

what He has already done for me, and of what He is prepared to do, conditionally on my faithful use of the grace He imparts. A poet of the last century wrote:—"The proper knowledge of mankind is man;" but in a much higher sense and with much stronger reason it may be affirmed that the proper knowledge of mankind is God. The knowledge of Him is the first step to an approximation towards a likeness to Him as the most Excellent Being in the universe, which approximation should be the aim of all creation. And the Holy Bible is a revelation of God—a revelation of His majesty and greatness, a revelation of His Holiness and Purity, a revelation of His mercy and loving kindness—including a revelation of the way in which these excellences have manifested themselves to His creatures, and especially to man.

The Bible is an inspired Book. This is its own claim: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect." This inspiration must be verbal, or it would not be inspiration in any proper sense of the expression. Nor is the principle of a verbal inspiration invalidated by the fact that the compositions of the sacred volume have a strong tincture of the characteristics of the several writers who penned them; for God always works by means, and presses all things into His service. Nor yet is the principle invalidated by the fact that every word of the original document has not in all cases been preserved. The variations, although numerous, are so slight in importance that the sense has in all cases been preserved to us, as with the greatest care.

We must not however imagine as some people do that Holy Scripture is any rival to the Church in a claim to an independent authority; for the sacred writings have been given to us through the medium and instrumentality of the Church. It is the Church that has decided for us which, among the multitude of early Christian writings, are to be regarded as the word of God, and to be studied and referred to as authorities in the statement of dogmatic truth. And it is the Church that is the "pillar and ground of the truth;" it was not the Bible that made or authorized the Church, but the Church that gave us the Bible as the fountain of truth. Our own part of the Church of Christ has always taken the Bible, interpreted by the early Church, as the ultimate standard of religious truth.

Each of our present readers can send us one new subscriber without much trouble, and a great many can send half a dozen or more.

BISHOP RYLE'S PRIMARY CHARGE.

Continued.

IT is remarkable that the two men, Bishop Benson, of Truro, and Bishop Ryle, of Liverpool, were both, in early life, placed under Wesleyan influences; and the difference in the course subsequently pursued by the two is not less remarkable. While the latter imagines the entire Gospel consists in howling the non-Popery cry, the former has addressed himself to the real needs of his diocese in a way that must ensure the admiration and the sympathy of every sound Churchman. We are glad that the Bishop of Toronto in his recent charge, entered so fully into the subject as to show his entire agreement with the plan adopted by the Bishop of Truro. We can

imagine how different the position of the Church would have been in the whole Province of Ontario, if the present miserable apology for a cathedral in Toronto with its enormous endowment retained by one individual in the most narrow and exclusive spirit, had been carried on in the way which the Bishop of Truro or the Bishop of Toronto would have done, had either of them been able to control it.

On Bishop Ryle's charge, the *Guardian* further remarks:—"On the general condition of the Church, and the present crisis, the Bishop seems to us equally to fail in rising to the occasion. . . . We see no sign of any attempt to distinguish the various elements of what is locally called Ritualism, or even of the great party represented by the Church Union, the secession of which as a body, he seems to contemplate without any serious misgiving. Since the publication of Dr. Littledale's 'Plain Reasons,' it cannot be either wise or candid to lump together the whole of those who sympathize with him as simply Romanizers. Nor is there much hope for the future in a policy which refuses to examine the characteristics of a movement so strangely blended, as it seems to us, of truth and falsehood, and certainly proving by its vitality, that it has in it some elements of accordance with the needs and feelings of the day. . . . The crisis cannot be met, as Bishop Ryle seems to think, by uncompromising condemnation of the recalcitrants, and an unsparing enforcement of law, in the present abeyance of Church legislation."

In the course of his charge, Bishop Ryle says:—"As to myself, my mind is made up. I mean to abide by the decisions of the Courts of Law, so long as those decisions are not superseded and nullified by Parliament, or reversed."

