

This letter of the Archbishop—rich in promise—many Church Reformers will deem most timely, and will gladly welcome its suggestions. For ourselves, provided only the Mission Preachers be sound and suitable men, we consider that the hopes expressed in the letter are thoroughly well-grounded, and we make no doubt that they will, with the Divine blessing, be all fulfilled. But the Canons must be evangelistic rather than ecclesiastical. If they are evangelists, “full of faith and of power,” minded to preach Christ’s Gospel in simplicity, able to stand up with a Bible in their hands and attract attention in out-of-the-way corners in towns, at a dinner-hour audience in a factory, or a railway workshop, or a barn, gathering to themselves coadjutors, clerical and lay, breathing the same spirit, they are sure to succeed; and they will get a permanently increasing series of earnest workers. It is in Lay Preachers that the Church of England has always been weak. Nor is there any way of getting at the masses, and at the same time of deepening Christian zeal among our devout laity so effectual, probably, as the one which enlists laymen’s sympathies and employs their powers as personal workers in evangelistic efforts.

One result of the Mission Services, as recommended by Archbishop Benson, will be, we think, the strengthening of the Cathedral system. At present, Cathedrals are the weakest part of the National Church. “What Cathedral has contributed largely to evangelization?” asked the late Lord Harrowby, some twenty years ago, at a Church Congress; and the answer of that sound, staunch Churchman was, “Not one!” Matters, no doubt, have somewhat improved of late. Nevertheless, among thoughtful Churchmen not minded to live in a fool’s paradise, it will generally be admitted, perhaps, that in the working of dioceses the Cathedral establishments, speaking broadly, are of little or no use. In these democratic days, when every institution in England is said to be on its trial, and when the utilitarian principle of “payment by results” seems to be gradually gaining acceptance, it is surely prudent to divert some portion of Cathedral revenues into an evangelistic channel.



## ART. VI.—EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND:

### A REJOINDER.

IT will probably surprise no reader of Dr. Skene’s article in the June number of *THE CHURCHMAN* to learn that the Church of England congregations in Glasgow do not accept its statements as representing their opinion of the present con-

dition of the Scotch Episcopal Church, or of their own attitude towards it.

Dr. Skene's views may be collected and summarized somewhat as follows. There are certain congregations in Scotland which, for reasons that at the time seemed good and sufficient, withdrew from their previous connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church. These reasons were: The "primary authority" assigned to the Scotch Communion Office; and the enforcing of a Canon which made prayer-meetings illegal in that Church. That latterly, however, in consequence of two pamphlets put forth by Dr. Skene and Mr. Dawson, the Scotch Bishops have made certain concessions to the views of these congregations on the points referred to, which concessions have induced Dr. Skene to return to the Scotch Episcopal Church; and finally, that all the congregations in question must take the same step, or accept the stigma and the punishment of schism.

He supports these views by contrasting the former tone and spirit of his Church with those which it manifests at the present time; by representing the existing position of the Scotch Communion Office as one of bare and excusable toleration; by asserting that the Scotch Episcopal Church is recognised by the Church of England as her "true representative" on this side the border; by urging the absolute identity of the standards of the two Churches; and by giving an imperfect statement of the grounds on which the Glasgow congregations object to follow his advice and example.

These views must be examined; but it should first be noted that the representatives of these latter congregations have from the first declined to accept them as a sufficient presentation of facts, or as an authorized expression of their sentiments. If we are once more to fight a pitched battle on behalf of the Evangelical and Protestant character of genuine English Churchmanship, it must not be on ground selected by Dr. Skene. We hold a strong position, and are not to be decoyed out of it, and on to the comparatively defenceless platform on which we have seen him out-manceuvred and captured.

