

throughout our whole country and found its way also into our Mission fields. Its recent Convention in Boston has been a joy and an encouragement to all our people, and the General Convention, as the representatives of the Church, cannot fail to render it their grateful thanks, and to wish for it in the future the abundance of God's blessing, as it has so largely had it in the past. Its work is for young men—the bone and sinew of the Church—and its work is for the Church at large, through the power of consecrated Christian manhood. The "Rule of Prayer" and the "Rule of Service," how they lie at the foundation of all our work for God! May God give to all these young men grace faithfully to observe these rules, and grant "that they may both perceive and know what things they ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

The Brotherhood has won, as it deserves, the confidence of Bishops and clergy. No Parish Priest loses anything by placing liberty or responsibility in the hands of laymen; but the provision is made for the withdrawal of this power if it is absurd.

6th.—All active members must be Baptized men. All officers and delegates must be Communicants of the Church.

The wisdom of these provisions is at once apparent. A man will have no confidence in your preaching unless you make some endeavor to have your practice correspond. The Brotherhood as a Spiritual order, working on Church lines, needs Spiritual men in places of responsibility.

There is no time left me for illustrations of the effects of Brotherhood work,—both upon the seeker and the man sought—though they are not lacking. But in closing I would say that if in any parish there are two or three devout laymen who value their Christian privileges, there is a duty and an opportunity before them to further the cause of their Master. And to any Parish Priest who recognizes that material among his flock I would unhesitatingly say, if you would have your Parish do the greatest good in the community, and if you wish to strengthen the lives of faith of your young men, appeal to them to undertake this blessed work for Christ, uniting with the manhood of the Christian Church in prayer and labor for His Kingdom.

MINISTERIAL RECIPROcity A BINDERANCE.

By THE RT. REV. C. C. GRAFTON, D.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac.

The divisions of Christians hinder the work of the Holy Spirit. We ought, therefore to seek the union of all Christians and for Christ's sake. To desire a union of all Protestant bodies to fight the Roman Catholics is an instigation of Satan. Until our love embraces all Christians we have not divine charity. To desire the formation of a great religious trust corporation in order to gain greater power thereby is a mark of an un sanctified heart. The Church which Christ, the Beginning of the new creation, founded is one Body and is a spiritual organism which is to last forever. As Christ is our Saviour so this Church is our spiritual mother; and the loyalty of every Christian is due, not to any one of the divisions in Christendom, which man's sin's have made, or to any one of the societies which man's skill has formed, but to the Church which Christ founded—the Church of Apostolic organization, doctrine, fellowship and sacraments; and in which the Holy Ghost, descending once for all at Pentecost, abides to

this day. This Body, like that of Christ on the cross, has become by man's sins dislocated. All the bones are out of joint, though not one of them is broken. Loyalty to Christ should lead every Christian to make reparation to every other Christian for his share in the wrongdoing, and willingly to sacrifice affiliation with every human organization to the furtherance of restored union. The Holy Spirit strives with our hearts. The dislocated Body pleads with us for this resetting. Will the opening of our pulpits to our Christian brethren, who are ministers in some of the modern societies, be an aid to union?

The result of doing so, 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 recognize their equality, but to admit them to act as licensed lay readers. This plan, therefore, would not aid union but hinder it.

We must all have patience and pray and seek to know one another better before the desired union can be brought about. One fact is fast becoming common property, and that is, that as the Apostles passed away and more complete provision had to be made for the Church's government, Episcopacy—and especially by St. John, who was the last survivor of the Apostles, and the special medium of communication between the ascended Lord and his Church—became established. It was the almost universal form of Church government for fifteen centuries and is that of *four-fifths of all Christians living today*. Unless we disbelieve in the guiding presence of Christ and the Holy Spirit in his Church, a result, with antecedents of such antiquity, permanence and almost universality, reveals to us the mind of God and his way of preserving unity. Ought we not to heed it?