On this the *Church Times* remarks:—"We used to think that 'Evangelical men' stood up for the 'Crown rights of Jesus,' and for the authority of Holy Scripture; but here we have an Evangelical Bishop taking for his infallible rule of faith a court and a parliament, the members of which, if Christians at all, are only so as it were by a happy accident. This is curious enough; but, stranger still, we have next the stout Protestant Dr. Ryle, flashing before the eyes of an astonished world that splendid invention of Jesuit casuistry, a *distinguo*. He says:—

'To place on the same level the conduct of the man who, in administering the Lord's Supper, introduces novelties of most serious doctrinal significance, and the conduct of the man who does not observe some petty obsolete direction of no doctrinal significance at all, is, to my mind, contrary to common-sense. But after all, complete and perfect obedience to all the rubrics is simply impossible, and I do not suppose there is a single clergyman in England who observes all. The three first rubrics in the Communion service are illustrations of what I mean.'

We suppose that Bishop Ryle has signed the Thirty-sixth Article half a dozen times over, and at all events, it is now his duty to make other people sign it. But this same Thirty-sixth Article declares that whether the 'novelties' to which the Bishop refers are, or are not, of any doctrinal significance, they are at any rate neither superstitious nor ungodly. And why should not the rubrics which he quotes be observed? We believe that, in point of fact, they are very often acted upon, and that they both might and ought always to be put in force. And so as to the Articles generally, the Bishop must know that High Churchmen hold, and always have held them, as

they are bound to do, "in their literal and grammatical sense." If his notion of what they contain be different, it is because he "reads into" them things which they do not contain, or takes them in some sense which is not the sense prescribed. . . .

In 1851 the Church had a clear, if not a large majority over the Roman Catholics, whose returns did not much exceed a third of the whole. Now the whole thing has been revolutionized. Indeed if we are to accept the Roman Catholic returns, they had 57,600 attendants, and all the other denominations put together only 49,000! We confess we cannot quite believe this, for we suppose that many Roman Catholics attend more Masses than one. Still, there can be no doubt that Popery has made an amount of progress in Liverpool that may possibly surprise Bishop Ryle, but will not astonish any one who has noted the inability of popular Protestantism to withstand the progress of Rome. During the Aggression panic, no town made itself so conspicuous as Liverpool for zeal against Romanism, and it enjoyed all the advantage which it could derive from the eloquence of a McNeile. Nevertheless, in two short years, that is to say, in 1853, Mr. Came had a census taken, which showed what the result had been; and it was this:—

Churches.	Sittings.	Attendants.
Church of England	58	63,279
Roman Catholic	12	15,310

Thus while the vehement objurgations of Dr. McNeile and his fellows had not prevented a small increase in the number of Roman Catholics, they had led to a falling off of more than 3,000 of their own followers.

There is one other point to which it would be criminal not to call attention, and that is the helplessness of Protestant Dissent as against Romanism or Infidelity when the Church makes no fight. Some excuses, we have observed, have been put forward to excuse their failure in Liverpool. One is that Dissenters go more to meeting in the evening than in the morning. That may or may not be true, but the plea held equally good thirty years ago. Another is that Dissenting meetings have a way of migrating to the suburbs, but surely a city which has received an accession of 178,000 inhabitants might have afforded scope enough for these minor sects to hold their ground.

It may now be taken as proved that pure Protestantism is a dismal failure, not only as a means of evangelizing the masses, but even as a means of resisting the spread of Romanism. If Rome had done as well, and Protestantism as ill, throughout the country as in Liverpool, the reconciliation of England to Rome might be said to have come within measurable distance. Such, however, is not the case. On the contrary, the marriage returns prove that Rome has distinctly lost ground since 1853, and it is clearly impossible to assign any reason for that fact but the Catholic revival in the Church of England.

THE NECESSITIES OF THE CHURCH.

THE advance of the Church in Canada for the last decade has not been along the whole line. Our men have not always clearly seen the enemy and much of their ammunition has been wasted. Too many of the captains of the Lord's Host have "abode with the stuff." The artillery of modern days has been opposed with the primitive weapons of a by-gone age. Bows and bills, once terrible weapons of war, have been superseded by the