

what the *si quis* in the ordinations of the Church to-day calls for; and that the Apostles also announced that they by themselves, in their own right, as Apostles, would appoint the ordained to their several ministrations in the different colonies of the Grecians at Jerusalem. This is the translation of our English Bible, and we know it was the custom of the early Church. St. Clement of Rome gives the earliest non-scriptural witness bearing on the law of Patronage in the Catholic Church. He wrote before the New Testament Canon was closed. His statement constitutes the 44th paragraph of his 1st epistle to the Corinthians; and agrees precisely with the New Testament in terms as well as substance. The part in the selection and ordination of the clergy reserved by, as he says, express Apostolic appointment, he designates by the most common of the Greek words used in his time, of election and appointment to office, while he designates the part the rest of the Church took by another word never used of nomination, even much less of election or appointment to office. This coincidence with the New Testament in the use of terms strengthens our argument above. It is clear that the nomination or election of the clergy by the laity was not in the thought of St. Clement. The learned Bishop Jacobson in his note on the Greek of St. Clement, says, "*Applaudente aut congratunante tota ecclesia. Nihil hic de acceptatione totius ecclesie.*" St. Jerome, in commenting on Titus i. 5, attributes supreme authority to the Bishop alone, and adds—" *Audiant Episcopi qui habent constituendi Presbyteros per urbes singulas potestatem, sub quali lege ecclesiastica constitutionis ordo teneatur.*" (L. 1, in Cp. ad Titum). Thomassin, one of the greatest of Canonists, similarly states: "*Comme l'évêque seul a le pouvoir d'ordonner il a aussi lui seul le droit primitif de donner les benefices puisque l'ordre et le benefice étaient ordinairement inseparables dans l'usage de l'ancienne Eglise.*" (*Discipline de l'Eglise*, L. 1, c. 33, s. i.) Which may be rendered, "since the Bishop alone has the power to ordain, he alone also has the primitive right of giving the benefices, since ordination and benefice were usually inseparable in the ancient usages of the Church."

CHRISTIAN UNION.

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
IN REPLY TO THE POPE.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has issued the following pastoral letter:

LONDON, August 30, 1895.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN AND BRETHREN OF THE LAITY.—The bishops, upon a recent occasion, requested the archbishops to address you on two subjects upon which their views were practically unanimous. These subjects were, first, a certain friendly advance made from a foreign Church to the people of England without reference or regard to the Church of England; and, secondly, the recent appearance within our Church of certain foreign usages and forms of devotion. An intermediate occasion arose in my own diocese which called for some notice of these subjects. And I now, in obedience to the request of the bishops, give closer and further considered expression to my deliberate judgment. A desire for sympathy among classes, for harmony among nations, above all for reunion in Christendom, is a characteristic of our time. We recognize the fact. We cannot fail to find in it a call to renewed faith in the mission of the Church, and to more strenuous labour for the realization of Christ's bequest of peace. We therefore commend this call to the candid thought and prayers of "all who love the Lord Jesus in uncorruptness." We know that our divisions are a chief obstacle to the progress of His Gospel. And we accept the many expressions of anxiety to be delivered from them as a sign among us of

God's purpose at the present time. The official letter of the bishops of the Anglican communion assembled in conference at Lambeth in 1878, already suggested "the observance throughout our communion of a season of prayer for the unity of Christendom," as well as intercession for the enlargement of Christ's Kingdom. The Lambeth conference of 1888 "commended this matter of reunion to the special prayers of all Christian people, both within and (so far as it might rightly do so) without our communion," in preparation for opportunities of further action. Similar desires have been expressed by eastern Churches. Conferences have been held between leading men of various communities. Almost all the Christian bodies known among us, including the Roman Communion, have, by their heads, requested that prayers should be offered this last Whitsuntide for grace to attain to so great a consummation. In thankfulness to the One Spirit for these manifold signs of His operation, the whole Christian Church will consider both the duty of continued movement towards the Divine end, and will also mark all forms of action likely to hinder or invalidate such movement. Peril there would be to us in any haste which would sacrifice part of our trust, and in any narrowness which would limit our vision of Christendom. The expansion in late years of our knowledge of the religious spirit and work of the past, the revived and cultivated love of primitive order, and the enthusiasm for repairing failure or carelessness in the acknowledgment of things divine have yielded happy results; and yet we cannot conceal from ourselves that, owing to the attractiveness of appearances (rather than of realities), some things have been introduced among us which find no true place in the religious life of the English Church. Evidence of this appears in the introduction of manuals for teaching, and of observances which do not even halt at mediævalism, but merely reproduce modern Roman innovations in ritual and doctrine. On the other hand, while the stern love of truth is still our inheritance from our fathers of the Reformation, there is some danger lest we should forget that every age does and ought to shed new lights on truth. To refuse to admit such light and its inherent warmth is to forfeit the power of seeing things as they are and to lose the vigour of growth. It is, in fact, to limit ourselves finally to a conventional use of hard formulas.

