

of the diocese. Membership includes honorary members \$100, life members \$50, patrons \$25, yearly members \$5. A capital of \$100,000 is needed to carry on the work of the society. It is the purpose of the society to use the profits for the free distribution of Prayer Books to missions, charitable institutions, and in places where the Book of Common Prayer would be serviceable as the best tract the Church can issue to set forth her glorious faith and the riches of her liturgical worship.

SERVICES in commemoration of the *one hundred and fiftieth anniversary* of the founding of Christ Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey, U. S., were held last month, the celebration opening November 14th, with an historical sermon by the Rev. E. B. Joyce, rector, and closing on the following Thursday. Bishop Scarborough, of the diocese of New Jersey, was present at several of the meetings. The Church was established in 1742 by missionaries from the Church of England. In 1761 the parish was incorporated by George III, the Rev. Robert McBean being its rector. In 1784 a general Church meeting was held in Christ Church, from which sprung the Episcopal Church in the United States. The first Convention of the Church in New Jersey was held in Christ Church in 1785. The Rev. John Cross, who was appointed rector of the Church in 1801, was the first Bishop of New Jersey, the Rev. John Hobart, minister in charge in 1799, afterward became the Bishop of New York, and the Rev. Samuel Seabury, the second rector of the Church, serving from 1753 to 1758, afterward became Bishop of Connecticut. From 1838 till his death in 1882 the Rev. A. Stubbs was the rector of Christ Church, and the Rev. E. B. Joyce, the present rector, has served for nearly ten years.

In a chained commentary on the Prayer-book, which is to be seen in Malvern Abbey Church, Worcestershire, England, the following suggestive and touching comment is given upon the sentence in the litany—"That it may please Thee to preserve all them that travel by land and water:"

"We have so general consent in all the ancient offices, that I have been apt to think this clause to be almost as early as the Apostles' days, and at first had respect principally to those devout Christians (as the liturgy of Jerusalem applies it) who travelled by land and sailed over all the known world by sea to propagate the Gospel, and make proselytes for religion; for doubtless these holy persons run through innumerable perils for the cause of Jesus Christ, and therefore ought to be remembered in the prayers of all them that wished well to Christianity....."

DR. BRADLEY, formerly Bishop of Sodor and Man, and now the Bishop of Carlisle, is a thoroughly scientific student and authority. In a recent address he said:—

"The wall of difference between Science and Scripture was broken down when, at the British Association meeting in 1865, a manifesto signed by 617 eminent men of science was published, in which Sir David Brewster, Professor Balfour, and others stated that the time would come when Scripture and Science would be seen to agree in every particular. Nearly thirty years have elapsed since the publication of that manifesto, and I think we may safely affirm for ourselves, and, so far as theologians are concerned,

that not only is that wall broken down, but the path which lay between has been marked out and well trodden. To what new domain we frequently repair, eagerly and confidently, knowing that we shall find confirmation of Scripture records, elucidation of Scripture statement, and illustration of Scripture truth. If evidence of harmony between Scripture and Science is waiting, we have only to wait till it is forthcoming."

## HOME RE-UNION.

(Continued.)

We are now brought face to face with a further question. Men say, "If you thus disparage the exercise of private judgment you must abide by the consequences. If you are so anxious for continuity, you must be consistent and accept the past with all its corruptions. You are really arguing for the Church which claims an infallible development and never confesses itself in the wrong." We are accustomed to this form of the argument, but not perturbed. The answer, to us at least, is complete. The Church of England holds

A UNIQUE POSITION.

For we are ready to learn and to confess that even Councils have erred. History has taught us much. Theory, without the benefit of experience, might possibly have led us to base our system on private judgment alone, or upon Church authority and continuity alone. But experience has decisively proved to us the dangers of either basis when taken alone. The unlovely excesses of unlimited and unbalanced self-will we have already pointed out. History lays bare also the fatal effects of an attempted infallibility. If man's reason is not free to criticise and test and reject, if necessary, then the highest part of man's nature is paralysed. He is not a free agent. We believe in the authority actually possessed and duly exercised in the early Church long before pretensions to infallibility were whispered. "There is no one infallible authority for the expression of the truth. No simple means for such an expression can be pointed out as the only trustworthy and divinely appointed one." The Bible rests on the Church: the Church on the Bible. "The individual must think and judge, but he should do so with the consciousness that he is but *one* member in a *vast organism*." The Church must speak with authority, but she must do so remembering that her voice must be in line with the oracle of God and the deepest intuitions of spiritual men. "In the early and undivided Church there was such a thing as authority, and there was no such a thing as infallibility." When she ask for the latter we are compelled to meet it by such a statement as this (I quote from a recent writer):—"The claim to infallibility is contradicted by reason, by Scripture, by history, by science, by every authority to which civilised and Christian men are accustomed to refer." Ours, then is indeed

AN UNIQUE POSITION.

