

not insist upon the Church Wardens being communicants? it is highly expedient that they should be, and that it should be the habitual practice of vestries to select such. They should not forget that the honour and good name of the Church is largely in their keeping, and that they will best preserve it by selecting their officers from the most worthy and obedient sons of the Church. Unfortunate selections have heretofore caused great scandal in many places, sometimes through personal unworthiness, sometimes through want of sympathy with the written laws and principles of the Church, or antagonism thereto. Such should be avoided, and only true and trusty men should be chosen whose sympathies lie in the direction of carrying out the Rubrics, and who are rather devoted to duty than quarreling with the clergy or their brethren of the congregation. It is hard enough for the clergy, even when the utmost harmony prevails, to accomplish their work. We therefore urge vestries to avoid dissensions and the setting up of official hindrances, but endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, that the poor may receive the benefit both spiritual and temporal which the Gospel provides for them through the Church, and that God may be worshipped in His house in the beauty of holiness.

LAY CO-OPERATION.

In most parishes there is a small band of workers upon whose shoulders the principal burden of what laymen's work is done, is allowed to rest. This burden, though heavy and fatiguing, and often thankless, is undertaken from motives of love to God and a sincere desire to see the spirit and work of Christ extended more widely among the people, and is carried with zeal and patience in the face of indifference and cynicism which are deplorable. It is, with them, a work and labour of love, and in their singleness of purpose they do not look for thanks, but only the success of their disinterested endeavours. But they cannot help deploring the hard-heartedness and want of interest to be met with in so many who "profess and call themselves Christians." The few that are so engaged are overwhelmed with the thought of their inadequacy to do more than grasp the fringe of the great work which lies before them undone, and yet they toil on. We see both unorganized individual labour and that which in many places is organized, equally impotent, as affecting the great mass of the people. There must be something to reform and something to improve our methods of working. We have unfortunately inherited a huge want of teaching and want of system; and the time has come when all the forces and resources of the Church should be recreated or brought to light, and rightly directed and vigorously utilized for the good of the scattered and wandering brethren, and for the edification of the whole Church. Beside the work of isolated individuals, we have that of a few sporadic parochial organizations in the different dioceses. But no one knows but these societies themselves, what object they have set before them nor the methods they pursue. They know nothing of each other, and have no plan for intercommunication, nor mutual help and encouragement. There is no common bond that is visible to themselves and the rest of the Church; no solidarity in the manifestation of their endeavours, no programme of principles and intentions published abroad, no means of bringing members of the Church into touch with one another and all her activities. Herein is our great weakness: too much individu-

alism, too much congregationalism, and not enough Christian socialism. Our fraternal relations as members of Christ must become more generally recognized and emphasized; and our equality before God and in His house must be felt together with a sense of the reality of our mutual responsibilities and the duty and devotion we owe to the Divine Head of the Church. To bring about this consummation, a system, everywhere concurred in, is required, that is to say, that every church should have its Parish Guild; and every Guild should have the same objects and rules embodied in a constitution carefully drawn up. Besides these a practical table of agenda should be set forth, so that special work may be assignable to every member, and another section should furnish rules for life and conduct, and methods of procedure in the various undertakings assigned according to varying circumstances. Thus a training school for Churchmen will everywhere be established, in which the highest Christian graces and discipline will be cultivated, and the latent powers of the Church brought into open activity for the glory of God and the good of men. The object of having the same constitution in every Guild is that these societies may be more in sympathy and in touch with one another, and be more as one great Brotherhood, so that the guildsmen of one parish may be fraternally commended to those of another, and that Guilds of neighbouring parishes or sometimes distant parishes may upon invitation unite for occasional religious or social purposes. It is useless to think of obtaining any great amount of useful lay co-operation in Church work unless the members of the Church unite in its true spirit and methods. Want of confidence, clumsiness and failure are usually the result of lack of training, and early training is the best; while indifference is the result of want of opportunity and being taken in hand in a kind and unarbitrary way at the proper time. Voluntary membership in properly constituted Guilds we think will afford all desirable advantages to our younger people as well as the older, and facility to our clergy to obtain all the lay help they may require. We therefore press upon our clergy and Churchmen generally, the desirability of considering the subject somewhat in the light in which we have presented it, and now especially, inasmuch as an important meeting is about to be held in the diocese of Huron, to discuss the subject, we venture to hope our remarks and suggestions will be thought opportune and to the purpose.

