

olic Church of Canterbury. The absurdity of it in Africa. Rome we holic which of Rome, is no such of Rome. established y use them r to avoid to ourselves which these number of pace, so to Catholic or self-contradiction of the As a matter to use them t lose sight existence antly see in and hear hes of the at the three- here never in the whole The Church hes than—ree Persons There may d one part l intercom- he two no Church than milies when ource, it is ion of the sy that it s may cease of Christ. ot consider- we wish to that Christ Church can ses to exist. e been bap- themselves across the a dilemma, ich it was nen. Some Suppose a England on England is hich alone uld you tell, served by the Roman Certainly t he would ed, see the rites, and confession, at the same orthiness of ity of the end could

only obtain regular sacramental grace at the Evangelical priest's hands. If he went to the Anglo-Roman Church he would be committing an act of schism, and if he did this with his eyes open, he would be guilty of mortal sin.

It is no part of our present purpose to go over the well-worn ground of proving that the Church of England is one with the ancient Church of this land, that she has come down with an unbroken succession of Bishops and priests from early times, and has inherited the jurisdiction she then possessed. We are not arguing to convince outsiders, but rather to strengthen our own brethren in the faith. Assuming, then, that our readers agree in upholding the Church of England as a living portion of the one Church, it cannot but be that the Anglo-Roman body in our midst is schismatical. It does not do in these days to mince matters. We dare not use honied phrases when the truth of God is at stake. If the Church of England be right, the position of Anglo-Romans must be wrong. There cannot be two Bishops holding canonical jurisdiction in one diocese. If Dr. Temple be the canonical Bishop of London, Cardinal Manning must be a schismatic, and all who submit to his jurisdiction must be schismatics also. We have no harsh feelings towards our Roman Catholic brethren. We number among our friends Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters. But no amount of personal friendship can make us blind to the truth of the position we as members of the Catholic Church in this country occupy. It is a distasteful task when so much has to be done to rescue souls from the state of heathenism in which they are living, to turn to such a question as controversy with our brethren. But we should be cowardly were we to refuse, from time to time, as occasion offers, to enunciate over again in as brief a manner as possible—too brief, indeed, to do justice to the subject—those principles which underlie our position. God grant that the day may come when intercommunion will be restored between all who hold the Catholic faith, receive the Sacraments of the Gospel, and live under the jurisdiction of their canonical pastors! But that day will not be hastened by refusing to speak the truth—only the truth must be spoken in love.—*Church Review*.

THE S. P. G.

THE venerable Society started in 1701, with an income of £1,527, and the idea, being a new one, had not made much progress before the reign of Queen Anne closed. At the accession of the Georges, religion and morals entered upon a down-grade movement, and in 1821, though the receipts of the society were £12,858, only £1,671 represented subscriptions, donations, and collections! After this date, things began to mend. In 1831, the total income was £17,801, and in 1841, it had risen to £60,923. We are glad to see that the actual voluntary donations have increased from £76,211 in 1879, to £90,780 in 1887, the improvement last year on 1886 being no less than £1,608; which, considering the hardness of

the times, is not so unsatisfactory. The total revenue last year was £109,763, against £105,711 in 1886. It should also be remembered that in 1882 the society declined to receive various funds amounting to more than £18,000, of which it had been merely the bankers, and which are now sent through other channels.

Foreign Missions have never yet occupied the position they ought to do in the minds of Churchmen; and no doubt one reason is the faulty manner in which the Gospel is commonly presented. There is, of course, a sense in which religion is selfish. A man's soul must always be in his own care. He alone is primarily responsible for it, and though he may and ought to receive infinite help from the Church, he cannot hand over to anyone the duties which he owes himself. But the misfortune is that too exclusive attention is paid to the idea of each person working out his own salvation. It is taken for granted that he has, comparatively speaking, little to do but to look after his own spiritual interests, whereas his first care should be to promote the glory of God and the extension and well-being of His Church. In other words, he ought not to confine his thought to what is merely profitable to him and to his, but he should likewise devote himself heart and soul to what may be called the politics of Christ's kingdom.

