

of those upon whom He conferred authority to take up His teaching. They are first to obtain, like Him, a firm hold upon Divine truth. They are to be appointed and ordained with formal authority to preach and to teach it. And they are to commend its power in a holy life.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents].

#### THE PROPOSED UNIFICATION OF THE CHURCH.

##### No. III.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

England being our best exemplar in matters ecclesiastical, it will be well to see what has been the actual practice with reference to the Synods of the *Exarchate*.

One of the earliest instances of a National Synod, or union of Synods Provincial into one body, is that of the Council of Whitby, A. D. 664, which is remarkable for the action taken in reference to appeals to Rome. Since that time as many as forty-five such unions of the Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York have been held. Some of these were *legatine* Synods summoned by a *legate a latere* in the Pope's name; but more were called together by the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as Primate of all England, in accordance with the powers given to him by the Great Council of Windsor, held in the year 1072. Of course the *legatine* Synods form no precedent for Canada; nor do the national Synods called together by any supposed power residing in the Archbishop of Canterbury by virtue of the "Constitution" of Windsor. This Council of Windsor was a mixed council, consisting of the King and Queen, many of the civil persons of high degree, as well as of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Metropolitan of York, and thirteen Bishops: so that the "Constitution" had high ecclesiastical authority. But its civil sanctions are the great argument against it. It was for state purposes that the Constitution was passed. For his own ends William the Conqueror desired that the Archbishop of York should be subservient to the Archbishop of Canterbury. An Archbishop of York had crowned the Conqueror in Westminster Abbey; another Archbishop of York might perform the same office for a rival in York Minster. But such subservience was a piece of Erastianism. And while we desire a Joint Synod combined from all the existing Provincial Synods, this can only be done by common consent and agreement. The Constitution ran thus:—"If the Archbishop of Canterbury desired to convene a Synod, wherever that might be, the Archbishop of York, with all those subject to him, should present themselves and yield obedience to all Canonical Commands." For centuries this "Constitution" has been acted upon, and National Synods, or Synods of the *Exarchate* have been held in England. Lanfranc convened five such Synods; from Anselm, his successor, to Cranmer, in 1537, there were seven others; and the Northern and Southern Provincial Synods were also invited in 1540 for the investigation of the marriage of King Henry VIII to Anne of Cleves; none of these being *legatine* Synods, but all convened by authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Constitution of Windsor. There is therefore no lack of prescription for such Synods.

There has been various courses pursued in England for securing the authority of a national Synod, without the Synod itself. And as it is possible that similar suggestions may be made at Winnipeg, it may be well to indicate them.

The first is, by transacting the same business simultaneously in the different provinces. This plan was followed when the provincial Synods

of Canterbury and York were held concurrently, and on the same business, one at Lambeth, the other at Beverley, in 1261. But it is evident that such a plan would be but impatiently regarded in these days of rapid thought and quick execution; and the Synods might pass contrary decisions, which would be awkward.

The second is, by discussing the business first in one Synod and then sending drafts of the proceedings for the sanction of the others. But this operation would be tedious, and again equally might educe conflicting resolutions, nor would this method be suitable where there are several Provincial Synods at great distances from each other.

The third has been by admitting proxies from the other Provincial Synods to the meetings of some one Synod, presumably the largest, or the oldest, or the most important. This mode of proceeding was adopted in reference to the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661. But here again the proceeding is cumbrous and, what is the most fatal defect of all, does not provide proper representation for the bodies who send the proxies. Such a plan may be considered, as the Provost of Trinity has expressed it, "out of court."

There remains only one method which has the sanction of antiquity and common sense, and that is, the inviting of the Provincial Synods into one assembly, thus forming an august body properly representing the whole Church of England in Canada, and so rightly deserving the name of a National Synod. This has been the case in several of the National Synods referred to above.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (see *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1887), "has been understood to suggest a free conference of the two convocations in both houses. . . . The conference would not be a Synod; it would debate, agree and conclude, but the Synodical decree would follow in the respective Provinces apart. Where the mind of each province was clearly ascertained, the Synodical act would be a matter of course."

