

Some Recent Teachings Concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a masterly essay, reprinted with additions from this Magazine, mainly dealing with the visitation addresses of the Bishop of Salisbury. This pamphlet of 31 pages is full of closely-reasoned argument and telling quotations (Elliot Stock). We quote a few lines from the passage on "do this":

Dr. A. Edersheim concluded his Review of Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians" in *THE CHURCHMAN* of August, 1888 (in which he had spoken of the Rabbinic usage of *addh*), by saying—and they are words of weight from such an authority—"The rendering 'sacrifice this,' which is advocated as 'in accordance with Hebraistic use,' absolutely fails on Jewish grounds of interpretation. . . . It is perfectly certain that no Jewish writer would in this connection have so expressed himself if he had intended to indicate a sacrificial act" (see also Malan's "Sacrament to the Lord's Supper," p. 68).

It may be added that the modern Greek Church does not take the words of her own tongue in the sense of "make" or "offer," but in that of "do" (see Malan's "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," p. 72).

We have received from Messrs. Longman and Co. a new edition of Dr. Mason's *The Faith of the Gospel*.

The Gospel of the Future, by a Parish Priest, containing several well-known chapters on unfulfilled prophecy, has a preface by the Bishop of Coventry (Griffith, Farran, and Co.).

Blackwood contains, as usual, much that is interesting. Mr. Fielden's excellent paper on the Lancashire Cotton Industry is very welcome.

THE MONTH.

ON the 11th, after three days' debate, the No Confidence amendment was carried, in a very full House, by a majority of 40.¹ The resignation of Lord Salisbury two days later was accepted by the Queen, says the *Court Circular*, "with much regret." Mr. Gladstone has formed his Cabinet. Lord Rosebery, we gladly note, is Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of "Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln" has at last been given. It confirms the Archbishop's judgment, and the appeal upon every point is dismissed. For ourselves, at present, we will only echo the wish expressed in different quarters by so many representative Churchmen, "May it truly make for peace."

¹ In the Lords the Address was voted without opposition and with little criticism. On "the conspiracy of silence," the Premier said: "I would express some little surprise at the reticence which noble Lords have thought it right to practise. Before such a tribunal I should have thought noble Lords would have wished to vindicate their opinions. They do not do so. I do not see that this is an occasion on which they can be made, by any process of pressure or torture known to Parliament, to express their opinions; but we are now met in this building in order that the House of Commons may exercise a prerogative which is exclusively its own. The House of Commons has an exclusive determination with respect to men. When the men have been selected, afterwards will come the measures. I hope the men will be found who can agree upon the measures. But when the measures are adopted, then the exclusive position of the House of Commons ceases; and, with respect to all matters not financial, the share which your Lordships must bear in legislation is as large as that of the House of Commons."

Comment upon the judgment by our valued contributor, Mr. Philip Vernon Smith, appears elsewhere. An article by a clerical pen, too late for our present impression, will appear in the October CHURCHMAN.

The *Record*, in the course of a very able article, said :

We regard with grave regret the legal establishment (so far as it is accomplished) of the use of lighted candles and the singing of the "Agnus Dei." We regard both as alien to the spirit of simple worship which our Church seeks to encourage, and as tending to superstition. The Eastward position before the Consecration Prayer has always seemed to us unimportant, since the Ridsdale Case legalized the Eastward position during the consecration itself. The use of the Mixed Chalice is a very early practice to which no serious objection has ever been taken except on the ground of its illegality, and that is now removed. But the aspect of the matter which seems to us of much greater consequence than the actual points under discussion is the fact of the agreement of the Spiritual and Crown Courts. It is an unmixed good that Church and State should thus, as it were, be once more brought into line. The anxiety with which we have viewed the Lincoln prosecution from the start had its source in the risk which it offered of a conflict between the Archbishop and the Privy Council, the final result of which it was difficult to speculate upon without alarm.

In the *Guardian* of the 10th appears the following :

We reprint with very great pleasure the comments of the *Record* on the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Lincoln case. It is easy to be wise and statesmanlike when things have gone as you wished them to go. Our contemporary, if we may be allowed to say so, has maintained this attitude in face of a decision with which it cannot be expected to feel any sympathy. It is eminently true that "the larger interests of the Church demand, and especially at this juncture, that constitutional obstacles in the way of the harmonious working of Church and State should be as few as possible"; that "the Lincoln case might easily have created the most formidable of such obstacles"; that "it is an unmixed good that Church and State should thus be once more brought into line"; and it is a striking testimony to the lessening acrimony of party divisions in the Church of England that these facts should be insisted on by the recognised representative of the evangelical clergy. We hope, too, that no injudicious or hasty action on our own side will mar the effect—in the long run, we believe, the very great effect—of this confirmation of the Archbishop's judgment.

The *Times* (of the 3rd) said :

In theory perhaps the Privy Council might again consider, in the light of new evidence, the questions determined yesterday, even as it has reviewed matters supposed to be settled in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, *Hebbert v. Purchas*, *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, and other well-known cases. The time has come for finality and a truce, if such are possible in regard to deep-seated differences. In every line of the decision which we report to-day may be traced a desire to bring about peace; and perhaps, in the praiseworthy anxiety to put an end to strife, the substance of points in dispute has been more than once slurred over. . . . Forgetting what is past and irretrievable, we look to the future, and are not without hope that the decision of the Privy Council may prove the beginning of a much-needed truce, if only Dr. King's friends do not abuse their victory.

In a letter to the *Record*, the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Headmaster of Harrow, said :

The judgment leaves Evangelical Churchmen exactly in the position in which they were before it was pronounced. They are not called upon to do anything which they have not done, or to abstain from anything which they have done. There is no question as to their loyalty in spirit or in practice to the Prayer-Book. They are at liberty to go on conducting Divine worship and specially celebrating the Holy Communion upon the lines which have approved themselves and do still approve themselves to their conscience. The only denial put upon them is that they cannot impose the precise ritual which they think best upon other Churchmen who prefer a ritual of another kind. . . . The Evangelicals may still fight the battle of truth with the armour of reasoning, sanctity, and prayer.