

given and saved, so that they have no need to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses." Other developments of their system are of a character corresponding with these, making the whole of their religion consist of an internal persuasion of the mind, and of a total denial of most of the outward ordinances, especially that of the Christian Ministry.

*THE BISHOP OF ADELAIDE'S RECENT CHARGE.*

THE former part of his Lordship's address to his Synod, the meeting of which we noticed in a former issue, is occupied with notices of the late General Synod of the Australian Province, chiefly with reference to the claim of the Bishop of Sidney to be Metropolitan of Australia and Tasmania, to which we have already referred. The next question alluded to is, whether a right of veto on the consecration of a Bishop remained with the Primate after he had received from the other Bishops the confirmation of the person duly elected to a vacant See. This point would seem to be left undecided. A third question relates to the formation of new Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania; and this he said had been carried to a successful issue.

The real question involved in the Metropolitanate, says the Bishop, lies deeper. And he asks, "What is the connection between the branches of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, and what the due subordination of the several Sees?" While the Church of Rome claims for its chief pastor the right to give law to the City of Rome and to the world *urbi et orbi*, the various Churches of the East and West, reformed or otherwise, simply regard the Bishop of that See as one of the College of Bishops of the Universal Church, *primus* in point of precedency, but *inter pares* as regards Episcopal authority. England's national independence of the Papacy and its reformed State Church emphasize this principle of Episcopal equality. To a General Synod of the Universal Church alone belongs the power of framing Canons (for against it "the gates of hell cannot prevail") morally binding on all Christians. Of course these Canons can have no legal force in any country without the consent of the civil power. The reformation of the Church of England proceeded on this principle; and in that fierce struggle for religious freedom both in matters of doctrine and of Church government, it may be, that the civil power encroached somewhat on the spiritual liberty of the Church. The appeal from the Bishop's Court in all ecclesiastical cases, many of which were of a mixed spiritual and temporal character, was transformed from the Pope to the Crown. For more than 300 years this has been the admitted status of the Anglican Church. The Act 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, A. D., 1532, made the Upper House of Convocation the final Court of Appeal. "But 5 Henry VIII., c. 19, and Elizabeth c. 1, were Acts for restraint of appeals to the See of Rome; and the submission of the Clergy, and the appointment of Court of Delegates in the High Court of Chancery." In 1832 the powers of the Court of Delegates was transferred by 2 and 3

William IV., c. 92., to His Majesty in Council. Hence the Judicial Court of Privy Council, of which all Bishops, that is, being Privy Counsellors, were made members by the Church Discipline Act of 3 and 4 Victoria, c. 86. This again has been superseded, as the final Court of Appeal by Her Majesty's "High Court of Justice," which came into operation in November, 1875, in which the Bishops sit not as judges but assessors.

Under this system of law every Clergyman of the Church of England has placed himself by accepting any benefice in the Established Church, and it was for resistance to the procedure of this Court acting "by authority of Parliament" that the Rev. A. Tooth, of Hatcham, was lately suffering imprisonment. In conscientious resistance, as he believes, to a Court possessing no "spiritual" jurisdiction over "rites and ceremonies of the Church he ignores the decree of the Judge of the Court of Arches." To inhibit a priest, "a saceris" *i.e.*, the performance of his spiritual office, is not the proper right of a lay Court, but that is not a full statement of the case. It is a question of violation of trust in the use of national ecclesiastical property. Such mixed questions, in which the laity are deeply interested, are rightly cognizable in Courts ecclesiastical instituted by the civil power. There are purely spiritual questions of which bishops are the judges by Divine appointment.

It is late, indeed, in her history for the Church of England to affect absolute independence of State tribunals in such mixed questions of property and ceremonials. In purely spiritual matters, no doubt, such as doctrine, discipline, and rites or offices, the Church of Christ is entitled to perfect freedom.

The principal part of the Bishop's charge however, is occupied with arguments and admonitions to stand on the old foundations, the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which his Lordship designates the immovable basis of the true communion of the saints on earth.

He remarks: It is unfortunate at a period when the whole mind and energy of the Church should be directed to the defence and propagation of the Faith, we are compelled to ask afresh, Which are the first principles of Church organization, apostolic and scriptural? Not only with reference to its numerous and widely-spread branches must that question be resolved, but also the relation in which they stand towards Christian bodies who, in the appointment of their ministry and other important matters, have severed their connection with the traditionary Catholic rule. The question is daily forced on our attention—Who are "lawfully called" and sent ministers into the Lord's vineyard according to the principles laid down in our formularies? In our Ember Week prayers we affirm that "Divine Providence has appointed divers orders in the Church." In the preface to the Ordinal we learn what these orders are; and in the 23rd Article we assert that none others can "lawfully take upon themselves the administration of the Word and Sacraments."

In South Australia, bound as the Anglican

clergy are by these solemn declarations, it appears they are accused of invading the liberty of the Christian ministry, violating Christian brotherhood, intolerant isolation; because adhering to the plain principles of the Church, they cannot recognize as duly called and sent those who are simply elected by the people. The question is: "How were they called and by whom sent?" The ministry of our Church claims to exercise an authority to preach and administer the Sacraments through successive ages, link by link, from the Apostles or Apostolic men, who succeeded them in their ordinary powers as rulers of the Church, Catholic and Apostolic. He adds that "The preface to the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer makes this evident, for the Ordinal was expressly confirmed in 1562 by the 36th Article, and enforced by Act of Parliament in 1566. It was again confirmed in 1571, and subsequently to the Reformation it was made law, A.D. 1662, by the Act of Uniformity."

He further remarks: In the Church of Scotland an Apostolic succession has been carried on, although it be through the Order of Presbyters. In the Methodist bodies the link has been broken, and the present ministry derive no authority from or through the Orders of the Rev. John Wesley or his episcopally-ordained fellow-workers. Like the Congregationalists and other Protestant bodies, the congregation, through the agency of the Conference, exercises the right of ordaining ministers. Wesley himself indeed originated an Episcopate for America with no better right to do so than the Conference to ordain ministers.

In cleaving, then, he says, to an Apostolically instituted ministry, the Anglican clergy believe that they are securing the best external evidence to the Scriptures and doctrine of Christ, viz., the contemporaneous and unbroken testimony of the living Church to the ground facts of the faith.

Sorry we are when an isolation thus originated excites the anger of Christian men, but we dare not surrender the outworks of the fortress raised for the defence and propagation of the Gospel. Rather, "being defamed let us entreat."

Nor are the clergy with greater degree of justice accused of violating Christian brotherhood, by declining to recognize unauthorized ministrations. Unquestionably all Christian courtesy ought to be shown towards such Evangelists, "for he that is not against us is with us;" but to break the order of the Church, sanctioned by a continuity of more than 1800 years, involves a serious responsibility. At all events, the Episcopal Church all over the world, not the individual minister, must bear the charge of exclusiveness and isolation.

"Popular ordination," he remarks "no doubt secures pulpit ability, but it also has a manifest tendency to produce self-sufficiency and a self-estimation which sometimes is 'puffed up, and behaveth unseemly.' The popular prophet is certainly not less likely to be thus affected than the Priest, whose delegated official authority makes him the servant,