

the greatest difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same line as our own, retaining *Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance.*" But this was chiefly manifested in the treatment of the subject of Home Reunion. The very greatest and deepest desire for such reunion was expressed. But the *Encyclical*, put forth, it must be remembered, by the unanimous consent of the Bishops then assembled, says, "We lay down conditions on which inter-communion is, in our opinion, and according to our convictions, possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock may be realised, *we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline.*" That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such a surrender."

And one of these conditions on which inter-communion is stated to be alone possible is, as is well known :

"*The Historic Episcopate*, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and people called of God into the unity of His Church."

Could it be possible to declare more emphatically than these words do, before the world, that the Episcopate is one of the things *essential* for the true Church? I know, of course, that attempts have been made to distinguish between the Episcopate as an historic fact and as a doctrine, and it is alleged that the former alone is here meant. But, if people are told that they must accept Episcopacy as a fact as the manner of the Ordination of their Ministers before they can be admitted "into the unity of the Church," it is surely a mere quibble of words to say that they need not, with it, pledge themselves to any particular doctrine as to why it is a necessity. The Bishops of the American Church who first suggested the four Articles accepted by the Lambeth Conference as the basis of a possible reunion, while declaring their willingness to make all reasonable concessions on "*all things of human ordering and of human choice,*" named these four, viz.: the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds, the Two Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate, "*as inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order, committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as, therefore, essential to the restoration of unity.*" (See Report of Committee, Lambeth Conference.)

It is indeed a matter of notoriety now, that there were some Bishops who desired that opinions, similar to those expressed by your Lordship, should be put forth on this subject, but the very general disapproval with which those opinions were met proved even more clearly and unmistakably the mind of the collective Episcopate as representative of our Church.

Such an assertion, then, of the need of Episcopacy as a condition for any reunion with other bodies, outweighs immeasurably the opinion that may be expressed by any one Bishop.

But, my Lord, I believe the witness that our Church does consider Episcopacy *necessary* to the existence of a Church, is even deeper and stronger than such evidence as this. I believe it to be enshrined unmistakably and indelibly in the formularies that we have all continually to use. When the Article, "*One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,*" was inserted in the Creed, there can be no doubt whatever that the Church therein meant was a duly organized visible body, having a Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; and to interpret that Article of our Faith as though it was intended to mean, as your Lordship seemed to imply, "*the whole body of Christian men dispersed throughout,*" irrespective of their organization and of their ministry, seems to me to be using most solemn words in a most loose manner, ab-

solutely contrary to the sense in which they were intended, and are, as I believe, intended still, since the Church has never declared her intention that they should be interpreted in any other sense than that which they had when they were first used.

But, further, what can the restriction of the power to use the words of Absolution, to Celebrate the Holy Communion, and to pronounce the Blessing, to those who have been admitted to the Order of the Priesthood mean, but this same thing? Can it for a moment be thought that our Church means that *inside* the Church none but Priests may execute those Offices, but that *outside* anyone is at liberty to do so with equal validity and efficacy?

But the chief witness is undoubtedly in the Ordinal itself. There, in the Prayers, as in the Ember Collects, it is distinctly asserted that God, by His "*Divine Providence, has appointed divers Orders* (not one only) in His Church."

Further, no body of Christians that does not claim to have received the Commission of its Ministry in direct Succession from our Lord, through the Apostles, has ever ventured to use anything like the solemn terms of Commission with which you, my Lord, send forth Priests to minister to Christ's flock. Those words of the Ordination of Priests are either a most solemn reality, conveying with authority a commission that none but God, whether directly or indirectly, could possibly give: or they are an awful mockery, if not blasphemy. When you use those words and commission Priests to preach the Word and dispense the Sacraments, are you really doing nothing more than any little congregation of Christian men that meets together and chooses to appoint a minister is as fully competent to do? If not, where is the line to be drawn between those who may and those who may not call and send Ministers? Your Lordship did not, indeed, say *what* you considered necessary for the validity of the Sacraments. You only said that you did not consider Episcopal Ordination necessary. But, if once the necessity of the Commission being passed on from generation to generation through individuals who have had power given them in the Church to call and send others,—and that is the essence of Episcopacy,—is given up, I confess that I, at least, cannot see any reasonable standing point between that and the acknowledgment of a power inherent in the smallest and newest congregation that may meet together to appoint one of their number to minister to them. But if such a congregation may appoint a man to represent it in religious acts, I do not see how it can make him, as you, my Lord, make the Priests whom you ordain, "*Ambassadors for Christ*" and "*Stewards of the Mysteries of God.*"

