

drinking. Together with this, it can be shown that there has been "an upward trend of the consequences of drink"—viz., an increase of "accidental deaths and suicides, lunacy and common crimes, and, notably, . . . a definite increase in the percentage of conscripts refused as unfit for service" (Article 181).

The figures given for France are as follows: In 1830 the consumption of proof spirits (containing 50 per cent. of alcohol) was 2·2 litres per head of the population; then 21 per cent. of the conscripts were rejected. In 1890 the consumption of spirits had risen to 10·16 litres per head, and the rejections of conscripts to nearly 32 per cent.

On the other hand, as is well known, the consumption of spirits in Norway and Sweden has in recent years very materially declined, largely owing to the introduction of the "Gothenburg system." The figures for Sweden are most remarkable. In 1830 the consumption of spirits containing 50 per cent. alcohol was actually 46 litres per head. In 1890 this had decreased to 6 litres per head. The percentage of rejection of conscripts in 1845 was 34·46; in 1885 it had declined to 19·61.

The final paragraph of this section is suggestive, if laconic: "The Committee cannot but commend these facts to the most serious attention of the Government."

The remaining sections of the Report deal with such subjects as the "Depletion of Rural Districts by the Exodus of the Best Types"; "Alleged Tendencies of Superior Stocks in all Classes towards a Diminished Rate of Reproduction"; conditions attending the "Life of the Juvenile Population," etc.

But the consideration of these must be left over to another article.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

ART. VII.—THE MONTH.

THE visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Canada and the United States bids fair to realize the best hopes which were entertained of its results. The Archbishop, of course, has everywhere been most cordially and respectfully received, and his addresses have been marked by a sympathetic wisdom which cannot but produce both a kindly and a useful impression. Among his most striking observations were some which urged upon the attention of Canadian Churchmen the consideration that if the English Church at the present day is

flourishing and extending, this must be ascribed in great measure to the wisdom with which its foundations were originally laid. He dwelt, we read in the *Guardian* (September 21), "on the incalculable debt which we of to-day owe to the men who in far-off ages laid the foundations wisely and well, and bidding us in our new country—which he doubted not had a splendid history, only it was as yet unwritten and unmade—lay our foundations equally wisely and equally well." This is a warning peculiarly necessary in Churches so open to the attraction of new experiments and new departures as those of the New World, and of the new worlds of our Colonies; and in the future they may have incalculable reason to be thankful for having been so closely bound up from the first with the foundations and the traditions of the Church of England. It is by this connection that they are united by indissoluble links with the Church of the Primitive Centuries, and their stability alike in doctrine and in practice will mainly depend upon the degree in which this connection is maintained. The genial and wise influence of the Archbishop, in his personal intercourse with the Churches and congregations in communion with the See of Canterbury, will, we may be confident, deepen this connection, and bring it home to the consciousness of our fellow Churchmen abroad. As the Archbishop said in a sermon at Toronto, there is something grander than the Imperial idea, and that is the idea of a "conversation" or "citizenship," of which the life is in heaven, and which is destined to extend on earth as widely as the heaven itself.

We may hope that in this intercourse with the vigorous life of the New World the Archbishop will find some relaxation from the strain which the controversies of the Church at home have in reserve for him, even if he should not be taken at his word, and asked to arbitrate in the controversies of the Scottish Churches. The Royal Commission is to resume its sittings this month, and in anticipation of them preparations are on foot to urge upon the Archbishop, immediately on his return, the main contention at issue in the Church in respect to the Ornaments Rubric. Lord Halifax, through the English Church Union, has invited signatures to a memorial which marks a new departure in the policy of the Union, as it asserts that the charge of disobedience to the law of the Church "lies rather against those who neglect to wear the vestments" than against those who use them. "Were such a memorial," he says, "to be signed by some 6,000 or 7,000 of the clergy, and presented to His Grace the Archbishop when the Commission resumes its sittings in October, it could not fail to have weight with the members of the Commission, with Parliament, and in the

country generally." It will be useful, perhaps, to quote this memorial in full :

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

The undersigned Clergy desire to represent :

(1) That, though a desire is understood to exist that complaints touching neglect and defect in the observance of the Rubrics should be laid before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, as well as complaints in regard to the alleged use of excessive Ceremonial, it has not been the practice of the undersigned to bring accusations against their brethren in the past, and that they do not intend to do so in the future.

(2) That, without departing from this rule of conduct, they conceive that under present circumstances it is their duty to say that the obligation of conforming to the ceremonial law of the Church of England imposes upon the Clergy the duty of observing the provisions of the Ornaments Rubric, and that the charge of disobedience to the law of the Church in one most important respect, namely, the use of the vestments prescribed by the Ornaments Rubric, lies rather against those who neglect to wear them than against those who conform their practice to its provisions.

(3) That the undersigned believe your Grace will wish, in justice to some thousands of the Clergy, to put before the Commissioners their conscientious conviction that the standard by which the Ceremonial of the Church of England must be judged is to be found in the provisions expressed or implied by the Ornaments Rubric, and that loyalty to the Church of England compels them to repudiate the competence of any such tribunal as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to overrule the plain meaning of the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, or to interpret and determine the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.