HOME REUNION NOTES.

HISTORIC PRESBYTERIANS.

By the Right Reverend Arthur Cleveland Coxe, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Western New York.

It is surprising how generally Presbyterians have forgotten the fact that they largely co-operated with the Anglican Church in the restoration of the English constitutions, civil and ecclesiastical, in 1660. If their eminent spokesman and leader, Richard Baxter, could have persuaded the Anglicans to modify what was conceded to be of civil rather than of ecclesiastical import, a reunion might have been effected at that time. The Church of England, at this moment, concedes as much when she recognizes our American Church constitution as differing from her own in nothing of ecclesiastical importance. Her own polity is the product, in many respects, of her time-honoured relations with the state,—relations which involve much to be deplored, but which few of her children are willing to see suddenly and rudely destroyed. We need not wonder, then, that after the civil strifes and the general overthrow of law and order under Cromwell, the restoration of the

ante-bellum conditions appeared to be the only practical solution of problems the most intricate, the only remedy for difficulties the most gigantic, and the mildest prescription for allaying the fierce resentments of the moment. It is very honourable to the Presbyterians, however, that they were able to unite upon proposals to the government, of which the substance is as follows:

We are induced (they say) to insist upon the form of a synodical government conjunct with a fixed presidency or Episcopacy, for these reasons: (1) We have reason to believe that no other terms will be so generally agreed on; (2) It being agreeable to Scripture and the primitive government, is likeliest to be the way of a more general concord, if ever the Churches on earth arrive at such a blessing; however, it will be acceptable to God and well-informed consciences; (3) It will produce the practice of discipline without discord, and promote order without hindering discipline and godliness; (4) And it is not to be silenced . . . that the Prelacy disclaimed in the late 'Covenant' was the engrossing, the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, and exercising the whole discipline by Bishops themselves and their delegates,—excluding wholly the people of particular Churches from all share in it.*

Upon this the heavenly minded Leighton cites Baxter's treatise of Church government as favouring "An Episcopacy for the reformation, preservation, and peace of the Churches." And why not? It was nothing new in Presbyterian statements of their theoretical position. In language too strong to be repeated, Calvin himself anathematized those who could refuse an Episcopate that recognizes Christ, and not the Papacy, for its Headship and its Lawgiver. "In my writings touching Church Government," says Beza, "I ever impugned the Romish hierarchy, but never intended to touch the Church of England." And Bucer, writing to Saravia, the bosom friend of Hooker, expresses himself thus forcibly: "If there be any, as you will not easily persuade me, who would reject the whole Order of Bishops, God forbid that any man in his senses should assent to their madness." It would be quite easy to multiply similar testimonies. At the Synod of Dort, its President welcomed the English Bishops in language that conceded the less fortunate condition of the Reformed in Holland, deprived as they were of the Episcopate. And later on, Diodate bewailed the same lack in the constitution of the Swiss Churches. Even then the most erudite and sagacious of the Presbyterians were of the same mind with Baxter; and what would they have said, had they fully foreseen the end to which they were drifting? A century later, Rousseau, and not Calvin, was the master of Geneva; and the Presbyterians of England had so generally lapsed into Socinianism, in the early years of this century, that it became necessary to enact a special law in behalf of three hundred congregations which had rejected the Faith of Christ. They were thus relieved from law suits which assumed that they had forfeited all right to their property by their acknowledged revolt from the principles of their original foundation.

But a rejection of Episcopacy was no part of those original principles, if we accept the testimony we have cited. In fact, the Presbyterians of England committed themselves to the acceptance of a primitive Episcopate almost identical with that defined by Chillingworth. He says: "If we abstract from Episcopal government all accidentals, and consider only what is essential and necessary to it, we shall find it no more but this: An appointment of one man of eminent sanctity and sufficiency to have the care of all the churches within a certain precinct or Diocese, and furnishing him with authority, not absolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by laws, and moderated by joining to him a convenient number of assistants, to the intent that all the Churches under him may be provided of good and able pastors; so that, both of pastors and people, conformity to laws and performance of their duties may be required, under penalties not left to discretion, but by law appointed."

*Two Papers of Proposals humbly presented to his Majesty by the Rev. Ministers of the Presbyterian Persuasion, London, 1661.