

loyalty and a true Churchman's interest in this anxious Diocesan undertaking.

Its completion and support would impose no heavy tax upon any one if our Church people generally, throughout the Diocese, would unite in making small contributions; and I cannot but believe that if the matter were brought before them and the opportunity given, they would gladly do this to secure to our Diocese the crown of our Church of England system—a noble Cathedral—the centre and source of the spiritual activities and unifying forces of the Church; the worthy spiritual home of all her children, the pride and glory of our ancient and historic communions.

Earnestly hoping that you will receive such a response as shall be the best reward of your disinterested effort, I am, yours very truly,

ARTHUR TORONTO.

Toronto, Nov. 8th, 1895.

THE QUESTION OF PATRONAGE.

Our study of patronage has brought us to the Nicene Church (A.D. 300—700), divinely organized in her dioceses. We have seen that the bishop in each diocese is the fountain of liturgical order and the centre of ecclesiastical unity. He is the embodiment of the Church in his diocese, doing nothing in his own name, but doing all in the name of the whole Church within his knowledge, with her counsel and under her laws (Dic. Christian Biography, Vol. I., p. 540). He alone can ordain and regulate the functions of priests and deacons; he has the disposition of the income, the offerings and the alms of the Church; he alone can alienate her property (34-40 Apostolic Canons, 24-25 Canons of Council of Antioch, A.D. 341). If a priest ministers at an altar without the bishop's authority and appointment, he is *ipso facto* excommunicated. In the matter of discipline, as in all the affairs of the diocese, the bishop has the primary administration. We have laboured this point in our preceding articles, because this diocesan organization of the Church is Apostolic and Divine, and therefore Catholic, of permanent and universal obligation, while the parochial Church organization is neither Apostolic nor Divine, but is simply an ecclesiastical adaptation of the Divine principle of the diocese to meet the need that arose in the Nicene Church through its expansion in the large towns and outlying districts. The parochial system is only one of many experiments which the Church made to meet the more or less necessity that arose. It has, however, proved itself the fittest by the fact of its survival. But the history of the Church shows that, like the primacy of Rome, it has had an awkward and dangerous tendency to become not an adaptation of what is Catholic and Divine, but its subversion. The Church of the first of our Councils to whom, at the Reformation and always, our national Church of England appeals as her Catholic mother, did not have her dioceses organized in parishes, but they were organized under her bishops. It was far into the middle ages before the system of parishes finally prevailed, and then not without the co-operation of the civil power (Dic. Christian Ant., art. Parish). The methods by which the bishops began to differentiate ordination and collocation to benefices, varied in the large towns and outlying districts, and in the eastern and western Churches. At first, in the large towns the clergy of a diocese were canonici, though the name came later. They were a community dwelling under the headship of the bishop; their ministrations in all the churches

of the diocese were directly and immediately ordered by him. Then the bishop began to send clergy to minister temporarily with more or less discretionary powers in certain churches, and then he came to appoint certain clergy permanently to certain churches. In Rome, at least, the name of cardinal was given to these clergy and to their churches; and they grew to be the principal part of the bishop's council. The bishop gave them a fixed stipend for life out of the revenues of the diocese (Con. Agde., 22 Canon, A.D. 506; 1 Con. Orleans, 23 Canon, A.D. 511). In the end a cardinal church was given a separate endowment and revenue, and a separate territory of the diocese as its *paroclia*. The bishops made the temporary and permanent appointments to the churches and created their parishes and endowments. See Duncan, Parochial Law, p. 4. The bishop was still at the head of his diocese and an integral part of its parishes, which were not peculiar as isolating their priests and excluding their bishop. The priesthood knew its function in the diocese to be a joint and collective one, under the bishop, and on the other hand, the bishop as an 'entity sole' was the 'bishop in Synod'; his authority was incomplete and inadequate without the priesthood's advice and assessorship. *Imita exit sententia episcopi nisi presbyterorum praesentia confirmetur* (Council Carth., iv., Can. xxiii). But this Divine principle of the diocese and of the relations *inter se* of its members, was maintained not without a struggle, nor is there any enactment of canon law except those relating to marriage, which required to be so frequently repeated. There were priests who attempted to leave the altars to which their bishop had appointed them, and to set up altars in their own right, but this sedition of the priesthood was effectually crushed (Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, C. 5, and ii. Council Carth. 5, A.D. 390). The history of the differentiation of ordination and collocation to benefices in the rural districts is somewhat different. When the Church was organized in a civil municipality, the boundaries of the diocese were made one with those of the municipality. But in the Roman Empire, the municipal boundaries were not coterminous, and when the Church penetrated beyond into these interstitial regions, in many instances they were, at the first, not given the diocesan organization, but chor episcopi were ordained to give them Episcopal ministrations subordinately to the neighbouring diocesan bishops. This system, which began and chiefly prevailed in the East, was found to be in practice a deprivation of the office of the bishop in the Church, while it was unapostolic in principle, and eventually these outlying districts, as well as the municipalities, were given the diocesan organization. But while the chor episcopi remained, in their portion of the Church the jurisdiction of the bishop was confused and weakened, as in other ways, so in the matter of patronage. When landed proprietors built and endowed churches on their estates lying outside of the dioceses, they claimed the right of nominating the clergy who were appointed to them. These clergy were not parish priests; their churches were not in any diocese; much less in any parish; they were chaplains of their patrons, bound to do missionary duty. The rights claimed by the builders of these churches were from the first subjects of dispute between these church builders and the neighbouring bishops, and when these outlying regions were included in dioceses, this right of patronage ceased, to be revived for a time, as we shall see, by Theodore in England.

