

THE HISTORICAL CHURCH.

(Concluded.)

And now we pass over two centuries and a half immediately succeeding the Council of Nice, a period during which the British Church suffered greatly from the invasions of the Saxons; and the scene changes to Rome, in Italy. It is about the year 590. A party of merchants arrived from Britain, bringing with them, in addition to their stock of merchandise, a number of boys, who were offered for sale in the slave markets. Among the crowd that flocked to see them, was a Christian priest by the name of Gregory. He was at once struck with the fairness of their complexion,—with their handsome forms and flaxen hair. He asked their origin; and when told they were natives of Britain, and pagans,—he exclaimed:—"Alas, for grief, that such bright faces should be under the dominion of the prince of darkness." In answer to another question, he learns that their nation is called "Angli" or "Angeli." "It is well," he replies:—"Angli, Angels, they are in countenance, and ought to be co-heirs of angels in heaven!"

Though he thus sports with the name of these enslaved Britons, his heart is deeply touched with pity, and he resolved to go as a missionary to their unhappy race. This he was prevented from doing, by his unexpected elevation to the see of Rome; but, though he could not go himself, he had the power to send others; and, accordingly, by the command of Gregory, Augustine and forty monks, undertook the mission. They reached Britain in the year 596, and were kindly received by the Saxon Chief, whose wife was already a Christian. They began to prosecute their work among the Saxons with great success, and ten thousand of them were baptized the first year.

Augustine then held a conference with the Bishops of the British Church, (seven in number, who were forced into Wales by the Saxons) and proposed that they should unite, upon certain conditions, for the further conversion of the Island. The Bishops, however, were displeased with his manners, and looked upon him as an intruder, as may be seen from their answers, which are still preserved. They refused his terms, and there was no union between them.

And now the limit of space compels us to pass rapidly on. Suffice it to say that Augustine was soon consecrated Bishop by two Gallican Bishops, and became the first Episcopal representative of Rome in Britain. This was the entering wedge of the papal power in England. The successors of Augustine, and the Bishops of the Church, continued their efforts for the conversion of the Saxons in their own ways. The growing power of the former was strengthened by the Norman invasion, and culminates in the reign of king John; when the Roman Pontiff in the person of his legate, trampled the British crown beneath his feet.

During the next three centuries the papal power was supreme over all the west of Europe. In England, protests were made in several ways. A Bishop here and there lifts his voice. Laws were passed curtailing the Pope's power to grant benefices in reversion, and forbidding causes to go to Rome; and finally, in 1534, by an act of Henry VIII, the papal jurisdiction was formally denied, the yoke was thrown off, and the Church of England was once more free and independent.

We have now reached the most important point in this historical outline, for the understanding of which the outline was necessary. Thus far, we have seen that there was a Church in Britain during the first six centuries of the Christian era, which sent its Bishops to several of the early Councils, and owned no allegiance to any cotemporary Church, through the mission of Augustine, a foreign Bishop gained a foothold within its jurisdiction; while it shared the fate of the whole Western Church, and passed under the Roman yoke. But this yoke was wrenched off, and the British Church resumed her ancient independence.

We say that this is the most important point; for we are told that the Episcopal Church takes its beginning from this change. Again, we hear it said, that "the Episcopal Church is only 300 years old, and Henry VIII. was its founder." The statement is so often repeated, that its truth comes to be taken for granted. It has been made to us many times;

and we have always been rewarded with a smile of pity for our ignorance or our credulity, or both, in denying it.

The question is simply this:—Did the Bishops of the Church of England, by denying the papal supremacy and casting out corruptions which had crept in during that supremacy, originate a new Church; or, was it not the old Church reformed? In other words, was there any break, in the sixteenth century, in what is technically called, "The continuity of the Church?"

Let us look at this point more closely. Here, in the year 1533, the Bishops of a national Church acknowledge tacitly, or otherwise, the supremacy, or jurisdiction of a foreign Bishop. The next year supported by the arm of civil power, they deny that jurisdiction and proceed to reform the Church of which they have been made overseers by the Holy Ghost, and to bring it back to its primitive purity and Apostolic order. They retain the ancient and the scriptural, and reject the novel and unscriptural. For eleven years, or until the death of Edward VI. all the people continue to attend the same churches, and receive the sacraments from those who had administered them all along. There was no formal schism for thirty-five years; that is, until the year 1569, when the bull of excommunication was issued again Queen Elizabeth and her adherents, and then only a few separated from the Church.