The ministers of these Glasgow churches owe no more allegiance to the Scotch Episcopal Church than to the Church of Scotland, being clergymen of the Church of England, ministering here under the authority of a special Act of Parliament (10 Anne, cap. 7). The seat-roll of St. Silas's Church shows that 75 or 80 per cent. of the congregation were members of the United Church of England and Ireland before coming here; the same is probably true of St. Jude's Church, as it is of St. Silas's Mission Church. Our position is not one of secession from the Scotch Episcopal Church, but of refusal

as English Churchmen to unite with it, or to put ourselves under the authority of its Bishops and its constitution generally. We do not put forward or endorse the "grounds of separation" attributed to us; viz., "The refusal to the Evangelical congregations in Scotland of those Christian privileges enjoyed by their brethren in England;" and "The recognition of the Scotch Communion Office as a standard of doctrine which they could not accept." We are individually members of the Church of England or of the Church of Ireland; and the question which presents itself to our minds is this: "Shall we become members of the Scotch Episcopal Church, or of the Church of Scotland, or shall we unite, as English Churchmen do all over the world, as Church of England congregations, under ministers of our own Church? We have decided to maintain this last position, balancing its clear advantages against its recognised inconveniences.

St. Silas's Church has, therefore, for nearly twenty years been held in trust as "a place of worship in proper connection with the Church of England;" such worship to be carried on "according to the presently existing standards of the Church of England, under the ministration of ordained clergymen of that Church, and no other." This admirably conceived Constitution may well be compared with an extract from the Grahamstown Judgment of last year: "The obvious course for a church which desires to be in connection with the Church of England to all intents and purposes, would be at least to say at starting that its faith, doctrine, and discipline should be those which then prevailed in the Church of England. Such a church would, until some fresh departure occurred, be in connection with the Church of England."

The charge of schism does not touch us. We are no more schismatics than our brethren on the Continent or in the Colonies, who retain their immediate connection with the Church of England, in preference to joining any of the Christian communities established there. We are not so fortunate as they are now in having formal Episcopal superintendence, though that is not due to our own rejection of it, or lax disregard of its advantages, but to restrictions imposed by a Presbyterian nation, which had good reason to put some check on the pretensions of Episcopacy within its borders. This is an inconvenience which we share with the incumbents of donatives and peculiars in England, with the chaplains of the army and navy, with many Continental chaplains, and other clergy and their congregations. One noteworthy instance is the Chapel Royal, Savoy, whose chaplain has been indebted to the Bishop of Antigua for the exercise of Episcopal functions, because the Bishop of London is debarred from

exercising his diocesan authority within its precincts, by the same secular power which has forbidden its exercise by the Church of England among ourselves.

Those few among us (and they are very few) who were once members of the Scotch Episcopal Church, are in the position of those who have been led to renounce the Church of Rome, in the first instance, because of some one flagrant abuse, such as the traffic in indulgences, or the assertion of Papal infallibility, and who have found afterwards many another ground for remaining separate. It is not by the removal of the abuse which first aroused opposition and awakened inquiry that those can be recalled in whom further inquiry has developed firmer opposition.

Dr. Skene urges upon us, however, the improved spirit of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and enters into an historical retrospect, apparently for the purpose of showing the contrast between the *Punica fides* of that Church in former, and indeed in uncomfortably recent days, and the "better spirit" which began to prevail, as he thinks, about 1863. He notes how the "usagers" (we should now call them "Ritualists") as soon as they "obtained a majority in the Episcopal Synod," introduced in 1755 the non-juring Communion Office, in violation of the "Articles of Agreement" of 1731; how the Articles of the Church of England were subscribed in 1804 for the satisfaction of the English Government, "under a reservation not communicated to the Government, or by which their subscription was qualified;" how the opposition of his own grandfather was disarmed at the same time by an agreement which his new allies, nullified seven years afterwards; how the Evangelical movement of 1822 in the Scotch Episcopal Church was met in 1838 by a Tractarian revision of the Canons, which eliminated from them the term "Protestant," as applied to the Scotch Episcopal Church, raised the Scotch Communion Office to a position of "primary authority" as a standard of doctrine, and gave to the Bishops the power of suppressing the prayer-meetings of the Evangelicals; how these latter, having been decoyed into the Scotch Episcopal Church in 1804, were driven out in 1842; how the Gorham Judgment was repudiated by the Episcopal Synod in 1850, and the clergy forbidden to teach what the Church of England had sanctioned; and how the same Episcopal Synod in 1858 thus addressed the clergy on the subject of the Lord's Supper: "You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to

our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient sacrifice once made upon the cross."

