

ence of 70 in 24 hours is not unusual, from 30 degrees above to 30 degrees below, or from 110 above to near freezing point.

"My work is chiefly with the Indians in this place. Last autumn the Indians sold their rights to the old village site, being influenced by some white men, and so this spring were obliged to move off. The land question is rather complicated here. The nearest plot of undisputed ground lies about two miles below the old village, and to avoid any future trouble I made application to buy 40 acres there for an Indian village. I am now living in a tent on this new site, and have men at work up the Yukon getting logs for my mission house, while I am busy clearing the ground healthy, but blistering, work. Owing to lack of funds I can at present only put up one building, which will have to be used as dwelling house, school, and church; this will cost \$1,200, of which the Bishop allows \$500, and a Christian miner has given \$700. The Indians like to come to the services, and join heartily in the singing.

"This is our spring season, and the flowers are in bloom. There are many varieties, and some very familiar ones, but all without scent. The prevailing colour is purple. This is the mosquito season, too, and they are maddening. They are everywhere in myriads, and their humming makes even the stout-hearted tremble. One has to eat, sleep, write, and do everything else that keeps one still under mosquito netting. The work is hard and discouraging, but when done for Christ's sake, and in His name, hope brightens, and there is more than a reward even here in the peace and quiet of His presence."

THE RELATION OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH TO THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

By the Right Rev. G. E. P. Blyth, Bishop in Jerusalem and the East:

"It is my privilege to represent our communion at the mother city of Christianity, where representatives of all other Churches have right of presence, without detriment to the Episcopal jurisdiction of the throne of St. James of Jerusalem; just as their Apostolic founders had a common home at the Holy City. I represent there also the missionary character of our communion amongst those who certainly do feel that missionary spirit is the life of a Church, and whose own responsibility is primarily in the missionary enterprise of the Church of Christ in the East. This society has, therefore, a right, which I gladly meet, to ask from me information on this subject. . . . And there is another aspect of the society's aim, the indirect missionary importance of which I am (jointly, I may say, with the Bishops of Gibraltar and in Northern Europe) very sensitive, having English chaplaincies to oversee in foreign parts; I mean that aspect of her mission which regards ministrations to Europeans resident in the lands of other Churches. Some of these chaplaincies are of the first importance (witness that at Constantinople) in bringing us into contact with our brethren of the East and West, and as setting before them our own method of fulfilment of the missionary commission of the Church.

"In these few words of preface I have acknowledged the nature of the claim which I feel the society has upon me. I have also stated the Catholic aspect of our representation at Jerusalem. But whilst I am saying that we of the Anglican communion share the common right of the branches of the Catholic Church to Episcopal representation at the mother city of Christianity, both as an independent Apostolic Church and as a missionary Church, I do not forget that the throne of St. James has been more prompt than most of ourselves to acknowledge this. It was with true brotherly sympathy that the Patriarch of Jerusalem desired the revival of the Anglican bishopric (in which he had had the concurrence of the Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople), in order that our communion might have representation at the Holy City. And the same prelate stated to me his understanding and acceptance of the

missionary character of our Church. I was speaking to him of what many Anglican Churchmen feel a tender ground, the missionary work of our Church in the three Patriarchates of the East within whose jurisdiction I represent you. He said: 'The missions of the Church of England, when not aggressive upon Christian Churches, and especially missions amongst Jews, have my sympathy and my blessing; we are not now able to undertake them ourselves.' In these terms his benediction evidently claimed a missionary responsibility which the late Archbishop of Canterbury acknowledged. And I think, too, he has (identically with the consequences of the Archbishop's words) forecast some future connection, which the Anglican communion, in days of more intimate unity, may retain in missions to the sons of Abraham, whether Jews or Arabs, a prospect of common responsibility and of brotherly association. The Archbishop's words are so true of the East, and so strongly to the point in considering the relations of the Anglican Church to the Churches of the East, that they cannot be too widely understood. He said (I have but time to quote the leading words of an address of very great value):

"The Eastern mind must be approached by Oriental missionaries. The Apostles were Oriental missionaries. Our only hope of influencing the world on that side is through the Oriental Churches. We must make the Oriental Churches what they once were. . . . Let them rise to the cultivation and the knowledge of Scripture, which we seek, and to a certain extent obtain, and they will fall into their places directly. They are still, I am certain, Christ's great instrument for converting half the world."