Is the Church thus reformed a New Church? It has the same old endowments, the same venerable cathedrals, the same Episcopacy, the same old creeds, the same old prayers, the same old congregations of the faithful! Is it not the same old Church? As well might you tell us that Naaman was not the same man, when he came up out of Jordan and his flesh was clean like that of a little child, that he was before he obeyed the mandate of the prophet, and dipped his leprous body in the healing flood! As well might you assert, that a river which flows pure and limpid from its mountain source, and then becomes dark and turbid, through the thick and foul waters of tributary streams, is not the same river, when further on, in its unbroken course, its waters have deposited their foreign and corrupting matter, and flow on in all their original purity and transparency.

When, then, we speak of "The Historical Church," we mean, (in so far as we are concerned,) a Church which had its beginning in Apostolic times; whose foundation was not improbably laid by apostolic hands; which had its Bishops at several well known Councils of the Church, held in the fourth century; which was free and independent, until the beginning of the seventeenth century; which was gradually brought under the Roman yoke; which sat down in captivity, from age to age protested against by her Wickliffes, Grostetes, and others; which finally regained her original freedom and purity in the sixteenth century; and has never been without her Bishops regularly and canonically consecrated.

Finally, we hold that this historical foundation is the only possible foundation for Catholic unity. Every scheme of union on any other basis, must certainly fail. All union on any other principle must be unreal, fickle, transient; for every such scheme will rest upon the assumption that there can be such a thing as a lawful separation or schism. Admit this, and you have struck a death blow to all unity, and all government. This principle when carried out to its legitimate and logical consequence, is fatal and destructive to the very existence of the Church.

If, for example, it is lawful for one minister to establish a new independent church, it is equally lawful for every minister to do the same. Each may originate a new church which shall be as much a Church of Christ, as the old one. And this work of division, disintegration and dissolution, will go on until we have as many churches as we have ministers; in fact, until every man is a church by himself. This is the simple and logical reduction of the question, which can never be set aside.

PROTESTANT RECRUITS:

A Record of Modern Priests, Monks, Nuns, and Theological Students, who have left the Church of Rome.

(Continued.)

Rev. Terence Callery, Priest, Kildoon Parish, Diocese of Meath, Armagh, Ireland.

Rev. Omer Camerle, Priest, America.
Rev. Fr. Cummins, Priest.
Rev. J. B. Curtis, Priest in Sydney.
Rev. J. Czarski, Parish Priest; Provost's Vicar, Posen.

Right Rev. James Doyle, D.D., Bishop of Carlow.

Right Rev. Padre Berardo Da Josi, O. S.F., Vicar Apostolic; Secretary to Monsignor Guasco Bishop of Fez, &c., &c.

Very Rev. Padre Leonardo Da Camarda, O.S.F., L. et C. Priest; President and Rector of the Grand Convent at Cairo; Confessor Extraordinary of the Nuns of "Lo Bon Pasteur," &c., &c.

Rev. Luigi De Sarcetis, D.D. Priest; Curé of the Maddalena, Rome; Professor of Theology; Qualificatore to the Holy Inquisition; Private Censor in the Theological Academy of the University.

Rev. Fr. De Gombaud, D.D. Priest, France.

Rev. Signor G. R. Di Menna, D.D., O.S.F., Priest and Capuchin Friar, Nice.

Rev. Mansol Joze Da Costa, O. S. D. Priest and Inquisitor, Portugal.

Rev. Joao Jose Da Costa Almeida, Priest; Chaplain in the Portuguese Navy.

Rev. Padre Luigi Da Spinnazola, Priest and Capuchin Monk; Capellano Cantore Pontificio, at the Papal Throne, &c., &c.

Rev. Fr. Carepieveille, Priest, Sillesia.

Rev. Manuel Ignatius Curia, S. J. Priest, Company of Jesus; Mysore, S. India.

Rev. J. N. Chaves, Assistant Priest of the Loretto Church, Lisbon, Portugal.

Rev. M. Chotin, Priest, Verdun, Department of the Meuse, France.

Rev. D. Rapphaele Cioeci, O. S. B., Priest Benedictine and Cistercian Monk; Honorary Librarian of the Papal College of San Bernardo, Alle Terme Diocleziane in Rome.

Rev. J. J. Coakley, Priest, Linlithgow, Eastern Ecclesiastical District, Linlithgowshire, Scotland.

Rev. Signor Cocci, Priest, Florence.

Rev. Pierce Conelly, Priest; Chaplain to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

Rev. Signor Corricelli, Priest, Italy.

