

in the article by Dr. Carroll. To admit the Protestant ministers to our pulpits merely as laymen, would be as great an indignity to them as we could offer, and with the present views of the most of our clergy they could be admitted on no other condition. . . . Any idea of a union of all Christians would have to be abandoned if we gave up 'the historic ministry,' which is so tenaciously held by all the most ancient branches of the Church. . . . This branch of the Church says to her ministers: 'I will relieve you of all responsibility in this matter, and forbid you to open your pulpits to any excepting to ministers and duly authorized laymen of this Church whose soundness in the faith can be vouched for.'

Bishop Coleman [Delaware], says that he can not advocate repeal, speaks hopefully of the change of Christian sentiment in favor of Christian Unity, and calls attention to Dr. Shield's "Historic Episcopate" at the point where he says: "Its exclusion of non-Episcopal ministers, though otherwise deemed opprobrious, gives it in fact a unifying quality. By recognizing such ministries it could not help true Church Unity, but would really hinder and frustrate it. It would only make new schisms in trying to heal old ones."

Bishop Grafton [Fond du Lac], thinks that "Ministerial Reciprocity" would prove a hindrance. "The result, unless such ministers were conditionally ordained by our Bishops, would be that a large number of our clergy and laity would be so unsettled that they would leave our communion. And, in respect of our now separated Christian brethren, it would only lead to further estrangement; for it would not be such an open and honorable treatment as they could accept; because to admit them by Episcopal or canonical license to our pulpits only, and not let them celebrate at our altars, would not be to recognise their equality."

Bishop W. A. Leonard [Ohio], writes: "The mere exchange of pulpits will never bring about organic and corporate union between religious societies. Something more vital than social amenities, or evangelistic work, or individual ability is requisite, and something besides personal piety and spiritual, subjective experience is demanded. The Church requires credentials and letters of embassage and a well authenticated commission in the regular army for her officers and instructors and leaders; and therefore it is that her Canon on the Ministry stands on her statute book."

With regard to the value of the Historic Episcopate, Bishop Graves, [Platte, Neb.], writes: "It has proved such a safeguard and blessing that we desire to impart it to all who love the Lord Jesus and appreciate its blessings. From the evident disintegrating tendencies of those Christian bodies which do not have the Episcopate, it would seem to be essential to a vital and lasting unity. Reciprocity, or exchange of pulpits, might possibly be so 'regulated' as not to endanger the principle of the Historic Episcopate, but the 'regulations' would probably be more objectionable than the present status. It does not appear that exchange of pulpits has had any appreciable effect in bringing into vital unity those bodies which have practised it. Its value is overestimated."

Says Bishop Jackson, [Alabama], "Ministerial Reciprocity" is a recognition of non-Episcopal orders. Recognition of non-Episcopal orders involves a contravention of our faith, renders our position not only untenable but absurd, and is a concession to the prevailing idea that the Church is a human society, not a divine institution. A human society may be amended; a divine institution never."

Bishop Nicholson [Milwaukee], regards "Ministerial Reciprocity" as a closed question.

Bishop Brooke [Oklahoma], shows how the canons are but a reenactment of the fundamental law of the Church.

Bishop Gailor [Tennessee], says: "Such a repeal would involve a surrender of the belief in the necessity of Episcopal ordination, and, ultimately, a surrender of the Episcopate itself. It might possibly be a long step toward union with a few of our Protestant brethren; but it would certainly be a complete abandonment of even the prospect of visible union with the remaining three-fourths of the Christian world."

Bishop Dudley [Kentucky], writes: "I do not see how it is possible for the Episcopal Church to admit to her chancels and her pulpits men non-Episcopally ordained, whatever be their confessedly great powers as preachers, and graces as Christians, unless she shall surrender the principle of the Historic Episcopate as one of the things with which she has been put in trust for the benefit of the human race."

Bishop McLaren [Chicago], says: "The repeal of two canons would do nothing for unity. On the contrary, if they were repealed, and if men could be found who would invite, and others found who would accept, the next sad number on the programme would be a disastrous cleavage in what is now one of the most homogeneous bodies in the country. The Anglican communion can do no more than she has done to secure corporate union, unless she surrender herself, her whole being, all that she has stood for and stands for; and no one believes that she will do that."