This is the best solution of the difficulty as regards the Provincial Synods of England. But in this country where the case has no impediments from the legal bonds of a Church establishment, the simplest plan would be for the Provincial Synods to be constituted either as they now are, or according to a readjusted territorial division, each Provincial Synod to have its own Metropolitan; for the Provincial Synods each to elect delegates to the National Synod, the number to be hereafter determined upon, the time and place to be settled at the first meeting of the National Synod; and then for the Metropolitans to elect their own chief, to summon and preside at the National Synod, with the title of Archbishop. This would be better than to make each Metropolitan an Archbishop, giving the president of the central body the appellation of Primate; it being contrary to the genius of this country to multiply lordly titles. This plan is simple, feasible, and churchly. There would be no conflict of jurisdiction, the law clearly laying down the rights and powers of the new Body. There would be no hasty adoption of novel methods, to be changed by and by from pressure of circumstances to the wiser and more tried system of the Church in every century.

It only remains to indicate the probable procedure, of which an example is furnished for us by an ancient National Synod, that of London, A.D., 1075, in accordance the tenor of some old Canons, and after consultation with some aged and experienced men who could remember the ancient practice of the Anglo Saxon Church. (My authority is that of Mr. Wayland Joyce in his Acts of the Church.) The prelates having taken their places in the order of their respective consecrations, and silence prevailed, the Gospel, "I am the Good Shepherd" was read. Collects were said, and the *Veni Creator* sung. After the sermon, the

Archbishop explained the cause of the meeting; formal business was introduced by the officials, and discussed. The votes were taken, the decision reduced to writing, signed and sealed by the Archbishop, and signed by the other members of the assembly.

The framers of the Constitutions and principles of our Diocesan and Provincial Synods have been judiciously conservative, and have followed the best models. The same men can be safely trusted to construct and frame the order of a National Synod. Let us hope that with all the light which has already been thrown upon the matter by the previous consideration of it in the various Diocesan Synods, combined with the wisdom and learning which will be concentrated at Winnipeg, the Church will be guided from above through the great and important crisis in Her history which is adumbrated by this movement. Not to gain political influence, not to procure fuller power to sway affairs, not to gratify personal ambition or afford scope for individual vanity; but solely for the glory of God and the advancement of his Kingdom, may the Church in Canada fulfil her glorious destiny, and march from victory unto victory!

F. PARTRIDGE.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Your various correspondents universally admit that no subject is more important than that entrusted to the coming representative conclave at Winnipeg. Canon Partridge has given a useful summary and sufficient for practical ends. We may well look for a general pattern to the history of the Church, and particularly note the exemplification afforded by the Mother Church in England. The ground should be cleared at once from various prejudices as affecting mere phraseology. Having proceeded so far, even in our newest and missionary dioceses, in the adoption of all the ecclesiastical cognomens from "Dean" downwards, including the whole range of significant and insignificant titles, it is too late to spend time upon words. The two lower Orders of the Ministry are fully provided for in contrast either with the Mother Church or the Church of Rome. This provision has come directly through the wisdom and action of our Right Rev. Fathers. It can be presumed in the useful and corresponding distinctions of the Episcopal Order that there will be no hesitating or faltering steps, under bugbears of fear or fancy. With our Episcopal and Synodical systems clearly outlined, *in fact*, the "rounding out" into a symmetrical whole, ought to present little difficulty. Apparently we need a final Court with universal jurisdiction, save in the restricted spheres of Diocesan legislation and larger, yet limited, Provincial action. The case of the double Archbishoprics in Ireland and England suggest the adoption of this title for each Metropolitan or head of the several Ecclesiastical Provinces. This will exactly, and for popular effect, afford a counterpoise to the pretensions of the Roman Hierarchy, which has dotted the Dominion with Archbishoprics. It is a part of that unchangeable and undying testimony of true against spurious Catholicism, that the Church of England to the extent of its genius and mission should stand with uncompromising front in the fullness of its own Ecclesiastical equipment. We have had some straws of tabular precedence flying from divers Protestant assemblies. These cannot logically or historically challenge the position of the Church of Rome. The Church of England *can*. If she would do this effectively she must be wise in her generation. The action about to be taken is fraught with ulterior consequences beyond what is evident on the surface. Resort has to be had for enabling acts to the Civil Legislatures. It is to be hoped that this resort will be such as to counteract the astute and far-reaching policy of the Church of Rome. Let our Provincial Synods, re-arranged, cover the