It appears, however, that this memorial has not met with the unanimous support of those to whom it was addressed. The Rev. T. A. Lacey and the Rev. E. G. Wood, of Cambridge, have written to say that "it is believed that many clergy, while approving the purpose of the English Church Union declaration, would prefer one differently worded. . . . In particular, while the English Church Union declaration could hardly be signed by any priest who did not himself wear the Eucharistic vestments, the accompanying declaration appeals to that much larger number of the clergy who, while believing the use of the vestments to be right, are for various reasons restrained from actually using them. It is hoped that the aggregate of signatures to the two declarations may thus be larger than would be the case if only one were in circulation." This declaration, however, introduces several other points of controversy, and will hardly tend to maintain a united front among Lord Halifax's followers. It is as follows :

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

"We, the undersigned clergy of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, in view of the recent appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into alleged disorders in the Church in these two provinces, desire respectfully to approach your Grace and to represent :

"I.—1. That the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England indicate the intention of the Church to retain the same kind of ceremonial which prevailed down to the middle of the sixteenth century.

"2. That this kind of ceremonial having been revived and brought into use during the last fifty years, has been wrongly attacked as unlawful.

"II.—1. That neither the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, nor any other tribunal deriving its authority directly or indirectly from Parliament, is a court of competent jurisdiction for regulating the ceremonial of the Church, whether by interpretation of rubrics or otherwise.

"2. That no interpretation of rubric or formulary which is not in general harmony with the law, customs, and traditions of the whole Catholic Church of Christ is permissible.

"III. That we do not ask for toleration, but claim that the clergy who use such ceremonial as is indicated above should be recognised by their lordships, the Bishops of these provinces, as the law-abiding clergy who walk orderly and keep the law."

Meanwhile, an eminent representative of the old and historic High Church party has put forth a remarkable repudiation of the claims thus put forward for the Catholicity or legality either of the vestments or of the characteristic practices of Ritualism. Starting from the Dean of Canterbury's appeal at the Bristol Church Congress, in the spirit of Jewel, to the first six centuries as the test of true Catholicity, Canon Meyrick has examined the Ritualistic claims by that test, and shows that they can none of them stand it. "The conclusion," he says, "from our examination is that neither the ceremonies, nor the practices, nor the doctrines urged upon the Church of England by the Ritualists can derive any sanction from the ceremonies, practices, and doctrines of the Primitive centuries. They are Medieval, not Primitive; Papal, not Catholic. We have already found that these ceremonials, practices, and doctrines can find no justification in the practice and teaching of the Highest Churchmen in the three centuries subsequent to the Reformation. They are the product of the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, and their adoption would be, and is intended to be, a betrayal of the position which the Church of England holds in Christendom, and a return to the evil estate from which we were delivered at the Reformation." He and the Dean of Canterbury have joined in issuing on these lines "An Appeal from the New to the True Catholics," which is being widely circulated. The following passage from the Dean of Canterbury's Preface states summarily the main point at issue:

"Bishop Beveridge, who knew the Primitive Church with exceptional breadth and thoroughness, made the following statement in the dedication to Archbishop Sancroft in 1678 of his edition of the 'Apostolical Canons': 'How great,' he says, 'is the harmony between the Primitive Church and

that over which you preside is not unknown to anyone who is but moderately versed in their respective dogmas and rites, least of all to one so fully acquainted with them as yourself. It is, indeed, so great that almost the only distinction between the two Churches is that of time. In both there is the same order of Government, the same Faith, the same number of Sacraments, and the same form of administering them. There are, moreover, the same Rites, the same Laws, the same Feasts and Fasts; in short, all things in the two Churches are held, established and preached in such identity, that the Anglican Church may justly and deservedly be regarded as the Primitive Church revived in these last times.' That was the ideal of all great English Churchmen till within the last fifty years. In the conviction of Beveridge, the faith and the order of the Anglican Church as it existed in his time, with its Scriptural doctrines and its sober ceremonies, reproduced the very image of the Primitive Church. That image and that ideal we are now urged to exchange for those of the Church of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when it was already groaning under abuses which led to a demand from its own children for a reform 'in head and members.' In resisting this movement we appeal, not to late or mere Protestant authorities, but to the same authorities to which every great English Churchman made his appeal down to the time of Dr. Newman—to the old Fathers and the six primitive centuries. It is a liberal appeal, and an appeal to the only historic catholicity. It calls upon all faithful sons of the Reformed Church of England to do their utmost to prevent the fair image of primitive faith and practice, which their Church has hitherto presented, from being disfigured by the introduction of vestments, ceremonies, and doctrines, which are associated only with ages of corrupted faith and of superstitious practice."

Such are the issues which are being brought to a head before the Commission, and with which the Archbishop will be asked to deal on his return to England. They are very grave, but they are inevitable, and the time has come when they must be decided.

Notices of Books.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Edited by A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D. Sometime Master of University College, Durham. Cambridge: The University Press. Pp. xiii+152. 1s. 6d.

A very useful commentary on 2 Corinthians was contributed to this series by Chancellor Lias in 1879. In the absence of any intimation to the contrary on the part of the general editor, we presume that it is still procurable, and observe several quotations from its notes in the present work. Dr. Plummer's preface partakes of the nature of a recantation. He once wrote in defence of the integrity of the Epistle, but has changed his mind "not at all with a light heart," and advocates the theory he has adopted "not as having been proved, but as being a very good working hypothesis for the explanation of some extremely puzzling facts." The