

OUR EASTER VESTRIES.

Canada—or rather the Canadian Church—has good reason to be proud of the general "showing" presented at the Easter vestries of this year. So great and almost universal is the *business depression* all over the world at present, Canada included, that no one would have been surprised to find that this depression had "told" upon Church finances, as well as other things—whereas the fact stands patent in very conspicuous form and shape that the *religious sphere*—at least, so far as the Church of England is concerned, in her parochial works—is the one which shows least evidence of the financial pressure which notoriously exists everywhere. We are not sure that other religious organizations can make the same boast to the same extent.

THIS IS VERY GRATIFYING.

It seems to indicate that the interests of religion are so deeply rooted in the hearts of our people as to be like the still depths of the ocean—comparatively free from the financial panics which agitate so unpleasantly all ordinary mercantile affairs. It takes a good deal of solid religious principle to enable a man to say—when beset by financial difficulty—"I will not touch God's portion till the very last resort." We feel sure that a vast number, if not all—that would be, indeed, too much to expect—of our Church members have been saying this to themselves and to each other during the past twelve months. It seemed to be—this religious sentiment—"in the air" everywhere.

WE ARE NOT SURPRISED,

therefore, as much as we might have been, at the hopeful, cheerful, and *prosperous tone* emanating from the Easter vestry meetings as reported all over the land—Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London, everywhere the same story! Plenty of money for Church purposes—or if not "plenty," at least a very fair and reasonable share, as compared with the small amounts which seem to be usually available for other purposes. We have no doubt a good many people have been astonished, considerably, as they perused these same Easter vestry reports: but we are not, and for the good reason given above—we felt the movement of the sentiment of dominant respect for religion in the very air.

OUR PEOPLE ARE SOLID.

—we do not mean "solid" in any slang sense—but in sober earnest. They are, as a rule, most faithful when most tried. The presence of a great necessity, or a great temptation, or a great difficulty, makes them *nerve themselves*, sit firmly, watch warily, and drive carefully over the dangerous ground. We do not say that all are capable of acting in this way: but we feel sure that the vast majority of people in our Canadian Church *naturally* settle down in this attitude, and safely ride through the storm, whatever it may be, which happens to assail their religious consciousness. We have abundant occasion, at times, to expostulate with or warn our readers under ordinary circumstances—when they are very apt to fall half-asleep at their posts and let others pass them by.

BUT HERE THEY ARE SOUND!

This is one of the "beauties of adversity"—it brings out the true qualities hidden away in time of prosperity. It is worth while to undergo some such "financial depression" once in a while, in order to have these qualities brought out and *tried*—otherwise they might not only "sleep," but *die* out altogether for want of adequate motive for full exercise. Once roused, however, under the

inevitable pressure of a great crisis, these qualities are not so apt to go to sleep again. Such is human nature—history repeats the lesson, has repeated it at least one thousand times. Once roused and tempered by use, the qualities *so improved* remain.

LET US SEE THAT WE USE THEM

—keep them up to the proper tension, *still* exercise them well—*still* "nerve ourselves, sit firmly, watch warily, drive carefully," over the ground of duty. The temptation will come to say "Oh, this is monotonous, tame, without excitement, don't bother yourselves about it": but, Church brethren, don't listen to that temptation. Let the ordinary routine of commonplace duty be marked by the exercise of the same high qualities of moral fibre which have marked our *fighting postures* in time of difficulty. The financial pressure continues almost if not quite unabated—and will continue, we doubt not—may we not say "we hope?"—till the so necessary lesson of fidelity to God is *well* learned, thoroughly ingrained for remembrance and use.

REVIEWS.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ZACHARIAS RHETOR. Translated by Rev. F. J. Hamilton, B.D., Incumbent of Ranis Episcopal Chapel, Homerton, London. Printed privately.

This is a very interesting and even a valuable book. Zacharias Rhetor was Bishop of Mitylene about the middle of the sixth century, and is, in his opinion, a proof how hard an error dies. The heresy of Eutyches was condemned at the Council of Chalcedon, just as the heresy of Nestorius had been at Ephesus. We all know that Nestorianism still exists, but it exists as an heretical sect; but here is a writer, in Catholic communion, a manifest monophysite, and that a hundred years after the heresy had been condemned at Chalcedon. Apart from the author's opinions, he is generally trustworthy as an historian, and the book is one to which all students of early Church history will have recourse. The translator seems to have done his work with ability and skill.

MAGAZINE.—The *Expository Times* sustains its high character. The March number is an excellent one. We learn from the notes of recent exposition that Professor Sayce has dealt some heavy blows at the "higher criticism," which is not unnecessary. Dr. Moulton writes admirably on the late Professor Milligan. The Books of the Month are carefully criticised in two articles. Mrs. Woods continues her studies on Tennyson's "In Memoriam." The shorter articles are good, and the Great Text Commentary is this time occupied with 1 St. John iii. 2—a great text indeed.

THE RITUALISTS AND THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. H. E. HALL, M.A., WITH A NOTE OF INTRODUCTION BY THE REV. T. T. CARTER, M.A., HON. CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

(Concluded.)

AN APPENDIX, DEALING WITH FIVE ADDITIONAL POINTS OF THE RECENT CONTROVERSY.

The following additional points, concerning the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and intimately connected with that part of my pamphlet, have been lately raised in the correspondence columns of the Church papers.