An ominous introduction is all this to an appeal to our confidence in the "better spirit" now prevailing. Of the growth and existence of this "better spirit" but scanty evidence is supplied. Its first token, coming from the same Episcopal Synod which rejected the Gorham Judgment, is a repudiation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, qualified by the utterance just quoted respecting the "Sacrifice of the Altar." Then again, "there was more spiritual life and less narrow formalism in her teaching and services," or, as we should say, modern "High Church" and "Ritualistic" services and doctrines were substituted for the old "high and dry" style. And finally, a mission in Edinburgh in 1875, conducted by Bishop Maclagan and Dr. Pigou, led High Churchmen to adopt the prayer-meetings which had been suppressed in 1842. Dr. Skene also points to the alleged feelings of the southern clergy and of half the Scotch Bishops towards their special Communion Office, and the close approximation of their services to those of the Church of England; but he does not seem to be aware that this approximation is towards services of the "high" type; that the Scotch Office is used in 74 churches, and the "Eastward Position" in 93 out of a total of 265; and that "Hymns Ancient and Modern" are in practically universal use. With respect to the spirit shown by the Scotch Bishops, clergy, and laity towards those English Churchmen who decline to join their communion, abundant, and definite, and recent evidence might be given of the active existence of a very different tone to that believed in by Dr. Skene. If a member of the Church of England "joins one of these ('English Episcopal') congregations, he will soon learn that he can only enjoy in Scotland the same privileges to which he has been accustomed in England, at the expense of being termed a schismatic, and his position in the Church being misunderstood and misrepresented." Which very mild account of Scotch Episcopalian toleration is quoted from Dr. Skene's pamphlet of last year.

But we are little concerned with these things, except when this interference has material results; we are more interested in the principles which guide the policy of the Scotch Episcopal Church. We see in it a practical working illustration of what High Churchmen would like the Church of England to be. It is essentially an organization on Tractarian lines. It perpetuates a dual Communion Service, such as the English Church Union proposes, and Canon Hoare has taken the lead in denouncing. Its legislation and the interpretation of its laws are virtually in the hands of the Bishops. They claim also, under Cyprian's authority, an absolute veto on the election of a new bishop.

The Church Court may advise the Bishop, who presides over it in person, but the Bishop decides and passes sentence on his own authority, subject to no appeal, except to his brother Bishops. The doctrine of the "Divine Institution" of Episcopacy is in the first Canon struck as the key-note of the whole system, and careful search throughout the code will show how strictly it is made to harmonize with this preliminary tone. The doctrine is not held as a matter of "pious opinion," but rigidly enforced. Most Evangelicals will think that Bishop Lightfoot's essay on "The Threefold Ministry" goes to the outside limit of Church of England teaching on the subject; but this falls far short of what Bishop Wordsworth's reply demands on behalf of himself and his brother prelates, and of those views to which they have given expression in the laws of their Church.

What fitting place can Evangelical clergy and congregations, to say nothing of Church of England ones, have in such a communion? In 1826, the Scotch Bishops unanimously resolved that "the time was past when they could with safety refuse to tolerate anything that was tolerated in the English Church;" but this happy disposition did not last long, for after seven years of "peace and harmony," the time that was past came round again, and intolerance revived in the vigorous shape which ultimately drove Mr. Drummond out. Now the clergy under Bishop Cotterill, including, according to Dr. Skene, two Evangelicals, declare their belief that Evangelical men have, as a matter of fact, enjoyed the same liberty of worship as in England, and hope that the Bishop, "without relinquishing such safeguards as are really necessary," may succeed in persuading new-comers to count with confidence on a like toleration. But toleration, mitigated by "safeguards," is not the position to which an Evangelical has been accustomed in the Church of England.

