

the Apostles time, and that they have been ever since continued, decided that only those who have episcopal ordination shall be admitted to minister in her churches.

But the point which seems to me of the chief importance, and one which I hope to be able to show has a practical bearing upon conditions here in Canada is this: When the Church of England said that it was evident that from the Apostles time there had been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, and therefore none, was to be accounted a lawful priest, bishop or deacon in the Church of England unless he were episcopally ordained: did the Church of England intend to teach not only that no one not thus ordained had a right to minister in the Church of England, but that they were not ministers at all?

Now in our law courts, when there is a doubt about the interpretation of a law, the previous judgments or rulings of judges are consulted. And in like manner the exact meaning of a formulary of the church can sometimes be elucidated by reference to the theological writings of representative theologians of the period when that formulary was drawn up.

As briefly as possible, then, we will examine some of these writings.

Take first Archhishop Cranmer, who had more to do with our prayer-book than anyone else. He did not hold that bishops are necessary to the constitution of a church. When King Edward VI died Cranmer was endeavouring to bring all the reformed churches, *i.e.*, of France and Germany as well as of Great Britain, into one communion, each national church to retain its own forms and formularies.<sup>2</sup> After the troubled times of Queen Mary, Arch-