But our separated brethren greatly mistake us if they do not understand that we are willing to acknowledge faults on our side, and that we prize Episcopacy especially because it preserves to us the priesthood and sacraments, confirmation and other means of grace which to them are wanting. And as a consequence, as tested by the best class of devotional writers and Christians on either side, the ideal of self-sacrificing saintliness and the attainment of a supernatural union with God, is higher under the sacramental system of the Church than elsewhere. What the Christian consciousness of four-fifths of Christians have found so helpful and precious we desire the other fifth to possess also. As Christians they are entitled to all the means the dear Lord left for their advancement in sanctity, and where they now are they have not got them and do not realize their loss.

Let me point out, in conclusion, the real barrier to union. It is not that we Episcopalians do not recognize the ministry of the other Christian bodies. *We do*. We acknowledge their ministers to be just what they claim to be—*i.e.*, ministers or preachers. *They don't claim to be priests*. Surely we cannot be charged with narrowness or illiberality in denying them to be what they repudiate. We acknowledge their ministry as preachers of the Word. *Let them acknowledge ours* as priests, which is what we claim to be, and a reconciliation and union can take place. They need not give up their congregations, but might carry on their ministrations as societies within the Church, either receiving the sacraments from its priests or from those among themselves who had been by our Bishops conditionally ordained.—*Church Eclectic*.
Fond du Lac, Wis.

WHY DO WE KEEP THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, SUNDAY, AS A HOLY DAY, AND NOT THE SEVENTH OR SATURDAY?

BY THE RT. REV. G. F. SEYMOUR, D.D., LL.D.

The great festival of Easter, which has just passed, suggested this question, and we answer, We have made the change from the seventh day to the first day, from Saturday to Sunday, on the authority of the One, Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ.

With one consent, all branches of the historic Church, as they emerge from the past, are united in their practice in substituting the day on which Christ rose from the dead, the day on which the Holy Ghost descended and baptized the first believers on Christ, as the day to be set apart as holy unto the Lord, instead of the seventh day as specified in the Decalogue.

The change is one of detail, not of principle. We cannot conceive of the Church of God "ordaining anything contrary to God's Word written." This the whole Catholic Church as the body of Christ has never done. Universal tradition has never contradicted, and cannot contradict, Holy Scripture or itself. Individual branches of the Church may give the lie to the Bible and tradition, as does the Church of Rome, for example, in the later ages in the matter of the government of the Church. Christ constituted that government as a corporation of equals under Himself, as the supreme and only Head; the Roman branch of the Church has changed the principle of this policy from the corporation of a number of equals into an absolute monarchy. This revolution strikes at the fundamental principle established by the Divine Master in Person, and with parting words to His disciples, and by the universal practice of the Church without exception in the first ages, and in those later days, with the sole exception of modern Romanism bearing witness against itself, that its present polity is a flat contradiction to God's written Word (St. Matt. xxviii. 18) and universal tradition.

The change from the seventh day to the first is, as we have said, a change in detail simply and not of principle. The principle laid down in the fourth commandment of God's moral law is that one-seventh part of man's time is to be set apart and dedicated to God. The detail under that principle was the specification of the seventh, or last seventh of the seven portions into which time was divided, as the one to be observed. The principle is obeyed just as sacredly and fully when the first seventh of the seven portions is kept, as when the seventh of the seven portions is regarded as the Lord's Day. The universal tradition of the Church, therefore, in giving us, Christians, the first day as our holiday, instead of the seventh day as God gave to the Jews, does not in the slightest degree touch the principle of the moral law; it only affects a detail, and the authority is the same which makes the substitution as is that which published the original law; it is the voice of God which speaks in universal tradition as well as in the written Word. To assert that the Church is the witness and keeper of Holy Scripture is to claim for her all the authority which is necessary for her to bear witness to the will of God in changing the detail of the time for keeping the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first.

Which is the greater concession to the authority of the Church, to allow that she can tell us what is the Word of God, and what is not, or to follow her in changing a detail as to the observance of the Sabbath?

It is one of the paradoxes of this enlightened age, that men who boast that they are guided by reason and not by caprice and prejudice and