My Lord, you told us that you "*were alive to the evils of Dissent,*" and were eager for the reunion of Christians, and that it was this feeling that took you to Grindelwald. You told us also that you "*loved and cherished Episcopacy with all your heart,*" and that you "*believed it to be the best form of Church government.*" I cannot say that we were thankful for the avowal. We took it for granted, or otherwise you would assuredly not have been where you were.

But, my Lord, I have seen and had cause to feel the practical "*evils of Dissent,*" and of our divided Christendom, far more evidently than it is possible, I venture to say, for any one to do in this country. I have seen something of the character and temper of Dissent, where there is no excuse of an "*Established*" Church for it to pretend to excuse itself with semi-political reasons for its existence, and I can, without the least hesitation or any fear of contradiction, say this, that it is not because your Lordship, or anyone else, declares that you "*cherish and love*" one form of Church government, or "*think*" it the "*best,*" that the wound of our

divided Christendom will ever be healed, or the "*evils of Dissent*" be overcome. The members of those other bodies "*love and cherish*" their form of Church government, and think it, whatever it may, "*the best.*" What reason is there why we should expect them to come over to what we "*love and cherish*" any more than why we should not go to what they "*love and cherish,*" that so we may be amicably one? Nor can there be any real unity among Christians except under one form of government.

The only power that can draw together the scattered forces of those who "*love the Lord Jesus in sincerity*" (and I believe that many of those who have unwittingly separated themselves from the unity of the Church do most earnestly love Him, and are most anxious to serve Him truly; I do not regard them as "*lepers,*" though I believe them to be in most unfortunate error) is the proclamation of some way that we can tell men with unhesitating voice is of *God's ordaining.* The mere preferences of men are the sure source of endless schisms. The Truth of God can alone be the rallying point for true and lasting unity.

It is because I, too, most earnestly desire the reunion of all who "*call themselves Christians,*" and that "*they may be led into the way of truth,*" and because I believe that your Lordship's words, spoken at the Congress, would, if they were accepted as the right interpretation of our Church's position, far from making for union, tend indefinitely to postpone that happy consummation, if not make it altogether impossible, because taking away all solid basis for such reunion, that I have felt it my duty, however unimportant my voice may be, to make this my solemn protest against the words your Lordship uttered as President of the Congress.

I am, my Lord, yours obediently,
ADELBERT ANSON, *Bishop,*
Master of St. John's Hospital, Lichfield; formerly
Bishop of Qu'Appelle, N.W.T., Canada.

ECCLESIASTICAL NOTES.

NEXT year's Church Congress will be held in Exeter, England.

THE Bishop of Bedford is ill, and has been prohibited from working for several months.

THE Church Army has opened a new Training House for Nurses in Marylebone, London.

AN East End "*Mission*" is to be commenced in the rural deanery of Stepney, London, commencing 19th Nov.

A VERY handsome CHURCH INSTITUTE is being built in Lausanne, Switzerland, on a site adjoining Christ Church.

MR. TOM MANN states that the report in the *Times* that he had applied for and accepted nomination as Deacon of the Church is untrue.

THE Bishop of London has contributed a second sum of £200 to the Schools Relief Fund, to which the Dean of St. Paul's also contributes £100.

THE Bishop of Ripon has been appointed by the Board of Theological Studies to be lecturer in Pastoral Theology at Cambridge for the ensuing year.

AT the October meeting of the S.P.C.K. money grants to the extent of £2,832 and book grants to £977 12s, were made to different Home and Colonial objects.

THROUGH a benefaction under the will of the