The aspiration after unity, if it be intelligent, is a vast one. It cannot limit itself to restoring what is pictured of past outward unity. It must take account of eastern Churches, of non-episcopal reformed Churches and bodies, on the continent, at home, and among the multiplying populations of the new world, as well as of the Christianizing of Asia and Africa under extraordinarily varying conditions. The Roman communion in which western Christendom once found unity has not proved itself capable of retaining its hold on nations which were all its own. At this moment it invites the English people into reunion with itself, in apparent unconsciousness of the position and history of the English Church. It parades before us modes of worship and rewards of worship the most repugnant to Teutonic Christendom and to nations which have become readers of the Bible. For the unquestioned kindness which now invites our common prayers, already gladly offered, we are thankful. All Christian Churches must rejoice in the manifestation of a spirit of love. The tenderness of unfeigned Christian charity can never be wasted. But this happy change of tone and the transparent sincerity of the appeal make the inadequacy of its conception of unity more patent. Recognition might have leant a meaning to the mention of reunion. But, otherwise, what is called reunion would not only be our farewell to all other Christian races, all other Churches, but we are to begin by forgetting our own Church by setting aside truth regained through severe sacrifice, cherished as our very life, and believed by us to be the necessary foundation of all union. Union solid and permanent can be based only on the common acknowledgment of the truth. On the other hand, history appears to be forcing upon the Anglican communion an unsought position, an overwhelming duty from which it has hitherto shrunk. It has no need to state or to apologize for this. Think-

ers, not of its own fold, have boldly foreshadowed the obligation which must lie upon it towards the divided churches of East and West. By its Apostolic creed and constitution, by the primitive Scriptural standards of its doctrine and ritual, by its living catholicity and sober freedom, by its existence rooted in the past, and on the whole identified with education and with progress, by its absolute abstention from foreign political action, by its immediate and intense responsibilities for the Christianity of its own spreading and multiplying race and of its subject races, it seems not uncertainly marked by God to bring the parted Churches of Christ to a better understanding and closer fellowship. We know that the unique position and character of the English Church cannot be without drawbacks. Its distinct blessings are not such as to tempt to self-assertion. We recognize them as providential gifts and quiet historical developments. They are encompassed with difficulties and obscurities as yet impenetrable to our sight and effort. But we may not be faithless to them. The blessings themselves are solid realities, which demand the thoughtful contemplation of its sons, and a readiness still to follow the same Divine leading which "hitherto hath helped us." The immediate duties of Churchmen, and particularly of clergymen, are plain: 1. To preserve in purity and in loyalty the faith and practice which characterized our primitive Catholic and Scriptural Reformation—a renewal in which Church and family and individual claim their part—a renewal which courts above everything the examination of its principles. 2. To avoid all that can cause confusion or weakness by either excess or defect. 3. To grow stronger in prayer that the Lord of the Church would interpret to His own prayer, that we all may be one in the oneness of Father and Son, and the Father Himself answer and fulfil it. If it is not yet given us to realize the full force of the prayer, or in our minds to reconcile the assurance of its efficacy with our visible conditions, it is none the less our supreme and perfect hope that at last "the peace of God shall rule in our hearts, to the which also we are called in One Body." We steadfastly pray the prayer. We commit ourselves "to Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." I remain your faithful brother and servant in the Lord.

EDW. CANTUAR.

Home & Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

NOVA SCOTIA.

FREDERICK COURTNEY D.D., BISHOP, HALIFAX.

JOGGINS MINES.—A new and beautiful church built at this place under the direction of the Rev. V. E. Harris, vicar of Amherst, was consecrated on Sunday, the 8th, by the Bishop of Nova Scotia. The building, which has cost about \$3,000, and will seat 250 people, is to be known as the Church of the Holy Name. On the afternoon of the day of consecration, fifteen persons were confirmed.

MONTREAL.

WILLIAM B. BOND, D.D., BISHOP, MONTREAL.

(Provincial Synod, continued from last issue.)

MONTREAL.—Thursday.—The debate as to how the reports of the committee on marriage and divorce should be dealt with, and which debate was adjourned from the previous day, was resumed at yesterday morning's session of the Provincial Synod, the first speaker being Judge Ermatinger, who favoured the matter being referred to the General Synod.

Mr. Strachan Bethune considered that, under all the circumstances, the wisest thing they could do, and the natural thing, was to refer the matter to the General Synod.

Rev. Prof. Worrell was of opinion that the Provincial Synod had no right to say that it had thrashed the matter out and that it would have nothing more to do with it. A great deal of time had been devoted to the question, and now, when it came to a crisis, the Provincial Synod said it did not want to touch it any more. At any rate, that was what a large number of the persons who read the reports of the Synod proceedings would think. He was in favour of the matter being referred back to the committee.