Rev. J. Cote, Priest; Monk of the Brotherhood of St. Joseph, Canada.

Rev. Fr. Cousins, Priest, County Wexford, Diocese of Limerick, Province of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. Vincenzo Crespi, O.S.F. Priest and Capuchin Monk.

Rev. Michael Crotty, Senr. Parish Priest, Castleconnor, Diocese of Killaloe, Province of Tuam, Ireland.

Rev. Michael Crotty, Junr. Priest, Birr, King's County, Diocese of Killaloe, Province of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. William Crotty, Priest; Curate in the Diocese of Killaloe, Province of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. Fr. Croly, Priest, Kildare, (formerly of the Foundling Hospital, Dublin).

Rev. D. Crowley, Priest, Ireland.

Rev. Fr. Cruikshank, Priest.

Rev. Joseph Dallaire, Priest, Curé of Lacolle, Canada.

Rev. W. Davock, Priest, S. S. Michael and John, Diocese and Province of Dublin, Ireland.

Rev. Grandjean De Kilen, Priest and Missionary; Order of the Lazarists, France.

Rev. Fr. Bron De Laurière, Priest; Curé in the Diocese of Périgueux, Department of Dordogne, France.

Rev. Angel Herreros De Mora, Priest, New York.

Rev. D. Francisco De Nardis, Priest, Penna. Abruzzo, Naples.

Rev. P. F. Bento De Silvestre, O. S. A., Priest, Order of S. Augustine.

Rev. Signor De Vita, Priest, Lucca, Italy.

Rev. Fr. Delamy, Priest, Ireland.

Rev. Joseph Desroches, Priest; Monk of St. Joseph, America.

Rev. William Dickson, Priest, Diocese of Killaloe, Province of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. Fr. Donnelly, Priest, Belcarra, Diocese and Province of Tuam, Ireland.

Rev. Felix Duffy, Priest, Diocese of Kilmore, Province of Armagh, Ireland.

Rev. Frederick Dumhof, Parish Priest, Bavaria.

Rev. James A. Dwyer, Parish Priest of the Island of Achill, Diocese and Province of Tuam, Ireland.

Rev. M. Encontre, Priest, Breauz, France.

Rev. Senor Escudero, Priest; Chaplain to H. I. M. the Empress Charlotte of Mexico.

(To be Continued.)

The names of very many, who fear persecution, are withdrawn from publication.

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

"Illos, tibi commendamus, * * * qui in mente corpore aut rebus anguntur aut laborant."

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I am at last convinced by facts that have come to my notice, that we laymen have not yet begun to realize thoroughly the vast amount of work which some of our Parish Priests get through with in the course of a year. Of course, I mean those Priests who are throwing their whole being—body, soul and spirit—into their work. Who is there among us laymen, no matter how great the business pressure may be, who has not more leisure time and less anxiety in the course of the year than some of our Parish Priests? No doubt, many of my fellow-laymen will doubt that such is the case, because it may not be so in their own parishes, but let them visit some of the hard worked parishes, of which there are not a few in our Maritime Provinces, and they will no longer doubt the truth of my assertion.

Now, we all know that this constant work, although it may not be able to conquer the zeal of these men, yet is so draining to their spirits, keeps such a strain upon their minds, and is so wearing to their bodies, that they soon find, in spite of their earnest desire to gather in souls, that the work does not yield the fruit they look for. Then they become more worried. If this state of affairs continues long, these earnest spirits, hungry for souls, get somewhat discouraged,—as who would not—and become, perhaps, a little irritable and, if they are young men, get a cheek which maims their usefulness for life. This is not overdrawn. Such similar cases have come within the writer's notice.

Now, the writer feels that this state of affairs in the Church can, and ought to be remedied, and the way in which it can be done, is the chief point in this letter.

The hardest work of our Parish Priests, as far as I have noticed, circles around the great festivals. The two greatest are those between which we are at present passing—Christmas and Easter. The hard work of Christmas is about over, and the Lenten work, to prepare the flocks for the better enjoyment of the Easter blessings is staring our Priests in the face. What new life would it put into a hard-working Priest, if he felt that he could afford to take a fortnight's rest of body, soul and spirit, and, free from all care and anxiety, run off to visit a brother Priest, and take sweet counsel with him, before entering upon new work. And he ought to do it. Our Priests cannot expect to infuse new life into their flocks, and bring them glad tidings, when they themselves are worn out. Half of our laborious and meaningless sermons are the products of overworked brains in weary bodies, and it is our own fault if we do not get better sermons. Let us send off our tired and weary Priests or Deacons, whom we know have done their work well when they could, and then we may rest assured that they will come back with renewed earnestness and vigour, and fitted for their work.

