

in the picture of the crucifixion. To the three first evangelists the crucifixion is the lowest depth of Christ's humiliation as man—the insults, the shame, the pain, all that is tragic, all that is repulsive in a public execution conducted under circumstances of violence and injustice, stand out with unmistakable prominence in their pages. Their task is to train and strengthen our sympathies with the One Perfect Man in His suffering—as with our suffering Elder Brother. But St. John's object is distinct. With him the death upon the cross, including all its attendant circumstances, could not touch, even remotely, Christ's Divine and eternal nature, upon which St. John's eye is so persistently fixed. In his estimation that death could no more detract from Christ's essential glory than the ascension into heaven could enhance it; but it formed the very climax of the moral manifestation of the life of God in Him, in Whom the Eternal Being really dwelt among men. And therefore, in St. John's eyes, the cross is not a scaffold: it is a throne; and Christ's death is not His defeat: it is His victory. Lifted on that tree of agony, between earth and heaven, He is an object of central interest to a far larger multitude than that company of Roman soldiers who have just nailed His sacred limbs to the wood, to a far larger multitude than that mob of His countrymen, educated and uneducated, who were watching His death struggles, either with brutal delight or with cynical indifference. Lifted up on that throne of victory, He draws to Him not merely His mother's heart, as she stands beneath His feet, veiled in the darkness of a sublime and awful sorrow, not merely His one loyal and well-beloved Apostle, not merely the deep sympathies of that band of faithful women, not merely the honest convictions of the centurion or the broken heart of the thief at His side. The sympathy of humanity extends immeasurably beyond all these. For on the cross He is in the presence of the whole human family—of all the coming centuries—of all the assembled races of men. From the cross He exerts a world-embracing attraction—for "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

M. LOYSON.

THE position occupied by M. Loyson (Pere Hyacinthe) and the relation of his movement in France to the other branches of the Church, appears to be, as yet, not very precisely defined. It will be remembered by our readers that the subject was brought up in the Lambeth Conference, but that no very definite action was agreed upon. Subsequently, the Primus of the Scottish Church made some offers of assistance to M. Loyson, which the Bishop of Ely in a letter to the Primus expressed his conviction was going a little beyond the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference. Since that time the Bishop of Ely has written to the *Guardian*, to join in the disclaimer of the Bishop of Ely, and to express with him his conviction that the "Lambeth Conference has not committed the Anglican Communion to such a course of action as complicity in the offer made to M. Loyson;" although he refrains from expressing any opinion as to the merits of M. Loyson's case, or as to the steps which the Primus has taken in his individual capacity in this matter.

The subject is of general interest; and in order to show the way in which it may present itself to different minds, as well as to indicate the peculiar position occupied by M. Loyson, we may, without committing ourselves entirely to it, refer to an ar-

ticle by Bishop Coxe addressed to a New York contemporary. He says:—It is painful to observe the various and contradictory grounds on which this "new departure" is spoken against. The *Guardian* and the *Scottish Guardian* open their columns to manifold complaints. One respects the established church of France, as such, and fears to disturb it; another dreads this intrusion into the domain of Papal bishops—that is, of Popery; another thinks it conflicts with the position of Anglican bishops in their protest against the interference of Cardinal Manning; and again, the *Record* will have nothing to do with it, because it is not fair and square "Protestantism." Need I say that all these objections, and many more, have been anticipated and thoroughly discussed by those who, notwithstanding, have encouraged M. Loyson to proceed? They have answers, reasonable answers, scriptural answers, and catholic answers, deeply and very seriously considered and prepared, against all opponents; and as time goes on they will all appear. Enough they believe that M. Loyson is the man whom God has enabled to do a work for France that nobody else can do and which needs to be done. The times are ripe for his work, and, however small the beginnings, "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Wiclif was not a "Protestant;" John Huss was not a "Protestant;" but they were reformers, for all that, and who would not help such spirits as theirs, rising up in any part of benighted Popedom? For one, considering the apostate condition of the Papal Church of France, I would gladly aid another Pascal, or an Arnauld, who should endeavor to restore to it the life and piety of Port Royalists. It is for things, not names, that we must now struggle.