The article under review further proceeds to represent the present position of the Scotch Communion Office as one of bare and excusable toleration, the plea put forth in the Declaration recently addressed to us by the Bishops. But, so recently as 1876, the present Primus, when consecrating the cathedral in Cumbrae, said: "No words of my own can so forcibly express my own deep conviction of what is the *special duty and office* of our Church in Scotland at this time, as the words addressed to the congregation gathered together at the consecration of my own cathedral by the deeply-lamented Bishop Douglas, of Bombay." These words were: "Hold fast your own distinctive usages, and especially your Communion Office, so majestic, so primitive in its distinguishing characters, and so clear in its assertion of the truth." Yet this same

Bishop has just invited us to join his Church, and, I presume, to assist in promoting its objects, on the understanding that in so doing we "do not thereby commit (ourselves), either to an approval of the distinctive features of the said Communion Office, or to any acceptance of doctrine which can be supposed to be inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer."

The "distinguishing characters" and "distinctive features" of this lauded Communion Office are a formal oblation of the bread and wine before consecration as well as after, and especially the consecration prayer quoted in Dr. Skene's article: "Bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son"; the omission of the word "militant" in the rubric which follows the offertory sentences; and other significant deviations from the English form. On this Dr. Skene observes that "in the Eastern Church, from which this form was derived, the Invocation is understood to express the doctrine of a material change in the elements, but the supporters of this office have always maintained that the expression can only mean 'become by way of efficacious representation.'" It seems characteristic, however, of the Scotch Episcopal Church to borrow liturgical forms and other necessities of ecclesiastical life, without borrowing the owners' interpretation of them, as in the case of the Articles and Baptismal service of the Church of England. And Dr. Skene's qualifications to act as a judge in such a controversy may be estimated from the fact that he pronounces the Communion Service of 1637 to contain "no features which are really objectionable," though it contains an offering up of the bread and wine, and a "memorial" oblation of the consecrated elements and other changes, of which Short speaks as bringing the Prayer Book back to a greater conformity to the first Liturgy of Edward VI. and the Roman rituals; and that he further declares the before-quoted Synodical utterance on "this Sacrifice of the Altar" to be "a moderate view of Eucharistic doctrine, in accordance with that generally held in the Church of England." Can he be aware that the Church of England bases her Communion Service on the rendering, "This do in remembrance of Me;" and that the words he quotes are an amplification of the Romish version, "Sacrifice this for My memorial"?

But we have to consider the apologies offered for the retention of the existing Communion Office. It is persistently represented as of limited and decaying use, "confined to congregations in the north," "obviously permitted to certain congregations as an article of peace," and so restricted in use "that there is obviously no possibility of its being imposed on

any congregation contrary to their wishes." It was, however, in use in but thirty churches in 1845; these had increased to forty-four churches in 1867; and to seventy-four churches in 1882. It is clear that in the great majority of these churches the service must be of recent importation; its use is imperative on any clergyman who may be appointed to one of these churches; its introduction into a new church, at the will of a majority, *must* be sanctioned by the Bishop, unless he can prove undue influence; and it may, therefore, be imposed upon the Evangelical members of a congregation in spite of their resistance. Evangelical Churchmen are thus shut out from these seventy-four congregations, whether as clergymen or laymen; and an Evangelical Bishop, solemnly pledged to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, would find himself as solemnly pledged to sanction this heretical service.

Dr. Skene's next point is the recognition of the Scotch Episcopal Church, as the true representative of the Church of England in Scotland, by Convocation and by individual Bishops. But he would do well to inquire at what time Convocation or individual members of it were entrusted with authority to exercise jurisdiction in Scotland, or to repeal statute law. And if this authority is not entrusted to Convocation, still less is it entrusted to Pan-Anglican Synods. The Upper House of Convocation, having no legislative power, cannot obtain it by taking into council groups of colonial and foreign bishops. If the English Church withholds such authority from its own Bishops, it is not likely to listen patiently to the mandates of strangers.