It is antagonistic to that which is upon a single basis. We are conscious of a *dual basis*. We rest on two principles—upon liberty for the reason of man, and also upon the continuity and authority of the Church. There is nothing abnormal in such a basis of balanced principles. It is found to be true in the government of a State. Two houses of Legislature are better than one, though in theory they may appear unworkable. Free will and predestination are both true, and form a dual basis. This world of ours is what it is, because it is the outcome of awful forces, centrifugal and centripetal, working in perfect balance. God's method is balance not directness: "Safety lies not in one force, but in a resolution of forces." It may have occurred to some to doubt the wisdom of God in creating us with two eyes. Would not one have sufficed? Why incur the trouble of

delicate focussing with all its attendant complications? The answer is that if we aim high our ends are only gained by using many forces to counteract and check the excesses of each other. The Church of England sees with two eyes. Let no man disparage the one or the other.

If I add a few words ere I pass from this subject, it is to expressed unfeigned thankfulness that those who have appealed to us to unite, are facing earnestly the subject of corporate union. Already broken fragments of Wesleyans are uniting again. Congregationalists and Baptists are approaching one another with true fraternal feelings. But can the movement end here? Can it be a "waste and a scandal" for Wesleyans to divide into three or six, whilst at the same time the *first* schism is looked upon as a legitimate step safe from the attack of our criticism? The desire for corporate unity cannot, in our opinion, leave contentedly the separations of the last century as though they were beyond all mending. It surely must come to be seen, as a recent writer well puts it, that "unity must mean joint membership in one society. There is a strain of unreality, not to say insincerity, about professions of *unity*, of *spirit*, while *outward separation* continues." The conviction must be more and more pressed home that Christ came to form a

KINGDOM UPON EARTH.

"It was to be a visible society also, for the inward principles possessing the mind and working upon the heart, must receive outward embodiment." And if this is so, what else could be the terms of the attempted union of English Christians but those put forth by the Bishops? The Scriptures, the Nicene Creed, the two Sacraments, and the historic Episcopate—concede these and you are in a line, in all essentials, with all that is truly primitive in the Greek, Latin, and Anglican communions. You are in full communion, outwardly as well as inwardly, with the essential development through all past ages of the Church of Christ. Yours will not then even be distinctively the Church of St. Peter or of St. John, or of St. Paul, but on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and these again on Christ. If we would not be members of the Church or even any one apostle, we may be permitted to hesitate when we are asked to accept as legitimate acts the founding of the *new* Church of Wesley or of George Fox, or of Robert Brown. These are our own principles. They are at least intelligible.

I have purposely left on one side the stronger claims of the Church, because those who have accepted these last need no arguments to establish their allegiance. I have taken ground, if you like, on a lower level, because I have desired to aid the largest number to obtain a basis which his at least intelligible. I am not sanguine as to a wide reunion of Christians in our time. The recoil from the corrupt developments of mediævalism was so great that even centuries may elapse before there can be equilibrium again. It may well be that unbridled independence may require centuries ere it becomes chastened and subdued; ere also, on the other hand, those who have once submitted their reason to the yoke of infallibility, can shake themselves free from it. What wonder if we would fain believe that it is the Church of England which will at length offer *the widest basis of union*? We understand both parties, for we contain within us the principles cherished by both. We are nearer far to each than the two opposing forces, one on each side of us, can be. We honour in both the basis they each know best, only we would correct and modify the one by the other. Nor will any who may chance to overhear these words, addressed to the innermost council of the Church as to brethren united together by closest ties of Church membership, look upon them as a sound of war or an attempt to widen any existing breaches. The first step towards reunion is for each party to state with all courtesy its own position, fairly and fully. Then let full reflection follow and