

mad riot among the heathen, it was natural that it should not be kept as a feast among Christians, when the excesses of the heathen were uncontrolled. There should be a celebration of the Holy Communion upon this feast, as upon all days when any part of our Lord's life and actions are commemorated."—(*Church Cyclopedia*).

The date of this festival is, of course, determined by Christmas. But it is not till some time after the establishment of the Christmas Festival that the day has any designation, except as the Octave of Christmas. Possibly anti-Judaic feeling might shrink from dwelling on our Lord's Circumcision; and the day seems for some time to have been observed as a fast, in protest against the riotous heathen celebration of the 1st of January; of which protest there is perhaps still an echo in the Collect. The earliest notices of it as 'THE CIRCUMCISION' appear to be Gallican. With us now it blends with the idea of New Year's Day, tending to solemnize the opening of the year by the thought of responsibility and struggle against sin.

The Collect freely rendered in 1549 from a Benediction in the Saram use, first notes the Circumcision of our Lord as an 'obedience to the Law,'—to an infliction of pain intended as a warning against sin—not for his own sake but 'for man,' as the beginning of His suffering for us. Then it prays for the 'Circumcision of the Spirit,' which is not merely obedience but obedience through mortification of our 'hearts and members,' our souls and bodies, recognizing sin in us, and our need in struggling against it to submit to law and to suffering.—*Bishop Barry*.

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

We notice that the tide of feeling in England is changing if it has not already changed in regard to the so called 'General' Booth scheme, for the social Regeneration of what he is pleased to call 'The darkest England.' It was a matter of great surprise to us to read the gushing approval hastily given by some of the leaders of thought in the Church, and out of it. It appeared to us upon the face of it to be one of the most doubtful character and feasibility, and to be based largely (as we believe, the work of the Salvation Army itself is based largely) upon assumption and exaggeration. We very much question the reliability of the figures and statistics given by Mr. Booth as well in regard to the state of affairs in London, as in regard to the work of the Salvation Army itself. The scheme appeared to us to wear upon its face, the aspect of an attempt to advertise and extend the peculiar work over which Mr. Booth presides with little less than papal power. Judging from what we have seen of those who in this country at all events are in poverty, it would be a pretty wild assumption to say that this was the result to any such extent as Gen. Booth supposes, of want of employment; and we fancy that should his scheme proceed it will be found that thousands of those whom he regards as quite ready to accept work if offered will refuse; and that it will require vigorous measures before the unwilling, the idle, and the vicious, will accept of any such proposals as he makes.

THE Cable announces that the *Times* of London, of date Dec. 27th, published a three column article severely criticising Gen. Booth's scheme and in it the writer says: Gen. Booth cannot think he is to be authorized to collect by force the lunatic and irredeemable slaves of crime and drink. He cannot expect us to believe he can compel men to work who admittedly will

not work, or that any colony of such men, even under the stimulus of the lash, which General Booth is too clever to ask for, could be compelled to be self-supporting. The article accuses Gen. Booth of a childlike ignorance of farming, and of recklessness in entering on a contract for the purchase of land for a farm colony in Essex at £15 per acre. It admits there is likely to be a certain percentage of success in farm and colony schemes, but questions whether Gen. Booth is the right man to control the operations. The editorial states that the article is the first instalment of a critical examination of the scheme by a well qualified writer, and says: We do not affect to regard the scheme with anything but profound distrust. We urge the public not to conclude in a fit of hysterical emotion that Mr. Booth deserves to be intrusted with an immense sum of money, but wait to hear everything that can be urged against the scheme.

It appears that the General sought the endorsement of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who more wise than some of the inferior clergy, decided and took the opportunity of pointing out the fact that as the scheme was dependent largely upon the peculiar religious ideas and system of Mr. Booth, which he most certainly did not endorse, it was of doubtful success. We will reproduce in our next number, the answer of His Grace.