1. A comparison has been instituted between Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, with a view to proving that the relation of the outward part to the inward is the same in both Sacraments. It has been argued that, since, as all agree there is no objective union between Christ and the element in Holy Baptism, and the outward part is an effectual sign in its use of the inward effect accomplished in the soul of the receiver, which is the inward part of the Sacrament, so in Holy Communion the outward part of bread and wine is only a sign that in the eating of it with faith the soul of the receiver is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ. According to this view, the Consecration is only the setting apart by authority of particular bread and wine for this sacramental eating, and if this is eaten

by persons in faith, expecting the inward effect to take place in their souls, the Body and Blood of Christ are, simultaneously with the eating, communicated by a purely spiritual process to the soul.

But a further study of the two Sacraments shows that, though there is an analogy between them, in that both have an outward part and an inward, there is yet such a distinction between them as to make the above theory untenable.

In Holy Baptism the Sacrament is made in the act of administration.

In Holy Communion the Sacrament is first made and then administered.

The words which, by our Lord's appointment, are needed for a valid Baptism are used in the act of administration, but in Holy Communion the necessary and appointed words are said over the elements in the Consecration.

In Holy Baptism the making of the Sacrament is fulfilled in the effect of the administration on the person baptized, and the inward part therefore is the same as the benefits of the Sacrament. In Holy Communion the making of the Sacrament is fulfilled in the effect of the Consecration upon the elements, and the benefits of the Sacrament in the soul of the receiver have to be considered afterwards, and then explained, as in the Catechism, by a separate and additional question and answer, as I have shown. In Holy Baptism the sign is that of a *virtus* or effect produced by its use. In Holy Communion the sign is that of a *res* or substantial reality made present and afterwards administered. There is nothing in Baptism equal to the acts and words of the consecration prayer, nor, as I have pointed out previously, to the reverent consumption of the consecrated elements after the service. The universal custom in the primitive Church of reserving the Blessed Sacrament for the sick and imprisoned, a custom which was explicitly sanctioned in the Prayer Book of 1549, indicates how differently the consecrated elements in Holy Communion were viewed as contrasted with the element used in Baptism, and how definitely the Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood was identified with the elements in the Holy Communion.

The whole distinction, and the refutation of the suggested view, lie in the words as above,—

In Holy Baptism the Sacrament is made in the act of administration.

In Holy Communion the Sacrament is first made and then administered.

2. The Words of Article XXVIII., "and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is eaten is Faith," are quoted as nullifying any suggestion that the words in the Catechism, "the means whereby we receive the same" imply that the outward part in the Sacrament conveys the inward.

There is, however, no such contradiction between the terms, or ideas, in the two statements. Both statements are necessary, giving the objective and subjective means of reception. The outward part of the Sacrament is the objective means of reception, the means, that is, vouchsafed on God's side by which the inward part or gift is brought within our reach. Faith is the subjective means, whereby we each separately appropriate the gift for ourselves.

3. Those who hold the doctrine of the Objective Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood have been called Materialists. Materialism is the doctrine which denies the independent existence of spirit, and admits the existence of one kind of substance only, which is matter. A materialist is one who holds this doctrine. It is clear therefore that this word is unjustly applied to those who hold the doctrine of the Real Presence. For by believing that our Lord's Body and Blood are really present under the form of bread and wine, we do not deny that He has a Soul and a Spirit. Nay, we believe that even His Body, though *real and substantial*, is so raised into the spiritual sphere that whole Christ is Spirit. The Second Man is become "life-imparting Spirit." "Bare flesh and blood profit nothing, but the Flesh and Blood of My Ascension are Spirit and are Life." Spiritual in the Bible is not opposed to real and substantial, but to carnal.

There is no materialism here.

4. Closely connected with this is another misapprehension.

If our Lord's Body and Blood are orally communicated to us, what then, it is asked, is to be thought of the union of His Body with ours?

The answer of Theology is very clear. The gift of Christ's Body and Blood is, as the Catechism teaches us, to the soul. Our body is the medium through which the communication is made, our body being the instrument of our soul. The gift is made sensibly *per corpus*, so that we know that it is made. The elements becoming absorbed in the material of our body, the Body and Blood of our Lord part company with them, taking possession of the soul, and through the *soul* affect our whole man. There is no corporal union between our bodies and Christ's Body beyond the act of reception.*

* "Unio corporalis quia corporalis est sumptis," Suarez, quoted by Hurter, Theol. Dog. vol. iii. note in

The saving which the so body we mu

a. Its per identit

b. Its car fluctu

The perma

again and g

is capable o

as the body

Spirit of God

of the soul, e

for the eleva

ascend towa

"That man

and whose s

and, "The li

soul is God.

and through

are temples

door through

soul; by wa

the dominio

which shall

There is t

of Christ's I

i.e., by mee

spiritual, tal

here it is t

Heavenly F

to the receiv

carnal food.

vii. 10), "I

thou shalt e

these, as thy

into Me."

5. It has l

the Sacrame

His Body an

bread and w

made by the

the Sacrame

mise betwee

a. First of

diction is fal

because His l

form of br

Body and l

Sacrament.

in this Sacri

vouchsafed

ubiquitous,

will, throug

Sacrament.

Blood are al

Our Lord

drinketh M

raise him u

meat indee

that eateth

dwelleth in

about the F

live by Me"

Flesh."

b. It is ob

we may not

promise wh

with notio

veracity of

in anything

reverence w

truth, and t

there is no

treating D

notion, and

is the prelu

on fact, aft

doctrine, c

notion, is s

must begin

Scripture, t

all our tho

agreement

our Lord sa

which He

My Body, T

calls the co

Body and F

a real sense

must be tru

Scripture, t

loc.: "Omni

contactum i

bus sacrame

unionem ph

Cornelius

"And I will

that throug

the resurrec

resurrection

a new title,

and "The F

of glory."