

great subjects which are ever and anon starting up, is already bearing some fruit. Many additional names of influential dignitaries and other clergymen have been added to the original list—not literally appended to the address however, but forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The feeling is becoming stronger than ever that the supremacy of the Queen does not mean the supremacy of Parliament, that her supremacy can be no greater or more extensive over the church than it is recognised to be over the State, and that consequently it can only be exercised in a legitimate manner within constitutional limits, and in connection with a reference to the voice of the Church. Nor is the monstrous anomaly felt to be less tolerable than heretofore that a Parliament composed of all grades of Jews, infidels and heretics should be taken to represent the body of the laity.

An address has recently been presented to the Bishop of Salisbury by the two Archdeacons of Sarum and Wilts, the fifteen Rural Deans of the diocese and 147 other clergy setting forth the grave complications in the relations between the Church and the State, from the fact that there is no satisfactory constitutional authority to adapt the Church regulations of two or three centuries ago to the present time; and that they consider the development of such an authority the great problem now before the churchmen of England. They, therefore, request the bishop to use every effort towards the attainment of this object; and they express an opinion that the following items must find a place in any scheme that would offer any promise of success: "(1.) Such a reform of convocation as may make it a satisfactory expression of the voice of the clergy. (2.) Some corresponding provision for ascertaining the voice of the church laity. The bishop has replied by expressing his cordial sympathy with the general sentiments of the address. He says the law of the church has to be gathered from "a heterogeneous mass of documents of very various authority and of all kinds—acts of parliament, injunctions, advertisements, canons, rubrics, modified, interpreted, and sometimes nullified by usage, and incapable of being obeyed entirely, while no living voice survives which can speak with living authority on matters of doubt continually emerging and requiring new legislation."

He says also that the experience of the Church of England in regard to acts of uniformity has not been a happy one. "The results have been only moderate in producing the uniformity they aimed at, but they have been very decisive in costing the church many adherents, and with them much piety, zeal, and learning, which it could ill spare;" and he is not without fear that similar action may produce similar effects in this generation. "In the former case," he says, "the prescribed uniformity was preceded by a definite rule (the prayer books of 1552, 1559, and 1662) containing in express terms, the practices enacted. The peculiar distress now felt arises from the uncertainty of the law combined with the stringency with which it

is to be enforced. The living voice is hushed, and judge-made law selects the principles on which the utterances of 150 years of struggle are to be marshalled for forcible action, and fills up as it thinks proper the inevitable chasms of these utterances, the latest of which is more than 200 years old." The bishop remarks that when the whole population was hypothetically and to a great extent really of one mind in religion, it was reasonable to regard the lay parliament and the convocation of the clergy as together representing the State and Church of England; and that while they operated jointly, both State and Church were represented. But every change in the constitution of Parliament, by which elements foreign to the Church of England have been introduced into its body has made it more and more the exclusive representation of the State of England, and the church has, in the same degree, lost its effective representation, while the convocation of the clergy has been half-muzzled. He thinks, therefore, that three great changes are imperatively required: 1. That instead of four houses, it should consist of only one, so as to speak with ready and concentrated voice. 2. That the representation of the clergy should be reformed so as to give adequate weight to the voice of the parochial clergy. 3. That communicant laymen should be elected to form an integral part of it. He thinks, however, that these changes may be impossible while the church remains established in its present constitution. But, he adds, "disestablishment—or what is far worse than disestablishment, the loss of vital truth, and of all the most precious elements of learning, piety and devotion in the establishment—is not an imaginary danger. Measures like these which I have tried to suggest might ward off disestablishment; or, if God in His providence allows that great evil to fall upon us, they might suggest the principles upon which the church detached from state control, might gather up her powers, and strengthen herself for the sacred work under new and less favourable conditions."

These weighty utterances of the Bishop of Salisbury connected with the movement now evidently going on among the earnest minds of even the more moderate sections of the church cannot go forth without exercising an important influence in the Mother Country. An address of considerable significance has also been sent to the Bishop of Oxford from influential clergy and laity, residents within the University of Oxford, in consequence of the understanding that the bishops of the province are to be consulted by the Archbishop of Canterbury upon the subject of the address lately presented by the Dean of St. Paul's. They express their serious anxieties in the present circumstances of the church; and state that "at a time when there is a growing sense of the life and responsibility of the church as a spiritual body, there is nevertheless serious and widespread apprehension even as to the immediate future." They trust that the bishop representing so important a diocese will do his utmost that "the present critical events and

the discussion they have aroused may not issue in any increase of external restraint upon the church, but rather in the removal or mitigation of the defects of the existing judicial system in matters ecclesiastical, and in provision for a more effectual exercise of the means by which her revived life may find due expression in council and action.

RUSSIAN TREATMENT OF THE UNITED GREEK CHURCH.

IN the contest now going on in the East, anything tending to show what kind of treatment might be expected either of the contending parties would condescend to bestow upon the Christian populations of the Turkish provinces, will be read with interest. A parliamentary paper has recently been published, "On the treatment of the members of the United Greek Church in Russia, that is, in Russian Poland; for these "United "Greeks" are Poles who did not join the Russian Church when Russia took forcible possession of Poland. They used some of the rites of the Roman Church without however acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope. They borrowed from the Latin, such wicked inventions as organs and benches; the iconostases in their churches exhibited heterodox features; there was no "Imperial "door." And then a peremptory order was issued from St. Petersburg that the "Græco-Uniat rites should be cleared from everything Latin." This ordinance was regarded by the Uniat Greeks as a piece of intolerable oppression. The Russian Minister of the Interior says, "they displayed religious fanaticism and stubborn resistance;" like the French Protestants, they went out into the desert. And then followed the persecutions which Colonel Mansfield, writing as Consul-General from Warsaw, called "Massacres." "He says "The mortality among the peasants bivouacking in the forests in the severe weather was frightful. Orders were given to the Cossacks to hunt them back into the villages, so that the peasants have been constantly on the move, retaliating by hanging the Cossacks here and there when in isolated parties." In one district, the *Pall Mall Gazette* states that the peasants defied the military to introduce the strange priest. As a measure of repression, fifty blows with the Cossack whip were given to every adult man, twenty-blows to every woman, and ten to every child; one "fanatical woman" receiving a hundred blows. Moreover, the Russian Government adopted measures to secure their object of stamping out the obnoxious system. "Having exiled the Bishop to Viatka," says Vice-Consul Webster, "and deported some 20,000 of his followers to Saratoff and other provinces, the Government sent Russian priests to proselyte the rest. There now remain 60,000 Uniat, all of them small landowners; as they will not change their religion, the Government persecutes them by putting them in prison, by flogging them, and by billeting Cossack troops, who commit every licence, in their villages." So states the Parliamentary report. Since this was drawn up however, the Russian Government appears to have succeeded in its object, for