I would add to the Archbishop's words the thought that Oriental missions of the future (including, surely, the revival of the missionary Church first planted, the Church of the Hebrews), may be very materially influenced by Anglican Church sympathy, experience, and co-operation. It is an unhappy and culpable misconception which undervalues the position and prospects of Oriental Churches, or which aggresses on them. They not only share with ourselves the eclipse which the un-Scriptural and unhistorical shadow of the Patriarchate of the West has cast over the Christian world, but they have to witness for Christ under an oppression which we ought not to forget. It was hard enough upon the English Church to wait for a pallium from Rome during certain centuries; but what would have been the condition of the English Church, in education, in knowledge of Scripture, in missionary activity, had the names of candidates for the Archbishopric of Canterbury, from the date of St. Augustine until now (for that about covers the duration of Church oppression in the Patriarchates at least of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria), to be referred to the Ruler of Islam, for the rejection of names favourable to the spiritual and educational growth of the Church, and had the chair of Canterbury then been left to the ambition of the highest bidder? Those who remain what they are under existing circumstances must have been preserved as by a miracle for some noble destiny presently to be revealed to them. It is due from us that we should be just to them; it is in our interest to desire their sisterly aid in advancing the cause of Christ. And over all is the constraining influence of His will that there should be no severance, except by His excision, amongst the branches of the True Vine. The discords of Christianity are its chief hindrance in the East, but the will of Christ is its unity. It is most touching to hear, as I commonly hear, prelates of the East speak of this will of Christ, and say that with our back to our differences, and our face to the common creed, we ought to pray for its fulfilment. Their expressions are not those of men who say sweet words which have no meaning. They are the grave plea of sisters of the Church who have been in bondage for thirteen centuries, and they are addressed to a communion which is spiritually free, and is powerful throughout their older world, and in those new colonies and mission fields which have been opened to the world of to-day. They see that difference—and is it not for the free and

powerful to make the first move? But if there are real difficulties of action on their part, there are restraints placed also upon ourselves. The first thing that seems to strike an English mind with regard to the subject of intercommunion between Churches (though the shock is less prominent to the conservative Oriental), is, 'What a tremendous plunge it is!' Is it really so? Or is it that we want time and information for the entrance of a new and foreign idea? We cannot, of course, orientalize the West or occidentalize the East in ways of thought or liturgical habits. But our Lord did not found two Churches, but one Church. And the Church had one creed. And let us ask what normal step was taken on either side, and when, to repudiate or excommunicate the other? We know communion is suspended between us; but does not suspension suppose a position which, having never been denied, requires only to be reaffirmed? I put that thought, only a few days since, to three prominent Bishops at Jerusalem, and they accepted it. There has been severance between the East and West, but that severance was the act of Rome. And we are not Rome. When did the Anglican Church take any normal action against the Oriental Churches? An article of ours says they 'have erred,' and *humani est errare*. So did various Churches come under the censure of Apostolic writers. And have not we erred? Whence arose Non-conformity? But there are other things to note also. A Patriarch of the Orthodox Church said to me (and we must remember that his ecclesiastical rank is equal to that of the Patriarch of Rome): 'I acknowledge the apostolic descent of the orders of the Anglican Church, but I am somewhat doubtful about some of your baptisms. We require total immersion.' He admitted, however, that the validity of the Sacrament does not depend on quantity in the outward sign; and that there is not actual denial of the sufficiency of affusion, by the Orthodox Church. Upon this my chaplain read to him the rubric of the Church of England, which prescribes total immersion, but accepts affusion, and does not recognize any other mode of administration. I told him that, of my own knowledge, total immersion was not infrequent, wherever asked for, in English missions in the East; and that I had myself lately immersed infants. He replied, 'Then such baptism is also valid.'

"I can imagine one of my hearers saying: 'How is it that we hear so little of what goes on between our representatives in the East and our brethren of Eastern Churches?' Let me give an illustration, as briefly as may be, of the difficulty of publication of matters connected with those who are not free, as we are, but are tied by many restraints, political and ecclesiastical, and who naturally do not speak for the interviewer. Some years ago the Patriarch of Jerusalem gave permission to a distinguished American prelate, then a deacon, and to our Canon Liddon, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist in the Chapel of Abraham, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He said: 'Yours is the only Church which has no representation here; but, because of various ecclesiastical and political difficulties, I can do but little to remedy that. But I can do this—I will allow to any Anglican priest who brings a recommendation from his Bishop, occasional permission to use the Chapel of Abraham.' Of course this gives us no footing there, but merely a permission, which has since been renewed as frequently as desired. About three years ago we proposed to the Patriarch to be allowed to make certain repairs in the chapel, as a token of appreciation of this kindly act. This was cordially accepted. The plans were in every detail submitted to the Patriarch, and approved by him. The work was executed in Italy and sent out to be fitted; and the occasion was one of much friendly feeling between us. But unfortunately, before the work was put in hand, a thoughtless English tourist, who held it nearly as bad as coquetting with Rome to use a Greek chapel, said, scornfully, in the chapel itself: 'So, is this the English chapel?' The words were noted. And about the same time a correspondent of the Church Times wrote an innocently jubilant letter about the use of the