The *Record* thinks we must do nothing for the France of Calvin and Beyer, unless we try over again their ways of doing—or not doing, rather. Without any disrespect to them, it may be justly asserted that their wisest followers, in France, at the present day, sympathise with M. Loyson, and feel that, if there is ever to be a reformation, or revival of true religion, in France, it must be through some such agency as that which he proposes to employ. The "Old Catholics" cannot work in France; for Frenchmen want nothing to do with Germany. The Latin Church, in France, contains thousands, however, who abhor the new dogmas, and who wish to be led back to a primitive catholicity. The late illustrious scholar, M. Garcin de Tassy, invited me to meet M. Loyson, at his table; and in the conversation which ensued he bore an animated part, of which this was the spirit. He wished to die in the historic Church of France; but he refused assent to the new dogmas, and honored M. Loyson, and the Church of England, too, as instruments for the restoration of a purer faith. Among the ecclesiastics also there are indications of a deep interest in the movement, and there are aspirations for its success in quarters from which little might have been expected.

Now, nobody who understands the semi-reformed position which the Gallican Church assumed in accepting the Council of Trent; nobody who reflects on the Exposition of Bossuet, which diluted the creed of Pius IV. almost to the point of annihilating it; nobody who considers the action of the French bishops in 1862 can fail to perceive that, logically carried out, all this must end in making the Church of France another Church of England. The Jesuits saw this, and have moved both Olympus and Acheron ever since to overthrow "Gallicanism." The secret *animus* of the late Vatican Council was to make Gallicanism im-

possible within the Papal Communion. They boast that this is accomplished. "Very well," says Pere Loyson; "then we Gallicans must abjure the Papacy. We conceded a *Primacy*, but we never admitted a *Papal Supremacy*, much less Infallibility; and we now occupy the old position of St. Louis, of Bossuet, of de Marca, of Fleury, of France herself, in *utterly rejecting a Papacy such as this.*" In a word, the Ultramontane, de Maistre, observes that "France in 1862 as really revolted against the Papal See as did England a century earlier." Loyson accepts this situation. He seems to say: "The Vatican Council forces us so to understand it. I stand where my mother church placed me, by her unanimous action of 1682, the consequences only now operating in full, because never till now has the Papacy dared to anathematize us for holding the position of Bossuet and of our fathers." Such is the language into which I translate his conduct, and it is full of force for Frenchmen. And who can fail to see that this appeal to 1682 gives him the fulcrum by which he may move all France? It is historical, it is logical, and the experiment is, at least, worth trying. Nothing could be more providentially favorable than the triumph of the Republican principle just at this time. It insures liberty of worship. McMahon did not venture to enforce the law against M. Loyson's projected chapel; but the new Government will make it legal. A crisis is at hand which may disestablish the Papal religion. If so the opening of a Gallican church in the first few weeks of M. Grevy's incumbency may be one of those little sparks of spiritual vitality which the Lord intends to kindle to a flame. Who will not pray for it? Who will refuse it help? I have reason to believe that some of the noblest names in French Protestantism are enlisted to aid the movement materially.

Now, what is the idea of M. Loyson's position and appeal? It is briefly this: The Jesuits declare that they have extinguished "the Gallican Church," and all those liberties of the same for which Bossuet and the whole Episcopate of France contended against the Papacy in 1682. But M. Loyson says: "This is a mistake. The Gallican Church still lives, and will make herself heard and felt before long." He falls back on the old Vincentian rule—that if a whole church apostatizes, save only two or three, that remnant is the true historic Church and witness for Christ in any country. Now, the few faithful who survive in the National Church of the French, like Garcin de Tassy, are unwilling to forsake their historic National Church; but, saving its identity, they are anxious to see it carried forward in the path of genuine reform. Not too fast; not so as to fail to lead a willing people step by step; but effectually and so as to restore in the end, the Church of Irenæus and Pothinus, the Church of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, the Church of Hilary and of Martin of Tours.

THE OSHAWA CHURCH CASE.

AS a great deal has been said and written upon this subject, perhaps it would be rather strange than otherwise if it should have happened that no misapprehension, no misrepresentation should have been manifested in reference to it. And yet we could scarcely have expected that articles would have appeared in the secular press of a character so very wide of the truth, both as to facts and principles, as some we have seen. There are one or two remarks that have suggested themselves to us to make.

As we have already intimated the canon or by-