The individual opinions of English Bishops could be matched by contradictory opinions from men as eminent and as Evangelical as any named. One name alone seems to claim a passing note, the honoured name of Bishop Baring. His advice has reached us only in fragmentary extracts or mere recollections of unproduced correspondence, and counter-balanced by the fact that those to whom it was addressed, and who knew all the circumstances, were unable to act upon it. Yet, without slighting his memory, it would not be impossible to quote on the other side one name, at least, which counts for even more in Evangelical Councils.

Another argument which has great weight with Dr. Skene, is the supposed fact that the introduction to the Canons contains words which commit the Scotch Episcopal Church to an unreserved acceptance of the standards of the Church of England. But the Grahamstown judgment of last year assured the South African Episcopal Church that though there are in the first article of its constitution, "and in other



parts of the Synodical proceedings, general expressions affirming in the strongest way the connection of the Church of South Africa with the Church of England, and its adherence to the faith and doctrine of the Church of England, all these general expressions are unavailing for the present purpose, if, on coming to particulars, we find that the constitution substantially excludes portions of the faith and doctrine of the Church of England." The practical test applied by the Privy Council showed that "in England the standard is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted. In South Africa it is the formularies as they may be construed without the interpretation." In consequence, "in the Church of South Africa a clergyman preaching (Mr. Gorham's) doctrines may find himself presented for, and found guilty of, heresy."

The Scotch Episcopal Church utters an abundance of these "general expressions;" but, like the South African Church, it is careful to nullify them by repudiating the judgments of the English Church Courts, and therefore the English Church's interpretation of its standards. In the introduction to the Canons of 1863 we read: "In this character, being in full communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, and adopting as a standard of her faith the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, as received in that Church, she (the Episcopal Church in Scotland) claims the authority which, according to the thirty-fourth of those Articles, belongs to 'every particular or national Church, to ordain, change, or abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.'" Dr. Skene quotes the first half of this, laying special emphasis on the words "*as received in that Church,*" and adding: "The Church thus explicitly receives them as they are interpreted by the Church of England, and accepts them without qualification." But the words which follow that clause, and which are omitted in Dr. Skene's quotation, constitute a "qualification," and a serious one. The late Bishop Mackarness, when representing the Scottish Episcopal Church at the Newcastle Church Congress, advanced this as an argument justifying the retention of the Scotch Communion Office, which is used at an "altar," orders an "offering up" of the bread and wine, changes "one oblation" into "own oblation," a "memory of His death" into a "memorial of His death and sacrifice," directs the offering of the consecrated elements as a "memorial," prays that the bread and wine may "*become* the body and blood" of Christ, brings back the offering of ourselves to the Consecration Prayer, omits the word "militant," and the last part of the words with which the bread and wine are delivered to the communicants, and reserves the consecrated elements. It may

be noted that the same prelate, on being transformed from a Staffordshire Vicar to a Scottish Bishop, adopted a mode of confirming taken from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., in preference to that in the Book of Common Prayer.

It is true, then, that the Scotch Bishops say: "The standards of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Church of England are the same"; but we are unable to reconcile this statement with the retention and defence of a Communion Service whose doctrines the Church of England emphatically rejects, with the most unqualified assertion of the doctrine of "Baptismal regeneration," and with the repudiation of the Church of England's interpretation of its own standards.

In this connection, two utterances of the Episcopal Synod require explanation :

On the Lord's Supper.—" You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross."

And on Baptism.—" We (the Bishops of the Church) declare that we do not consider the sentence in the case referred to (the Gorham case) as having any authority to bind us, or to modify in any way the doctrines which we and the Episcopal Church in Scotland hold, and have always taught, respecting the nature of Baptismal Grace. . . . We declare, then, that we teach, and always have taught, and we entreat, and to the extent of our Episcopal authority do enjoin you, brethren, severally to teach . . . that every child baptized according to that Office is then and there 'regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.' . . . 'In my Baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.' . . . All the preceding statements, reverend brethren, we teach, and, by the authority committed to us, we enjoin you to teach to the flocks under your charge, in their plain, and natural, and grammatical sense, without the intervention of any hypothesis—charitable or otherwise."