In the west, before they became parish churches, the Cou. of Chalons-sur-Saone (650, C. 14) gives the ordination of the clergy and the disposal of the revenues of these churches to the bishop. Gregory the Great, in his letter to Felix of Messina, which became the basis of the Canon law on the subject, expressly denies to the founder any rights except the right of admission to service, "which is due to all Christians in common." Gregory went further and declined to allow priests to be permanently appointed to these churches; they were to be served by priests sent by the bishop from time to time (S. Greg. M. Epist. ii. 12 ad Castor, Animin and others), and Pope Zachary lays down a similar rule in almost identical terms. The I. Cou. Orange, C. 10 (A.D. 441), gives to a bishop who builds a church on an estate belonging to him, which lies within the territory of another bishop, the right of nominating priests, and this implies that a layman would have no such right. We have the authority of Dr. Hatch. The only evidence of the recognition anywhere in the Western Church before A.D. 800, of any right on the part of a founder or any other person to nominate a priest to a parish church is the 2nd Canon of the 9 Cou. Tolet, which gives to the founder of a church the right of presentation, but this right does not descend to his heirs. We have come down to the times of Charles the Great—to mediæval times—and we find the bishop's divine right of patronage practically as intact in the Church Catholic as is his office itself.

REVIEWS.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MANKIND. By Rev. J. H. Crawford, M.A. Price 5s. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Toronto: Revell Co., 1895.

To one who merely glances in a superficial manner at the title of this book it may possibly seem that its subject is of a commonplace character and promises a commonplace treatment. When, however, we remember that the recognition of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man is the great need of every age, and that these great truths have hitherto been very imperfectly recognized, we shall probably change our minds on the first point. A perusal of the volume before us will certainly cause a change of opinion on the second. It is rarely indeed that we can say of a book on a religious subject that it is original in the full sense of the word. There are few statements on religious subjects which can be both true and new; and the author certainly makes no attempt to broach what would be called novelties in theology. But he does much better than this: he puts comparatively familiar truths in a manner so fresh and striking that they almost impress us with their seeming novelty. The object of the book, Mr. Crawford tells us, is to show that the end towards which mankind is progressing is a united brotherhood. This goal of mankind, he adds, is the key to human history, which unfolds a steady progress towards its realization. We are not quite sure that the progress is quite steady, but the writer certainly shows that there has been, and that there is progress, and he makes us hope in the good time coming

"When men the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that."

The treatment of the subject is largely historical. Beginning with brotherhood before Christ, the author goes on to consider the unity of man, the theology and ethical principle of Jesus, and His authority. He then considers brotherhood in the Epistles, the family, the sacraments (with some excellent and suggestive remarks on this subject). Subsequently he considers brotherhood in the early Church, in the middle ages, and since the Reformation. Among other topics handled we find social and political progress, Christianity and patriotism, the Kingdom of God and the Church. To those who may undertake the perusal of this book, we must testify that we have not found a dull page in it. To preachers and teachers we

..... \$ 5 00
..... 20 00
s " 6 00
..... 1 00
..... 2 00
..... 3 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 5 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 2 00
..... 1 00
..... 1 00
..... 5 00
..... 5 00
..... C 50
..... 2 00
..... 7 00

AL.
read in yes-
announcement
al Fund, and
this spontane-
your part to
n's Cathedral
earnest appeal
as a proof of