The readiness with which some notable clergy of London fell into the trap and sung the praises of this scheme, and lamented that it had not been formulated by the Church, thus reflecting upon Her, seems to betray astounding ignorance on their part, of the work actually being carried on by the Church in East London and in other parts of that great city. Bishop Billing interviewed in regard to Mr. Booth's scheme pointed out not only his distrust of the whole thing, but also the work which was actually being done and had been done for years past in East London, and the sufficiency of the Church in its regular plan and system for meeting the evils complained of provided the clergy received that support which they were entitled to expect at the hands of those who claimed to be Her sons and daughters. We also reproduced a report of a meeting in December at "St. Giles' Mission," Drury Lane, London, and which Society was started a quarter of a century ago, for the work of reclaiming criminals, and which claims to have brought during the present year no less than seven thousand seven hundred persons of that class discharged from the four Metropolitan prisons under its benign influences; and who had been induced to turn over a new leaf. It also appears from that report that for thirteen years past, this organization has actually been working upon the lines General Booth now trumpets to the world as his new idea for dealing with the lapsed masses. We fancy that St. Giles' is by no means an isolated instance of the great work which the Church of England is doing and has been doing in this direction; and that if the clergy engaged therein were to communicate the result of their labors to the public, it would appear not only that efficient work had been done, but that there was very little necessity for the present much lauded scheme.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—I am thankful for *Messenger's* statement of his belief at the close of his last letter, in your issue of November 19th, though

bewildered by it. He says, "I am content to believe that somehow the Holy Spirit does make the baptized His Temple." I thought that was the point at issue between us. There must be some meaning in the words which my dulness fails to comprehend. How can the bodies of the baptized be His temple without His Indwelling Presence being there?

*Messenger* asks, "If the baptized have the Indwelling Presence of the Spirit, how can we pray for the Holy Ghost to be given again through the Laying on of Hands?" The solution is simple enough. The Gifts of the Holy Spirit are frequently called by the name of their Divine Giver. The Scriptural account of the matter is, that the Holy Ghost dwelling in the Body of Christ and in every member of it, that is, in all baptized persons, distributes His gifts to those members severally as He wills. The Indwelling Presence is in the Body of Christ since the Day of Pentecost, and only in individual believers by virtue of their being made parts of that Body. But the Gifts of the Indwelling Spirit are divided, one to each apparently, and doubtless through the Laying on of Hands.

*Messenger* demurs to Dr. Pusey's statement that "the Church has always taught that the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism," and he makes his own appeal to the Fathers. Does *Messenger* suppose that any reasonable person can be persuaded that Dr. Pusey made that assertion in ignorance of or without having fully considered everything that St. Cyprian, St. Cyril and every other Father had said upon the subject? Does he not know—he must, for I called special attention to the fact—that it is with special reference to the very passages *Messenger* quotes from those Fathers that Dr. Pusey states that they are not to be understood as *Messenger* understands them? But not Dr. Pusey only. Those passages of St. Cyprian and others, "which seem to teach that Baptism confers simply remission of sins, and that the gift of the Spirit is reserved for Confirmation," have been considered over and over again by our own and other great Catholic divines, who have all come to the same conclusion as Dr. Pusey. So does Bishop Bethell [e.g.] in his classical work on Regeneration in Baptism, (cap. vi, 90, 5th ed.) with special reference to St. Cyprian. And Dr. J. H. Newman, then our own, does the same for those passages of St. Cyril quoted by *Messenger*. His note, marked by his usual force and acuteness, is worth extracting (St. Cyril's Lectures, Oxford Tr., close of Lecture iii, page 33):—"The Fathers speak as if Baptism was primarily the Sacrament of remission of sins, and upon that (the italics are his own) came the gift of the Spirit, which notwithstanding was but begun in Baptism and completed in Confirmation. Hence, as in the text, Baptism may be said to be made up of two gifts, Water, which is Christ's Blood, and the Spirit. There is no real difference between this and the ordinary way of speaking on the subject; water, which conveys both gifts is considered as a type of one especially; conveys both remission of sins through Christ's Blood and the grace of the Spirit, but is the type of one, viz: the Blood of Christ, as the oil in Confirmation is of the others."

I think your readers, who follow this correspondence, will place more reliance upon the judgment of the greatest Patristic scholars of the Age, when a question is raised as to what the Fathers really taught, than upon any number of apparently plausible passages extracted by *Messenger* or myself. Nevertheless if you are willing to give me room in your columns, I shall only be too happy to prepare a series of passages from all the Fathers stating in plain words that the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism. But first I am sending you a catena of Anglican Divines which no one will pretend can be explained away.

HENRY ROM.

Bishop's College, Nov. 25th.