Dr. Skene classes this latter utterance with the " numerous protests drawn forth from the High Church party in England," ignoring the fact that it emanates from the College of Bishops, with whom rest the interpretation and enforcing of the doctrines of their Church, and who have power, under their Canons, to admonish, suspend, deprive, and degrade from orders. Capetown, Colombo, Grahamstown, will suffice to show that modern Anglican Bishops are not slack to assert

and to use these powers, if once conceded to them, or supposed to be so. There is no reasonable ground of comparison between such authoritative utterance and formal sanction of false doctrine, and the impunity enjoyed by the Ritualists, not only without lawful authority, but also in open defiance of it.

Finally, Dr. Skene undertakes to state the "grounds of objection" in virtue of which "the two Glasgow congregations have peremptorily refused to join their brethren in either uniting themselves to the Church, or entering into a Concordat" similar to that made between St. Thomas's, Edinburgh, and Bishop Cotterill. He specifies the two originally put forward by himself, and pronounces them untenable; adding, "It is probably due to this being apparent to themselves that two other grounds have since been urged: viz., That the Scotch Episcopal Church protested against the Gorham judgment in 1850, and that the 'Declaration' is merely the opinion of individual Bishops, and has no authoritative or permanent character." Objections which he pronounces to be equally untenable. But he will find the first of these strongly urged in the well-known pamphlet issued by us in 1876, and the second in our Chairman's acknowledgment of the Bishop's Declaration. Naturally, the Bishops offered concessions only on those points on which Dr. Skene's pamphlet, without any mandate from us, asked for concessions; and, as naturally, our Chairman examined these concessions critically; but Dr. Skene overlooks the following sentence: "These are not the only fundamental principles of the Scotch Episcopal Church which are repugnant, I am sure, to English Episcopalians."

The present writer's reply, dated two days earlier than the Chairman's, and addressed to him, was a protest against Dr. Skene's attempt to minimize the differences between the two Churches, and an epitome of those matters which would require to be adjusted before Evangelical Churchmen could recognise the Scotch Episcopal Church as adequately representing their own. It was as follows:

GLASGOW, *December 19, 1882.*

DEAR MR. BURNS,

I have received a declaration emanating from the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and intended to satisfy the scruples of those members of the Church of England who may be desirous of connecting themselves with the Church in question, but object to sign certain of its Canons.

The document to which I refer is a very imperfect and unsatisfactory representation of the differences, in doctrine, discipline, and government, which exist between that Church and the Church of England; and I should on this ground alone feel that a discussion of the subject had been raised on a false issue.

But, beyond this, I have no intention of leaving the Church of England; and no amount of assurances and explanations from other bodies would induce me to take any such step, so long as that Church maintains its distinctively Evangelical and Protestant character.

For your information, however, and for the benefit of any who may wish for a fuller explanation of my views on the subject, I address to you, as Chairman of the Association which unites the Church of England congregations in Scotland, this brief memorandum of certain considerations which I would venture to commend to members of that body who may contemplate seceding from it.

It appears to me that the declaration to which I have referred invites Evangelical clergymen of the Church of England to occupy in the Scottish Episcopal Church a position analogous to that of Ritualistic clergymen in the Church of England.

The Ritualist in the Church of England (in it, but not of it) teaches doctrines which are repudiated and denounced by the Court of Final Appeal ; himself repudiates and denounces the fundamental doctrines of his Church ; and may be deprived of his charge if the law be enforced against him. He enjoys at best a precarious toleration.

The Evangelical in the Scottish Episcopal Church is in a like ignominious position. He teaches regarding Baptism (for instance) doctrines which his highest Court of Appeal has formally condemned and forbidden ; he condemns doctrines and practices concerning the Lord's Supper which his Church sanctions and fosters ; and consequently he holds a position from which his Bishops can oust him at will. It is he, in this case, who enjoys a precarious toleration.

