

congregations, the people. The service. They can make it seem to rest persons, or at the best in muffled tones, could realize how hearty service is, to uplift the soul, to attract others to participate in a practical way, and can be made, well, let the heads copy unity to intro-duce out, and speak together; the weak-ly, and marvel-ous voices will be strong, and the service, edifying, lifting heaven.

outsiders who are the worship of our oldness, to witness service. Not an musical service! do not mean that. d-fashioned service id not sung, said such a unity and ring again. And world why such a ry Church in our line to have it, they

here, but speak- a Church well- is simple, plain, e join with such the responses, ng clergyman de-ound which swept egan the responses o astonished him t his place and was e heard and seen it none of them to is' and 'heartiness he one alluded to. hat a ylain ser- It is in such a glory und beauty ines forth, and I all lovers of our labour, clergymen there shall be in hearty, happy ser- l, and makes when ether the house of en.

N OF THE
INGLAND.

ill, in the course of :—I desire to pre- the Church of Eng- Churchmen seems ne Church of Eng- which has never

separated from any Church or person. I speak of this because, while many points of our Church's position have been cleared up to her people by better information lately, their answers on this point seem still uncertain. The Church of England has never separated from anyone. Some people say, 'This is not true;' others say, 'So much the worse for her.' The first mean, she separated from Rome, and she drove out Nonconformists; the second mean, some that schism is glorious, dissent for dissent's sake is noble, every man is his own Church; others, that Christians ought to form a perfect Church of saints on earth, and come out from the unclean thing, and be separate from the world. Now I fancy that I observe some weakness in Churchmen's replies to such positions. When the Church is called only one sect among many, or is said to have taken the place of a Romanist Church, or is said to have itself seceded from Rome, or is said to have been the creation of Henry VIII., or of Acts of Parliament, these statements are rarely met on the historical facts as fully and directly as they should be. And yet the case of the English Church is as plain and complete in this respect as in respect to its property. The strange thing is that popular delusions have been so far allowed to be created and pass current that it seems incredible that they have been delusions. I think, therefore, that it is wise to repeat, and repeat, and repeat that they are delusions. I will name six. (1). It is a delusion that the Church of England was ever Roman, or ever acknowledged, as a Church, any subjection to the Pope, or any other relation but that of an independent English Church (or churches) established by the preaching of missionaries from Rome, accepted by kings and people of what we call England. (2). It is a delusion that the Church of England seceded or separated from Rome, as indeed she could not if she was always independent of her. She was, in fact, so insular that she had no occasion even to protest, as the German Protestants at Spire. She renounced certain mediæval error promulgated from Rome, and at a certain stage in her reform the Pope desired all English who would follow him to withdraw from attending English Church services, and so the Pope made a (not very large) Roman schism in England, which remains till this day in our English Roman Catholic bodies. (3). It is a delusion that the Church of England was a different Church after the Reformation from before, any more than England is a different country because she has abrogated the slave trade, or had a Reform Bill, or than a drunkard's personal identity is lost if he reforms. (4). It is a delusion that King, Queen, and Parliament either reformed the Church, or ordered that the Pope should no longer be her head. The Church declared, what she had repeatedly testified on occasions of encroachment, that the Pope never had any more authority over her than any other foreign Bishop. Civil enactments maintained that declaration at home and abroad in secular actions upon it. (5). It is a delusion that the recognition of the Royal Su-

premacny meant or means any spiritual headship, or anything else than what had always been asserted—that the clergy of England, as well as the laity, are subject to English law, without appeal against it to a foreigner like the Pope; that the last appeal of all alike is to the Sovereign. It is strange in the face of the very strong words of Henry and Elizabeth that any delusion on this exists. (6). It is a delusion that Parliament settled the Church of England, or even that the Church is subject to Parliament now, except in matters affecting personal or property rights. The Church reformed her errors herself; her Prayer Book and her Articles are her own work. The Act of Submission, which is the limitation of her action, is in theory no more for her than for Parliament itself. In these statements of delusions have I been repeating stale and elementary facts of Church history? To all Churchmen they ought to be familiar, and I hope they are. But I repeat, and repeat—the Church of England was never Roman, but always national; has never changed, but has always been herself: has never made any schism from anyone, but every schism from her has been made by others.

