

THE CHURCH IS ONE.

(THE ENGLISH REFORMATION).

It is often laid to the charge of the Church of England that she is guilty of schism. Such sayings as that she is "an Act of Parliament Church," "the Church of Henry VIII," "the Church of Luther," are constantly thrown in her teeth by those who seek to disparage her position.

What is the truth? That the Church of England is the same Church that was first planted in this land. Where the mists of history part, we behold her the same in all essentials. In 305 A.D. St. Alban suffered martyrdom, thereby giving its present name to the ancient Verulam. In 814 A.D. we read of British Bishops as present at the Council of Arles. Let it be admitted that a Roman missionary, Augustine, came to our shores in 596 A.D. Still the fact must not be suppressed that he found there a British Archbishop and seven Bishops.

Nor is this all. Christianity was introduced into Scotland, and thence into the North of England, from a third and distinct source. St. Patrick had evangelised Ireland about 432 A.D., and the Celtic missionaries under St. Columba had passed over to Iona, one of the islands on the West of Scotland in 563 A.D. From Iona mission bands went forth in all directions. One of these, under St. Aidan as its Bishop, on the invitation of King Oswald, settled, in 635 A.D., on an island off the coast of Northumberland, called Lindisfarne.

Therefore Christianity from a Roman source found British Christianity in the West, and met a wave of Celtic Christianity advancing from the North of England.

The British and Irish Churches agreed in their ecclesiastical usages, which in some respects were opposed to the Roman use. This led to much contention, and both the native Churches combined in repudiating the supremacy claimed by the Bishop of Rome.

Then came the gradual usurpations of Rome over Christendom, accompanied by that corruption of the Faith, which is inevitable when the whole body is not suffered to act. Again and again these usurpations were met by protests from both the Church and State of England. From this it has been truly pointed out that no one is able to say when the English Reformation began.

At length matters reached such a pass, that by a convulsive effort, the State shook herself free from the supremacy of Rome. Englishmen had paid taxes to the Pope, appeals in judicial cases had been carried to Rome, and these about the year 1580 A.D., were put an end to by the English Parliament, thereby securing the liberties of English citizens.

A parallel movement was going on in the English Church. The invention of printing had multiplied Bibles, and English Churchmen in constantly increasing numbers, began to discover that the Faith, as imposed upon them by Rome, was not the Faith of Holy Scripture, or of the first and purest age of the Church. There was only one thing left for her to do, to retain all that was Scriptural and primitive in her Liturgy and Service Book, and to expunge all that was new and unscriptural. This was the Reformation, which was spread over the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth. The very mention of those names will show how the tide flowed and ebbed, and flowed again, ere it was complete. As in all great movements, there were two great parties, the Conservative and the Reforming, and the result was that, while what was false was put away, all that could be retained was carefully preserved. Consequently, the very prayers are for the most part the old prayers, the churches retained the same features, the priests who ministered in them were the same priests, and the lay people were none other.

Is it true then, to say that at the Reformation a new Church was set up? Would it be true to say of a restored church fabric, from which the whitewash and plaster had been scraped away, that it was a new church? No doubt it was a great convulsion through which both Church and State of England passed at this time, but the Church emerged as much the same Church, as the State

was the same State. A Reform Act does not create a new State, neither does a Reformation involve a new Church. The river Nile below the great Cataract, is the same river as that which flows above it; and in a like manner the English Church is one and the same Church before and after the Reformation. It was therefore an effective, if a somewhat homely, retort upon the Romanist, when he asked, "Where was your Church before Luther," to answer, "Where was your face before it was washed?" Or, to take the common argument, that because the English Church held Roman doctrine before the Reformation, it was therefore a part of the Roman Church, it would be just as reasonable to maintain that Naaman and Gehazi were the same person because the leprosy of Naaman came unto Gehazi!

Now arises the question, *Did the Church of England separate from the Church of Rome?* To this here can be but one answer. There was no act of the Church of England which could be interpreted as a renunciation of communion, either with the Catholic Church in general, or the Roman branch in particular. All she did was to do what the French Church had done but a few years before without reproach—she recast her Prayer Book. This is within the powers of every branch of the Catholic Church. That Prayer book recast, was not at the time considered heretical by Rome. Those who preferred the pre-Reformation state of things, used to worship through a long course of years, side by side with those who supported the Reformation.

Whence, then, came the separation? There can be no hiding of the facts. It came from the side of Rome. "On April 27, 1570, the shameful mandate went forth, bidding all who would obey Pope Pius IV. to break with their own English Church, to secede and form conventicles, to abandon and dethrone their sovereign, and to subject their country, if they could, to a foreign invader." If there can be schism in this matter, that schism is on the part of Rome.

