

cated usually to Welsh saints, who, in days gone by, exercised immense influence on the Principality, while the chapels are known by Hebrew names. In short, Dissent is the exotic, not the Church; and an exotic which, having been raised under excessive pressure of heat, is destined to pass away.

The sermon at the Consecration of five Bishops on St. Peter's Day in St. Paul's, London, was preached by the Bishop of St. Andrew's.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR claims that his position as to the Athanasian Creed has been misrepresented. He declares that he admires the Saint (Athanasius), holds the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, and recognizes the necessity which existed for its formulation. But he thinks its use in the public service undesirable.

A BRASS has lately been erected in Salisbury Cathedral to the memory of Canon Liddon, and the Dean in unveiling it referred to the life and labours of Dr. Liddon in touching terms. He told several incidents that came under his personal knowledge, showing the influence of the great preacher on the men who heard him. Speaking one day to an eminent statesman, the Dean asked what effect a sermon preached by Dr. Liddon in the Chapel Royal produced. The answer was, "It made me do what, alas, I had not done for years—pray." Not long ago the Dean saw a commercial traveller reading his Bible in a railway carriage, and, getting into conversation with him, found that the man had once heard the Canon preach, and the result was a resolution never to pass a day without reading a portion of the Word of God. Such are the fruits to be found on all sides of Dr. Liddon's work as a preacher, while his Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord are embalmed forever in the theology of the Church. He was a man of great saintliness, extraordinary intellectual gifts, whose vacant place cannot be filled in this generation.

THE FUTURE OF THE SCOTTISH ESTABLISHMENT.

(From *Religious Review of Reviews*, June 15, 1893.)

But the cataclysm may come too soon. I have no hesitation in saying that disestablishment would be disastrous from every point of view. It is a well-known fact that in the opinion of the best judges disestablishment of the Kirk would lead to a large accession of Presbyterians to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. But the movement would be by no means general, or even large enough to be considered a great gain by anyone. I would earnestly, therefore, appeal to High Churchmen in England not to give only a half-hearted support to the Established Church in Scotland because it happens to be Presbyterian. The ideal to be aimed at is the development of the present National Church of Scotland, not its extinction as a national institution. And it is, moreover, very certain that if the Church of England and our brethren of the Scottish Episcopal Church were to throw the whole weight of their influence on the side of the establishment in Scotland, and give it their active support, the good deed would not be forgotten by Scotsmen, and many old prejudices would disappear.

This brings me to a very thorny and difficult question, which I approach with some diffidence. What are the chances and conditions of ultimate union between the two establishments? Disestablishment, if it comes at all, will come

much too soon for any scheme of union. Many years of education are still needed for the National Church of Scotland, if she is to join the great body of English and Scottish Churchmen. If this ever comes to pass—and certain recent facts seem to make it quite possible—it cannot be reasonably expected that it will take the form of unconditional surrender to our Episcopal brethren in Scotland. No one who is at all familiar with the Scottish Episcopal Church can contend that it reflects in any degree the national feeling of Scotland, and human nature forbids the surrender of the greater to the less. Thus the line which we take with dissenters in England cannot be taken with Presbyterians in Scotland.

Substantially, the Episcopal Church in Scotland is the same in thought and policy with the Church of England. Now it is perfectly certain, whether we look to history or the fixed principles of Scotsmen, that they will never be content simply to adopt our Prayer Book *en bloc*. What is really wanted is a new national liturgy for Scotland, in which the essentials of the Church must be preserved, but which would allow the fullest development of a new National Church.

How far the Scottish Liturgy of 1764 should be made the basis of a new national Liturgy it is beyond my province to determine. I feel sure that the Communion Office, so generally admired, will commend itself to all Scottish Churchmen, and, in particular, to the members of the S. C. S. No inconvenience is at present felt in the Scottish Episcopal Church from the possession of two offices which are said at different times. And so may it be in regard to the future National Liturgy, which will differ from the English book by the introduction of certain materials from the various Presbyterian Liturgies, and in certain necessary changes in rubrics.