UNITY AS A MARK OF THE CHURCH.

THE Bishop of Salisbury in his Bampton Lectures writes:

'The Church alone rests not upon men's ordinances or compact, but upon the Divine unity. In every act and thought it takes us up to God. Its root is the unity of the Blessed Trinity, into Whose Name every Christian is baptised, one in singleness of nature far above all creation, and one in the Divine concord of love, which knows no will and no good outside the will and the blessedness of the common nature. It is unique because there is but one God who has said to His people, "Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else" (Isa. xlv. 22); and again, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people" (2 Cor. vi. 16.), &c. It is united in love, because God is "Love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him" (John, iv. 16).—(Lecture viii. p. 281.)

In answer to the objection that this beautiful ideal does not exist in divided Christendom, the Bishop shows 'that the visible Church for many centuries showed a power of union, which was a new thing in the world, and that this union lies at the basis of all Church life.'

'The union of the Early Christian Church is a fact which is specially remarkable when we consider the discordant social and religious elements out of which it was compacted. The chasms between Jew and Gentile, between freeman and slave, were greater than any with which most of us are familiar. Yet, in the first half of the second century of our era, within about a hundred years of the Ascension, the Catholic Church was established all around the Mediterranean Sea, under the same form

of episcopal government, and with a doctrine substantially the same as that now held among ourselves.'—(Pp. 283-4.)

Surely, what has once been manifested to the world may and should be again possible. But the hindrances, or 'the main causes of schism,' as the Bishop points out, 'are two, and those intimately connected. 1. The intrusion of the secular spirit into the Church. 2. And its correlative opposite, the Pelagian or individual tendency, which dislikes the whole principle of human mediation. The Church of Rome has been the great offender under the first head, by turning her own spiritual power into a secular one, while the Eastern and Anglican Churches, with the Lutherans of the Continent, have been more in danger of treating secular and royal power as if it were spiritual. The Protestant sects, on the other hand, have resisted this intrusion of secularity, under whatever form, by their tendency to it the contrary error of denying the spirituality of the body and localising it in the individual.'—(P. 287.)

But this cloud of misconceptions is speedily passing away. 'In the first place secular rule, which has been so closely associated with the Church since the time of Constantine, has all but entirely departed from it. The temporal power of the Papacy, which was the most distinct embodiment of this union, passed away about eleven years ago as quickly and quietly as a dream. . . . This revolution which has taken place with regard to the Church of Rome extends more or less to all other Churches having a connexion with secular power. We cannot tell exactly how far the change will go, but it is morally certain that toleration for all opinions not absolutely anti-social must be granted.'—P. 287.

As the outcome of all this, 'it is clear that one great barrier to Re-union will be removed by the loss of any power of persecution on the part of the Church. The transference of power to her enemies and to the enemies also of all dogmatic belief, which has in some case taken place, ought also to strengthen internal union. It is clear that the great conflict of the immediate future will be one on the most fundamental doctrines of religion and morals, on the existence of God, on the truth of a future life of rewards and punishments, and on the supremacy of an external law of conduct. A feeling of agreement on these points, joined to a clearer consciousness of the reason of this agreement, ought to drive all Christians closer together in the face of a common enemy. The value of Unity, and of the blessings which we receive through the Church, must needs grow plainer in the midst of this conflict. Men will learn that without revelation they could not even be certain of these primary truths, and that without the grace which comes from the Body of Christ the highest discipline of society cannot be long maintained. They will cease to cling to their mere individualism, and will no longer think it strange that God should have ordained a continuous ministry from above, when they perceive its value as a guarantee of purity of doctrine and independence of moral teaching. When the great obstacle of Individ-