The neglect of the Society during the eighteenth century was unspeakably calamitous. If its work had but been taken up with anything like zeal, we should perhaps not have lost our American colonies at all. In any case the Church would have kept her hold of them, and her position in the world would have been very different from what it is. The same may be said of our other colonies—in hardly one of them is she represented as she ought to be. Instead of sending out Bishops and clergy in a reasonable proportion to our countrymen who sought new homes across the seas, and sending them *pari passu* with the emigrants, or even anticipating them, the course has been to let large populations grow up without the means of grace, or with no religious teachers but those of the sects, and then after a time to try to recover the ground that had been lost. Our duties to the native tribes as they came under our rule were plain enough, but how scandalously inadequate has been, nay, and is, our performance of them! To speak quite within the mark, our missionary expenditure—or, at all events, the expenditure of the venerable society—ought to be at least double or four-fold what it is.—*Church Times*.

CULTUS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN

FIRST of all stands the cardinal and indisputable fact that it is impossible, by any ingenuity whatever, to extract directly a single utterance from the New Testament in its favor, or to draw indirectly a fair and reasonable inference from Scripture which makes for it.

Next is the equally indisputable fact that nothing colourably like it is discoverable in the genuine works of the Christian Fathers

for the first six hundred years, except as a heresy in the sect of Collyridians. Where such evidence seems to be found, it proves in every instance, without one exception, to be in some spurious forgery of later times. Surely then, a religion was good enough for S. Peter, S. Paul, S. John, S. Athanasius, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, and S. Gregory the Great, and for all the martyrs, doctors, and saints of the past ages of faith, not one of whom practiced the cultus, ought to be good enough for Christians to-day.

Thirdly, the distinction, mentioned above, between the different grades of religious homage, expressed by the three Greek words, *latría*, supreme worship, *hyperdulia*, extra service, and *dulia*, ordinary service, has no warrant from the usage of the Greek Scriptures. Its prevalence is chiefly due to the influence of St. Thomas Aquinas, who, with all his splendid ability, did not know Greek, and was incompetent to settle a question which depends on its answer entirely on the meaning and established use of Greek words. The fact is that the two verbs *latreuein*, to worship, and *douleuein*, to serve, are used in the Greek Bible, Old and New Testament alike, convertibly, as meaning the very same thing. For example, in the first verse 1 Thessalonians i. 9,—“Ye turned to God from idols, to *serve* the living and true God,” the verb in the original is *douleuein*, which would give us the noun *dulia* as the word for God's service; while in Hebrews ix. 14, in the sentence, “Purge your conscience from dead works to *serve* the living God,” the verb is *latreuein*, which gives the noun *latría*. The conclusion is that religious service of the kind in question is God's due only, and may not be exhibited to any other.

It is carefully to be borne in mind that the ordinary plea does not fairly apply, that as we ask our living friends to pray for us, and attach much value to the intercession of the devout and excellent among them, so it is even more reasonable and salutary to ask for the prayers of the saints at rest, who are in a higher condition, more free from human weakness and error, and more certain of praying acceptably. For the question is not at all as to kind of petition strictly limited to a “Pray for us.” The devotions commonly addressed to the Blessed Virgin, and indeed to many other saints, ask directly for the bestowal of gifts and graces, as though from themselves. And that mode of supplication is Divine worship, however seemingly fenced by specious safeguards, unintelligible to and unpractised by the ordinary uneducated or by the half-educated Roman Catholic or Oriental Christian. The defence, constantly pressed from the Roman side, that the unique pre-eminence of the Deity is perfectly safeguarded in practice as well as in doctrine, and that no mistake happens, would require, to make it valid, that the first Commandment should run, “Thou shalt have no other Gods *equal* to Me.” What it does say is, “Thou shalt have no other Gods *but* Me.” And that bars any such homage as belongs to God from being lawfully paid to any other being whatever; direct