I might enumerate and dilate upon many other grounds of objection to the fundamental principles and established practice of the Scottish Episcopal Church—its assertion of the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, its repudiation of non-episcopal ordination, its adoption of Cyprian's ultra-episcopal maxim, its method of electing Bishops, its mode of enacting Canons, its interpretation of the Prayer Book, its autocratic Church Courts, its sacerdotal Communion Service, its altars, its sacrificing priesthood, its assumption of illegal titles, its self-conferred territorial jurisdiction, its present repudiation of bygone reassuring declarations—but I content myself with one comprehensive ground for refusing to enter the Scottish Episcopal Communion.

I regard the Declaration which has been forwarded to me as an attempt to commit me, and others who share my position and views, to what has been called "Anglicanism ;" that is, an attempt to force upon members of our Church, when outside of England, a specious imitation of our own Church, in which, however, immunity and encouragement are secured for doctrines and practices which are illegal at home, and loyal Churchmen are deprived of the safeguards against sacerdotalism and ultra-episcopalianism which at home they still possess.

My answer to the Declaration is, therefore, as follows : I am a member and a clergyman of the Church of England ; I have the right to retain that position wherever I may find myself ; that right has recently been reaffirmed and practically enforced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Grahamstown Judgment ; that right has been expressly reserved to me by law when resident in Scotland ; that right is carefully recognised and safeguarded in the "Constitution" of the Church (St. Silas's, Glasgow) of which I am Incumbent ; and the right thus secured to me by the laws of the Church and realm to which I belong, I intend, with God's help, to maintain so long as the Divine Providence which, in my judgment, guided me to this difficult but honourable post, shall enable me to retain it.

Trusting to have your sympathy and support in this determination,  
I remain, dear Mr. BURNS,

Yours faithfully,

FREDERIC PEAKE, M.A., LL.D.,  
Incumbent of St. Silas's (Church of England),  
Glasgow.

The Vestries of the Glasgow Churches, first separately and then unitedly, discussed the whole question, and came to the conclusion that neither Declaration nor Concordat afforded a suitable basis for a business-like arrangement. The Declaration offers an opinion, differing from our own, as to the effect of signing the Scotch Canons, and leaves untouched many grave questions in dispute. The Concordat scheme proposed isolated agreements between individual congregations and individual Bishops; dependent for acceptance and continuance on the goodwill and the tenure of office of each separate Bishop; not binding on the Scotch Episcopal Church in its corporate capacity; and making no provision for new congregations of members of the Church of England who might object to corporate union with the Scotch Episcopal Church.

We, therefore, embodied our views in two resolutions which represent the attitude of the Glasgow congregations:

I. That a corporate union of the Church of England congregations in Scotland with the Scotch Episcopal Church on the basis of the Bishops' Declaration is not desirable.

II. That, as members of the Church of England, we shall be prepared to recommend to the congregations which we represent, any proposal for union involving the acceptance by the Scotch Episcopal Church of the standards of our Church with regard to faith, doctrine, and worship, as they have been or may hereafter be interpreted by our own Church Courts.

We feel that the second of these resolutions offers to the Scotch Episcopal Church an opportunity for stating what it means when it professes to adopt the standards of the Church of England. We want to know whether it desires to be a *bonâ fide* representative of the Church of England so far as the Presbyterian constitution of Scotland and the good faith of England will permit; or whether it is to be another Cape-town Church, *plus* a Communion Service, which we will no more tolerate in the Church to which we belong, than we will tolerate the perhaps less objectionable service proposed by the English Church Union. We offer to the Scotch Episcopal Church an opportunity for clearing up doubts and objections which remain in spite, or even because, of the ambiguities in the Declaration. We have, therefore, placed these resolutions in the hands of the Scotch Bishops—and we are waiting for an answer.

FREDERIC PEAKE.