But these words are not meant for parishioners, as such. They are meant for those of us who are beginning to open our eyes to the fact that, we have for many years been keeping back from God his just dues—for those who have made up their minds that henceforth they will give back to the Giver of all, one-tenth of their yearly income. These are the men and women to whom I now appeal, and, if the above object commends itself to their minds, and their little boxes have anything in them thus early in the year, will they please take my suggestion, call to mind some hard worked Priest or Deacon—I can at this moment call to mind six in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Cape Breton—who feels that he cannot afford to take a holiday, and, either alone, or together with some of their fellow *tithe-men*, send him enough to meet his expenses, and gladden his heart by a holiday. This, I am sure, will cause a blessing to fall on both priest and people. The former will be encouraged and filled with new zeal, and will probably impart a

little of it to his fellow-priests, who need a puff or two from the bellows to start their flame; while the latter will be fed, and cheered, and strengthened, and the Church will be aroused from the nap, in which she is indulging in some of our parishes. In conclusion, the writer trusts that he will not offend any of the clergy by a reference to their want of means, for, if it is anybody's fault, that they have not more means, we laymen are the ones to be blamed, and besides, we all know the many calls upon their means, which we escape.

Trusting that this letter will not have been written in vain, I remain yours, etc.,
PHILIP CLERICUS.

MESSRS. DALE & ENRIGHT.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)
Sirs,—When the letter from a "Student" in re Dale & Enright, appeared in your columns, I thought of trying to answer the very reasonable questions contained in it. But on reflection I saw they could not be answered at all satisfactory in a short compass, and so I passed them by. "Eldor" has attempted to answer them by means of an article from *Church Bells*, which does not go at all to the root of the matter, and is eminently unsatisfactory. Your London correspondent, (Jan 20), does go to the root of the matter when he says that, "as at present constituted, there is no ecclesiastical court that a really conscientious clergyman can submit to." This assertion, he goes far to prove by his subsequent remarks, to which I will refer your readers.

If a court were established in Halifax by the Provincial Government, under some distinguished lawyer, for the purpose of trying cases of alleged violation of ritual law, with power to suspend or imprison, in the event of the defendants' refusing to alter their ritual or vacate their livings, such a court would be exactly parallel to that over which Lord Penzance presides.

Some indeed, (*Church Bells* amongst the number), may say that when the faith of the Church is seriously menaced, it will be time enough to contend for her liberty. But it is obvious, that unless we protest against the encroachment upon her liberty in little things the principle is yielded, and the protest is not premature! Even now we are told that members of parliament have given notice of their intention to bring in Bills to abolish one of the Creeds, and to cut down the office of the Ordering of Priests. Probably a larger admixture of Brights, Chamberlains, and Bradlaughes would be necessary before such Bills could pass, but we all know what determined and ceaseless agitation can effect.

Men who are not High Churchmen are beginning to see that Mess. Dale and Enright are contending for a principle which is as dear to many Evangelicals as it is to Ritualists, and they are beginning to fear that the Church of England must suffer disestablishment and the spoiling of her goods, unless she would become the abject creature of the State.
D.

PARISH OF ANNAPOLIS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)
Sirs,—Will you have the kindness to publish in your paper a few lines in contradiction of the erroneous statement relative to the Parish of Annapolis, contained in a letter signed "Wolfville" under date of Jan. 8th. I think this due to the contributors. The writer of this letter "ventures to assert" that each of the families in the Parish does not contribute one dollar a year to Church purposes. That this statement is not correct, I am prepared to show, by publishing the actual amount contributed for Church purposes for the last two years, and this amount has been raised solely by one congregation, exclusively of the districts of Rosette, Dalhousie and Perott, which form part of the Parish. The sum contributed for the last two years amounts to \$2089.17, of this amount \$790.00 has been raised to build a chancel to the Parish Church, by the people of the Parish exclusively, with the exception of £10 stg., and \$203.12 has been remitted for Home and Foreign Missions, towards which objects collections have also been taken in other parts of the Parish.

I cannot think that the publishing of statements misrepresenting Parishes can be for the interest of your paper.

I am yours, sincerely,
JAMES J. RITCHIE, Rector.
Annapolis, Jan. 26th, 1881.