Bishop Boyd Vincent [Southern Ohio], says: "Those restrictive canons of the Episcopal Church are not conceived in any narrow, sectarian spirit of spiritual self-sufficiency. They were not meant to reflect offensively on 'the ministerial character' or efficiency of our non-Episcopal brethren, apart from the systems they represent. God forbid! We know too well their ability, devotedness and success in saving and edifying souls. But the Episcopal Church, in those canons, looks further afield than the question of individual ministry or mission in our non-Episcopal churches. They are her standing protest (and the only practical way she has of making it effective) against the sectarian principle itself, against the divisive tendency she sees in non-Episcopal ministries as a system. They are her proclamation of the idea and fact of an historic Catholic Church, and her vindication of the Historic Episcopate as inseparable from that."

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME.

By REV. JOHN LOCKWARD, Rector of Port Medway, N.S.

The time has not yet arrived when the truth which is great shall prevail. There are still many misconceptions abroad, and as a consequence many misunderstandings arise, sometimes even between chief friends. And yet the truth is within reach of all, but all do not take the same care and pains to get at the truth. Too many have received in their earlier, if not very earliest, years, some idea or theory on the particular question, which had been born of ignorance or prejudice, and in these days when learning has increased and knowledge abounds are still content to advance such disproved and exploded views as facts of history.

One of these easily disprovable and often disproved theories is the assertion that the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome at the Reformation, and was founded or created by Henry VIII. This assertion is made both by Roman Catholics and by all Protestants. It

is easily seen to be in the interest of each of these very opposite parties to make and to believe such a theory. It reminds me of the time when Herod and Pontius Pilate were made friends together, who were before that time at enmity between themselves. Such a theory is the only one the Roman Catholics can hope to use with any effect among intelligent members of the Church of England to bring them into the Communion of the Church of Rome. It is also the strongest argument which the various sectarian bodies have to use when they are charged with their separatism or life of sectism a schism. It is the "tu quoque" argument. They seem to think that if they can say of the Church of England, "you also are a schism from the Church of Rome," that they justify their position. But two wrongs never get made a right. Schism, which is a rending of the Church of Christ, is always a grievous sin, and its worst feature is the fact that it tends so naturally to propagate itself. If, therefore, the Church of England be not itself a schism, there would be one rent less in the Body of Christ.

In opening this subject it will be of the very first importance to notice that England was not Christianized from Rome. Indeed it is even easily to be shown from Holy Scripture itself that the earliest Christianity of Rome was under great obligations to British Christians. It has been claimed that the first Bishop of Rome, at least after the Apostle or Apostles, was a Christian from the Island of Britain, and that the first building used for Christian worship at Rome was built by a British Christian.

These circumstances are closely connected with St. Paul's mention of certain Christians at Rome, when he was last a prisoner there, and whom he speaks of in his Second Epistle to Timothy. In the last chapter of that Epistle and in the last verse but one, we read: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren." We have the word and authority of St. Irenaeus, who lived A.D. 177 to the fact that "after the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul had founded the Church at Rome, they committed the Bishopric of that city to Linus." "This Linus," he says, "is mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistles to Timothy." Other authorities tell us that Linus was a Briton and the brother of Claudia, and wore children of a British King. Claudia afterwards married Pudens. Then Constantine, the first Christian Emperor of Rome, and who erected the first place for Christian worship at Rome, was a lineal descendent of Caractacus and was born at York, Eng., A.D. 274. So that up to this time Rome itself was much indebted to British Christians for its own Church privileges.

The first connection of Rome with Christianity in Britain was the mission of St. Augustine by Pope Gregory to convert the Saxons. All who are acquainted with British history know that the Saxons, who had been invited into Anglia to help the Angles to drive out their enemies, the Picts and Scots, afterwards turned upon the Angles themselves and drove them into what is now Wales and Cornwall. The Angles were Christians, constituting the old British Church, but the Saxons were not Christians. The poor conquered, helpless and deceived Angles or Britons seem never to have attempted to conquer their conquerors to the Christian religion. So, when in later years the Romans conquered the Saxons and took some of them as prisoners to Rome, and to be sold as slaves, they were known to be heathen. And thus Gregory, who afterwards became Pope or Bishop of Rome, on seeing them, and being struck with their beauty, determined to make them Christians. On becoming Pope he sent Augustine into Britain, A.D. 597, who upon landing first found that Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert, the King of Kent, was a Christian, and had a church in which she worshipped, with a Bishop-Chaplain to minister therein. His