What, then, is the attitude of the English Church? While it has never ceased to be Catholic, in the truest sense, as regards Rome it is Protestant.

The word is a valuable word, and we can ill afford to spare it. No doubt much has been done, and many doctrines have been held under shelter of that title, with which the English Church can have no sympathy. The same would be true of "Liberty." But from her own point of view, the word "Protestant" exactly describes that earnest attitude of calm protest against the errors and assumptions of the Church of Rome. Schism and separation she recoils from as forbidden by the Word of God. To this day she encourages no schism in the Roman Communion, nothing corresponding to the treatment which she herself receives from that Communion. If she sends her own priests to foreign lands, it is solely to minister to those of her children who are settled abroad, because the Roman Church repudiates them, but she sets up no bishoprics in Roman Catholic countries, as the Roman Church has done in this country.

But if there be any earnest movement abroad, towards reformation on primitive and truly Catholic lines, to that she gives her support, her counsel, her prayers.

For herself she has never departed from the attitude which she took up from the first. Archbishop Cranmer appealed from the Pope of Rome to a General Council of the Whole Catholic Church.

* "It is certain that no English ruler, no English Parliament, thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of Reforming the existing English Church. Nothing was further from the minds of Henry VIII or Elizabeth than the thought that either of them was doing anything new. Neither of them ever thought for a moment of establishing anything at all. In their own eyes they were not establishing, but reforming; they were neither pulling down, nor setting up, but simply putting to rights. . . . There was no one act called the 'Reformation'; the Reformation was the gradual result of a long series of acts. There was no one moment, no one Act of Parliament, when, and by which a Church was 'established'; still less was there any act by which one Church was 'disestablished,' and another Church 'established' in its place."—*Disestablishment and Disendowment*, by E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D.

The Convocation of Canterbury in 1583, Bishop Jewel in 1602, and Richard Hooker in 1604, amongst others, advocated the same course. To such a Council, could it in God's providence be called together, she would doubtless now be willing to defer, as in accordance with Scriptural precedent, (Acts xv).

—0—
PLEASING OTHERS.

The desire to please others is God-given, but not so the desire to create an impression which is far from pleasing by self-assertion and assumption. The secret of making oneself pleasant to those about was thus told by Wm. Wirt to his daughter: "The way to make yourself pleasing to others is to show that you care for them. This is the spirit that gives to your time of life its sweetest charms. It constitutes the sum total of the witchcraft of women. Let the world see that your first care is for yourself, and you will spread the solitude of the upas tree around you."

Not only may a woman win favour for herself by following this advice, but she may also wield an influence for good which is inestimable. Try it girls! The same principle applies equally well to the other sex. Try it, boys!

—0—
SERVICE FOR ALL.

"We can serve in every station:
None so weak or none so small,
None so poor or none so lowly,
That they cannot serve at all.

"We can serve in every station,
If, with loving heart and true,
We will seek to know our duty,
And our daily task to do.

"We can serve in every station:
He who fixed our lot is wise;
And each act of willing service
Is accepted in His eyes.

"Let us, then, in every station,
Humbly strive to do our part,—
With a faithful, earnest spirit,
And a meek, contented heart."

—God is a kind Father. He sets us all in places where He wishes us to be employed; and that employment is truly "our Father's business." He chooses work for every creature which will be delightful to him if he does it simply and humbly. He gives us always strength enough and sense enough for what He wants us to do; if we tire ourselves or puzzle ourselves, it is our own fault, and we may always be sure, whatever we are doing, that we cannot be pleasing Him if we are not happy ourselves.—*Ruskin*.

—0—
WHAT ARE WOMAN'S RIGHTS? *

The right to wake when o'er her sleep;
The right to watch, the right to weep;
The right to comfort in distress,
The right to soothe, the right to bless;
The right the widow's heart to cheer,
The right to dry the orphan's tear;
The right to feed and clothe the poor,
The right to teach them to endure.

The right when other friends have flown,
And left the sufferer all alone,
To kneel that dying couch beside,
And meekly point to Him who died;
The right a happy home to make
In any clime for Jesus' sake.
Rights such as these are all we crave,
Until our last—a quiet grave.

COMFORTING NEWS.—What a comfort and how very convenient to be able to have a Closet indoors, it being neither offensive nor unhealthy. "Heap's Patent" Dry Earth or Ashes Closets are perfectly inodorous. The commodes with urine separators, can be kept in a bedroom, and are invaluable in any house during the winter season, or in case of sickness; they are a well finished piece of furniture. Factory, Owen Sound, Ont.

* Written in 1851 by Mrs. Charlotte B. Conarroe, who died in Philadelphia, January 15, 1895, aged 83. She was a member of St. Mark's Church.