

become dry or fire wet. An Archbishop of Canterbury is the very pinnacle of Establishment in the most Established Church in the world, and Mr. Spurgeon in the character of an Archbishop would not be a greater anomaly than the Archbishop in the character of a Dissenter. Yet the Archbishop has really been performing this extraordinary part. A cathedral has just been founded for the diocese of Moray and Ross in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Archbishop took the trouble of going as far north as Inverness in order to lay the first stone. Of course, he was attended by nearly all the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and they did their best in those northern latitudes to make a demonstration worthy the dignity of Lambeth. Now, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, as our readers are well aware, is nothing but an insignificant sect of Dissenters. The Established Church in Scotland is the Presbyterian. It stands in exactly the same position there as the Anglican Establishment in this country. Of course, there are many bodies of Dissenters, just as there are among us, and the Episcopalians are one of the smallest of all the denominations, so small that it was once jocosely proposed to mark the site of every Episcopalian on the Ordnance Map of Scotland. At all events, they are Dissenters, just as much so as the Wesleyans, or the Independents, or the Roman Catholics in England. Now, this being the case, we beg to inquire what is the difference in principle between establishing a cathedral in Scotland and erecting a tabernacle in London? If in the one case the act be that of Dissenters and schismatics, why is it not in the other? Of course, in a certain sense, both proceedings are equally legitimate, but it is still somewhat startling to witness an Archbishop of Canterbury in so novel a part. To put it in the mildest form, an English Archbishop is supposed to be the incarnation of the principle of public order. We should not expect even the most tolerant of Archbishops to take the chair at an entertainment in aid of Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle, or to accept an invitation to a Methodist tea party. He would appear like a fish out of water, and we expect him to keep to his own element. Yet, under a more specious form, this is precisely what he has been doing in Scotland. He has crossed the border, and is metamorphosed into a Dissenter.

"But this consideration by no means represents the whole of the anomaly which is involved in this proceeding of the Archbishop. An act may be very unseemly in a person holding an official position which in a private individual would have been perfectly legitimate. If Scotchmen choose to dissent from the Establishment and maintain an Episcopal Church, it is not for us to blame them for doing so, nor would it be reasonable to find fault if some Englishmen take an interest in their efforts, and endeavour to encourage them; but we must say that the Archbishop of Canterbury is not the proper person to offer such encouragement. As the head of the Established Church in one part of the kingdom, he is bound by the strongest considerations, not only of interest, but of duty, to offer no dis-

paragement to the Church established in another part of it. He holds his dignity and authority in this country by precisely the same right as that by which the Presbyterian Church holds public authority in Scotland, and in offering a slight to the Established Church of the sister kingdom he is disparaging his own title to public recognition. The impropriety of the proceeding may be seen by a very simple parallel. If a Wesleyan comes into an English parish and sets up a meeting-house, he is at all events acting in accordance with his principles. But suppose the clergyman of a contiguous parish disapproved the proceedings of his neighbouring brother clergyman, and were, in consequence, to hire a room, preach what he thought right doctrine, and initiate a rival parish organisation. In such a case the law would probably at once restrain him, but, at all events, every one would see the extreme impropriety and unseemliness of such an intrusion. Since a clergyman is granted exclusive privileges in one parish, he is especially bound to respect the similar privileges of his neighbour. Now, the Churches of England and Scotland are just in the position of two contiguous parishes, and the two Established Churches are the two clergymen in possession. For the Church of Scotland officially to intrude into the province of the Church of England, or for the Church of England to intrude into Scotland, would be equally unseemly. But the Archbishop of Canterbury is the public representative of the Church of England, and such a proceeding, therefore, as we have recently reported is, to say the least of it, a great offence against ecclesiastical propriety. He has no more right to interfere with the Established Church of Scotland than with the province of the Archbishop of York, or of the Archbishop of Dublin. An immense outcry was justly raised in this country some fifteen years ago by what we called 'the Papal aggression.' But what is the difference in principle between the interference of the Pope in the diocese of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the interference of the Archbishop of Canterbury within the province of the established Church of Scotland? We maintained that the Pope, as a foreign prelate had no right to intrude his authority or influence within the domain of a national Church. We tolerate his doing so at the present moment; but we certainly do not expect the Archbishop of Canterbury to mimic his proceedings in the sister kingdom.

"If this gratuitous interference of the Archbishop is wrong in principle, the error is certainly not rendered less serious by the tone of the speeches delivered at the inaugural banquet. The Archbishop himself was not the most discreet of the speakers. "I rejoice to be able," he said, "to give testimony to my anxious desire to seal the union and communion between the Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Church of England. That Episcopal Church is the only true representative of the Church of England in Scotland." We must confess our astonishment that such inconsiderate language should have proceeded from a person of the Archbishop's authority and responsibility. If these words mean anything, they repudiate