There must, of course, be no trifling with episcopal ordination. If we recognise Presbyterian orders at all, it is only as valid for a Presbyterian Church. Episcopal ordination is a *sine qua non* to union. The Scottish ministers at the present moment are not at all indisposed towards the idea of the Episcopate. Presbyterian parity has so many disadvantages that the revival of Knox's "superintendents" is often talked of, and the practical advantage of having bishops in the Church is more and more admitted. Now, although we decline to regard our own Episcopate as existing for mere expediency, we must be prepared to take the Presbyterian on his own ground. We must be prepared to show him that the restoration of the Episcopate to the National Church of Scotland would be of inestimable benefit, not to us as Churchmen, but to the whole Scottish nation. We must not ask the large body of Scotch Presbyterians to submit to an English Church; we must rather aim at giving them the blessings of the Episcopate, preserving at the same time as much as possible of the present National Church of Scotland. It is my firm belief that what was impracticable in Archbishop Leighton's day may be possible in our generation, viz., the synthesis of Episcopacy and Presbytery in a renewed National Church. So long as the Episcopal succession is maintained, and Episcopal authority recognised, I do not see why much of the present machinery should not be retained. In particular the *General Assembly*, which is the very life and focus of the present Kirk, ought certainly to be retained. I have not space to enter into the probable adjustment of the various parts of the new Catholic Church as I conceive it, but that they can be adjusted by men who are thoroughly in earnest I have not the slightest doubt. The question of the future of the present Episcopal Church in Scotland is one on which I do not feel qualified to speak with confidence. It is quite possible, and it may be very desirable, to maintain her exactly as she is. So long as one single Episcopal

authority is recognised both Churches would be substantially one, though perhaps with different "uses."

The General Assemblies of the Established and of the Free Churches have just concluded their sittings for the year 1893. I have hitherto said nothing about the relations of these two. There has been at various times much talk of Presbyterian re-union; and a body of well-intentioned laymen of both Churches, calling itself the "Laymen's League," was founded two or three years ago, with the object of staving off disestablishment by union with the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches. This league has, however, met with very little support among the dissenting Presbyterians, has been practically powerless to prevent the fierce talk against the Establishment—talk which grows more and more bitter from year to year, and has thus helped only to show that union among Presbyterians is an absolute impossibility. The breach is widening—the old division is not being done away. That which might have been possible in 1874, when patronage was abolished in the Establishment (an ancient cause of strife being thus removed), and when the Free Church declared itself still to be the "Church of Scotland—free from State interference"—is no longer possible now. To-day the contrast is not between those who have the endowments and the prestige of Establishment, and those who have not; it is between a strong, well-directed Catholic movement in a powerful, healthy organism, and the restless agitation of a political machine. The Free Church has completely lost the dignity of former days. It is harassed by heresy and dishonoured by the aspersions with which it continues to irritate its "brethren of the Establishment." Its fair name is sullied by the contamination of politics. It has ceased to have a *raison d'être*.

I am well aware that in the foregoing paper I have touched on subjects which lay me open to severe criticism on all sides. But they are the thoughts of one who has been led, by the force of circumstances, to give considerable attention to the matter, and who hopes that he has misrepresented no one. "P. A."

WISE COUNSELS FROM THE LORD PRIMATE OF IRELAND.

The Most Rev. Dr. Knox, at his triennial Visitation in the first week of June, delivered the following charge which might well be addressed to the whole Church. Speaking to the Clergy, he said:—

Though they must all admit the natural tendency in men's minds to overrate the importance of the times they lived in as being the most eventful, yet he thought they could not be accused of too much credulity if they read in the sceptical spirit of the age the growing tendency of the irreverent to rob revelation of its divine inspiration, and not only to discredit the authorship of the books of the Bible, but also to deny that the Scriptures were God's revealed word to man. He did not want them to think that he would discourage them from examining into the whole question of higher criticism thoroughly. Of course it was the bounden duty of the clergy to be well acquainted with the controversy in all its bearings, which would necessitate on their part careful study and extensive reading. The subject had attracted the attention of the most acute critics and Biblical scholars, and could not be lightly dismissed. He had, however, only alluded to it in his charge in order to warn the clergy against making it the subject of their sermons to uneducated congregations; that would have the effect of unsettling the minds of their hearers, and might