land is divided into three partitions—the home of the Scotch Presbyterian in the North, of the English churchman in the East, and of the Irish Roman Catholic in the West and South—it is time to explain that which all who really know anything of his country well know—namely, that in Ireland, as in England, the population represents a compound stratum of national life, formed by the fusion of many races. Our geographical position as an island close to England's side has invited many strangers, whether as settlers, invaders, or, alas! as agitators, to visit our shores; and, as a consequence, the blood of many nations—Celtic, Saxon, Danish, Norman, Spanish, French and Scottish—has been inextricably intermingled in the veins of our ancestry. The result is that, though some of these ancestral types of physiognomy and character may still display themselves here and there with more or less predominance, the people as a whole are now an "Irish people," and nothing else. No section, whether geographical, political or religious, has a right to claim that designation for itself. By way of example, I may state that representatives of all the more ancient families of Ireland—the O'Haras, the O'Mulleys, the McDermot Roes, the O'Donnells, the O'Neills, the McGillicuddyys, Mahons, McNamaras, Malones, O'Briens (from Brian Boromhe), O'Reillys of Breeffay, McCarthys and others—are to be found among the leading members of our Church. While, on the other hand, the Ironsides of Cromwell have their descendants among the Roman Catholic peasantry of Tipperary. Let me, in passing, refute another widespread misconception to the effect that our Church has

little or no standing ground outside the province of Ulster. As a matter of fact, more than a quarter of a million members of our Church are to be found in the three southern provinces. In our own diocese of Dublin alone there are at least 100,000. But if it be thus clear that Irish Churchmen are not strangers and foreigners in their own land, and that they form a considerable portion of the "Irish people"—all the more considerable if education and culture and property are to count for anything—the question still remains—What claim has their Church to the title of "The Church of Ireland?" Long usage and preliminary sanction are no doubt valuable accessories in establishing our case. But our claim rests on more solid foundations than even those. We make it because we believe that our Church is the only legitimate successor and representative of that ancient Church established fourteen hundred years ago in this land by St. Patrick—a Church to which the title of "Church of Ireland" has never been by any refused. That Church was an Episcopal Church. St. Patrick himself was a Bishop, and consecrated Bishops in every place where he desired to give permanency to his work. As regards the Church of Rome in Ireland, her present episcopate derives its continuity from bishops introduced in this country in the sixteenth century. I do not deny the validity of their orders; but they are not derived from the ancient Church of Ireland. Again, the ancient Church of Ireland was free from Papal control. The ancient Church of Ireland was never committed to those dangerous innovations with which Rome has overlaid the Primitive Faith. It is true that as the centuries rolled on "the foreign doctrine" spoken of by Archbishop Usher made its way gradually into our Church, and the history of the 350 years which intervened between the Synod of Cashel and the Reformation is, indeed, a dreary one; but, even during that interval, the Church of Ireland never formally adopted that "foreign doctrine" as her own. It remained the old Church still. The new Church that then found place in this land was in reality the Church of Rome, which, after the Reformation, having adopted the novel creed of Pope Pius IV, introduced its bishops—some from Spain, and some from Italy—and placed them in the sees already occupied by Irish prelates. These are facts which, as I believe, defy contradiction, and if they be true then again I repeat—the old Church is the Church of Ireland; the new Church is the Church of Rome. Such is the history—such the distinctive character of the ancient Irish Church.

### BISHOP HUNTINGTON.

ON THE CHURCH'S SYSTEM AND FIDELITY TO IT.

There is a system of Church observance, Church support, openness of sanctuaries, kneeling down in them, weekly and holy day communion, which is plain on the pages of our Liturgic Manual, in our law, our rubrics, our history. It is there; it belongs there; it will stay there; it will be honored there in the years to come more than in the years gone by. A Churchman who undertakes to reason these features out of the Church system, or to prohibit them by intolerance or hard speeches or a secular policy, overrates his capacity—whatever his mental furniture, his ingenuity, his wealth, or his confidence in the fashion and "spirit of the age." The house in which the Faith has domesticated us has an economy of its own. We cannot handle it as a human device, or politically. When Christ, Son of God, became Son of Man, not only was He, as He repeatedly declared, "from above," but that also which He brought by the Incarnation with Him and in Him, and is unfolded in human history as the New Creation, the kingdom of God with all its powers and gifts, ministries