

them. But they will do well to consider the signs of the times.

THE RITUAL QUESTION.

"The cry is still they come." Undoubtedly England is at last deeply stirred. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York have uttered their voices, and now the Bishop of London has spoken. And their utterances are all worth considering. One point dwelt upon by the Archbishop of York was the autocracy of the clergy. The Laity were not consulted. Now, this may be perfectly true, but it does not meet the case. Many of the ritualistic clergy declare, and with perfect truth, that their lay people are quite with them. But surely no one will maintain the position that a clergyman may do as he likes, if only he gets a number of like-minded people to fill his church. To return to the Archbishop of York. The ritual use of incense, he says, is unlawful; and we understand that several of the clergy have indicated their intention of obeying the Bishop and the law by desisting from the "censing of persons and things." Then the "asperging," the sprinkling with "holy water," is declared to be unlawful. Here is one of the absurdities of the extreme man. By itself the sprinkling with water might seem a perfectly innocent ceremony; but it is a practice unknown in the Church of England for centuries, and used by some in recent times simply as an imitation of a Roman practice—an act of gross disrespect to our own history. Among other things forbidden are the "burning of candles before pictures" (we should think so!) the reservation of the consecrated elements in the sacrament of the altar, the use of such Roman terms as the Viaticum, and various other things, some of which we have already mentioned and commented upon. We have already remarked that, as far as we have noticed, the Archbishop speaks merely for himself and not as the representative of the episcopal Bench. But, when we remember that, apart from the Bishop of Lincoln, the theology of the Archbishop probably represents the high water mark of the English Episcopate, we can understand that most of the bishops will go quite as far as he does, and some of them further. The Bishop of London has declared on the same side, and has got some of the most advanced of his clergy to abandon some of the practices which he condemns. And, while we write, the report comes that her Majesty the Queen is deeply moved and keenly interested in the matter. The "Establishment" may be in danger, and someone has said, when the Established Church is removed, the throne may begin to totter. Such an event is quite conceivable. And if so, not the Queen only, but all who love the Fatherland, may well have fears for the future of the Empire.

TRINITY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.

The Authorities of Trinity College have issued an appeal to the church people of the Province of Ontario, which we wish greatly

to enforce; and in doing so, we are satisfied that we are bringing to the notice of our readers a matter of the greatest importance to the Church of England in these parts. It is well known that the establishment of Trinity College was taken in hand by the first Bishop of Toronto, the renowned Dr. Strachan, in consequence of the destruction of the religious character of King's College, and the setting up of a secular institution in its place. Bishop Strachan was deeply convinced of the necessity of a University in which education should be based upon religious principles. In this conviction he was seconded by the mass of the clergy and laity of the Province; and the result was the founding of Trinity College. It is nearly fifty years since this was done, and it can hardly be said that Trinity has failed in its work during that period. Many men eminent in law and medicine and in the sacred ministry of the Church are numbered among its graduates. As time went on, however, it became evident that the work of the University must be extended and its staff strengthened. This work was seriously undertaken by Dr. Body, the second Provost, when he came from Cambridge in 1831 to assume the government of the College. Dr. Body's conception of the needs of the College was admirable and complete, and he was successful in obtaining considerable sums of money for the establishment of new chairs, for the increasing of the scientific apparatus, and for the enlargement of the buildings. Under his administration the chapel was built, and first the west wing and afterwards the east wing was added to the College. It cannot be said that any of these additions were unnecessary or superfluous. The University could not keep its place among the institutions of the country unless such provisions were made. But the revenue never quite covered the expenditure, and the interest on the endowments has steadily decreased, so that, at the present moment, there is a considerable annual deficit. In these circumstances two courses lay before the governing body—either considerably to reduce the expenditure, which would mean the reduction of the staff, or to make an appeal to the public for an increase of income. It is important that the exact state of things should be understood by church people generally. It has come to this, that one of several courses are open to the governing body of the University. They may suppress the department of Arts and make Trinity merely a theological College for the training of candidates for the ministry, or they may so cut down the teaching staff that the University could not take its place among the similar institutions in the country; or they may succeed in obtaining an increased endowment for the College. These are the three courses which they have before them. Are the church people of Ontario content that either of the first two shall be taken? We cannot believe it. We cannot suppose that the churchmen of this great province will consent to what is practically the destruction or the maiming of their own University. For

this is the exact state of the case. Trinity University is not a private venture or the property of a joint stock company or the organ of a party in the church. It belongs to the Church of England in the Province of Ontario. Every Bishop in the province is ex officio a member of the governing body. A considerable proportion of the lay and clerical members of the corporation are nominated by the Bishops. The College is under the direct control of the church. It is not a party institution either in theory or in fact. Its teachers are not chosen because of their belonging to any particular party. All schools of thought have been represented among them. The College is, in principle and in practice, no more narrow or broad than the church which it represents. All its governors are directly or indirectly chosen by the church at large. It is impossible, therefore, to imagine an institution with stronger claims upon the churchmen of Ontario. Any serious injury to the University would be a blow to the church. Its destruction would be an indelible disgrace.

ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT, BY DR. EBERHARD NESTLE.

(No. 4).

In conclusion, a word must be said about the German text of this edition. It is the revised version produced in accordance with the desire of the German Evangelical Church conference held at Eisenach, which contains in the notes, every point of difference between it and the last edition of Luther in 1545. Besides this, many earlier attempts at translation by Luther, (the edition of Bindseil-Niemeyer, 7 vols., 1845-55) and many of his marginal comments, which are now so hard to obtain, have been added. In the interests of a better understanding of the Bible, Nestle has in his edition given up the traditional system of dividing the chapters into verses; he places the numbers on the margin and divides the text into the paragraphs into which it would naturally fall. In doing this, the learned Bible-student has not brought in an unheard-of innovation, he has only gone back to the system which Luther himself employed. The division of the Holy Scriptures into chapters, which were marked on the margin, was the idea of Stephen Langthon, Chancellor of the University of Paris, who did this for convenience sake when he was arranging for the publication of the Vulgate in 1210. After Cardinal Hugo of St. Caro, in the year 1250, had further carried out this system, it was used in the edition princeps of Erasmus and in the Complutensian Polyglot, and was accepted in all subsequent editions, and also by Luther, although this division into chapters often occasions an unnatural break in the text, as for instance Deut. xxxi., 30; Wisd. viii., 21; Acts xxi., 40. The division into verses is the work of the printer, Robert Stephanus, who in 1551, in his third edition of the Greek Testament, published with the Latin translation of Erasmus and the Vulgate, for typographical reasons divided the chapters into

verses and printed the year 1557, this (first in the Pentateuch in 1661 in the New Hebrew Bible, with Jews. Luther himself the verse-system. His version was 1 divisions suggested the numbers of the the margin. It was in his own translation separately, the chapters from the margin were furnished worthless. Our Bible and unintelligently cost to the reader the cause. So this is due to the fact away with this Greek-German Bible Society has publication of the (15cts). Nestle's a welcome advance Testament, for which thanks of every t appears at the seems—at least in clusion and the fr which in the past success, but which The coming of bringing a new four which will intro Testament revisi date, our Greek great Uncials (S andrian), in futur laid upon Codex I lations, which ha reasonably negle Itala, in the far e the Itala in a south the Egypt nesses of the first closer to the orig Testament than t smoothed-over t beautifully says: by long self-sac from the light by gradually for until we reach t

Neulusheim.

The life of Henry Adam Smith. Co., 1898.

Henry Drummond one of most re and he has had have the story o a most intimate and cultivated that the Dr. G memoir is the Prophet Isaiah know that we