

ation with the Church, we fear their present aims, organization and appliances must be very inadequate to the demands of the Church's ideal of solicitude for the well being of her members. This can only be satisfied when it is found that no one is left to drift without many earnest efforts having been made to bring him home to the warmth, and light, and love of the Church's domestic fireside, where he may partake of the Bread of Life and drink of the Cup of Salvation, and where all sanctified social requirements may be provided for. We would therefore urge the formation of Men's Guilds and Women's Guilds wherever non-existent in our parishes; and where they exist, that they should be put upon a better footing to cope with the work which should engage their attention and most earnest labours. There should also be an "Amalgamated Association of Church Guilds" for each diocese, formed by delegation from the parochial guilds, for which there is special work to do. These organizations are necessary that the brotherhood of the faith may be seen and felt of all men, and that the work of Christ and His Church may grow apace among us, and that the lives, energies and means of Churchmen may be saved to the Church, instead of being frittered away upon what is alien to her spirit and teaching. Let us provide within the Church all that her members require, then will she cease to appeal in vain for help, and cease being the object of reproach both from within and without. Then will a concourse flock to the "Household of the Faith" and learn to "love the brotherhood." Space will not permit the treatment of details of guild organization in this article, but we hope to recur to the subject on future occasions.

FROM UNITARIANISM TO TRINITARIANISM, AND HOW I BECAME A CHURCHMAN.

BY A. K. GLOVER.

(i) I had accepted the existence of God, and pined to know Him.

(ii) I had placed implicit confidence in our Lord, and was ready to believe whatever He could be proved to have taught, whether He were God or man.

(iii) I had acknowledged the Gospel records themselves as having come down to us uncorrupted, as containing exactly what they did in the Apostolic age, and as the truthful repository of Christ's teachings.

Having gone thus far, there was but one more step for me to take, i.e., to study the Scriptures, and having discovered what Christ taught and preached, what His apostles taught and preached, to accept those teachings openly and unfiguredly. Certain promises had been laid down, certain admissions had been made, and on these as a foundation a superstructure of belief, of religion, had to be raised both as a moral and a logical necessity.

"In the Scriptures I find the teaching of the 'Trinity,' of the Deity of Christ, and I was morally bound to accept them. I will not consume valuable time in showing orthodox Christians where in the Bible I found these teachings, since this I would do only in the presence of persons either known to be Unitarians, or to be weak in their orthodoxy and inclined toward Unitarianism. Thus in a very imperfect way, I have told how I attained to the dignity of a Christian believer, and now let me tell you how I became a Churchman.

The one prominent fact that first attracts the attention of one who is seeking for the Church of Christ, and one which attracted mine was, the general disorganization and wide-spread sectarianism among the non-episcopal bodies. Is this condition right or wrong? I answered, as every unbiased man must, *wrong* on the very face of it,

for our Lord could have founded *one faith* and *one Church* for the preservation of that faith. The Apostle says, "There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." Now, where there are numerous sects there cannot be one Faith. One Church recognizing one form of government, is necessary to the preservation and perpetuation of a united Christian empire. What kind of government did our Lord and His apostles give to the Church? The greatest of living Presbyterian scholars says that government by bishops was a universal institution in the first half of the second century. Thus, as far back as the early part of the second century, both Presbyterian and Episcopalian recognize the existence of episcopal government in the Church. But, going back still further, I found what all Churchmen find, that in the first century, in apostolic times, episcopal government was then as stern a reality, as much a Christian institution, as it was in the second century. In the "Acts of the Apostles" (the earliest history extant of the Church) we find the same body of ministers ruling the Church as we find in the Episcopal Churches to-day. There we find the *bishops, priests* and *deacons*, and in the "Acts" and Epistles we read of regular and formal ordinations to the deaconate, to the priesthood, and to the episcopate. The objection that bishops are often called *presbyters* (or priests) in the "Acts" and "Epistles," and that the *presbyters* are frequently denominated *Bishops*, was to me no valid argument against episcopacy. In fact, there are very few Churchmen who will deny the fact of this early confusion of terms, but no such confusion can be found in the *duties* and *offices* of the ministry! The first century was a time when the Church was undergoing its foundation process, when the names and titles of the Church officers were used in a somewhat careless way. But no matter how free the early Christians were in the way of applying these titles, there was never any confusion in their minds as to the lawful and respective *duties* and *offices* of the bishops, priests and deacons! Bishops may frequently have been called *elders* or *priests*, but the bishop did not give up his office and duties! A presbyter may frequently have been called a *bishop*, but never has been found,—never can be found—an instance of a *presbyter* in the New Testament assuming the *functions* and performing the *office* of a bishop! As soon as the Church grew a little older, when exactness and care and order were found to be absolutely necessary to the welfare of the Church, then it was that these three names, *Bishop, Priest* and *Deacon*, became fixed and definite,—and thenceforward there was no more confusion in name as there never had been in office and duties. Episcopacy, therefore, came down to us from apostolic times. Until the Reformation (?) in the 15th century, government by and ordination by bishops had been the universal practice of Christendom. The age of the Reformation was one in which the most radical sallies of the human imagination were allowed to have free play, and one of the lamentable results of that whirlwind of radicalism was the rejection, by a portion of the Christian Church, of episcopal government—that government which for 15 centuries had knit together the various branches of the Catholic Church and the various kingdoms of the Christian world, as no other power could possibly do—that government which connected by an unbroken chain the Church of the middle ages with the apostolic Church—that government which meant, and still means, *law*, and *order*, and *perpetuity*, in all that appertains to the Bride of Christ, the *Holy Church*. Even in our own age the greater part of the Christian world acknowledge the apostolic origin of the episcopate, and openly practice episcopacy. The majority of Christians are Episcopalians in one form or another. The great Church of Russia, the Greek Church, representing over one hundred millions of souls, is episcopal in government, as are also the Roman Catholic (representing 250 millions of people), the churches of Norway and Sweden, the "Old Catholics" of Germany, Holland, France, Switzerland, the Moravians of Germany, England and America, the Church of England and her daughter in America. All of these are episcopal in government, and cannot look back to the day when they did not have bishops!

Moreover, I can remind my readers of something even more suggestive. The *Unitarians* of Hungary, numbering upward of sixty thousand communicants, are also episcopal in government! Here we find the most radical of all the sects acknowledging and perpetuating a form of government just like the Church of England or our own American Church, a fact which forms a powerful argument for the apostolic origin of the Episcopate, since a body so far removed from us in faith would hardly be expected to perpetuate a system of government so intimately associated with Catholicism! Thus the whole world is practically episcopal in government, and it will be seen that *Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Methodism* represent but a small portion of the Christian commonwealth. The consensus of facts regarding Church government is this, viz., that government by, or ordination by, any other method than by bishops, is something *new, strange, out of harmony* with history, and comparatively small in extent and practice. But, it may be asked, if all the world is episcopal in government, why not join the Roman Catholic Church, or the Unitarian Episcopal Church? Here we meet the great question of doctrinal belief, and the tenets of both were to me untenable and unscriptural. Had I been in England, or Germany, or Holland, I might have joined any one of the several branches of the pure Catholic Church found in those countries. If in England, I should have been confirmed in the Church in England; in Holland or Germany, the "Old Catholic" Church there, and if my lot had been cast in Greece or Russia, I see no insuperable objection to my having joined the Greek Communion. But the fact is, I was an English-speaking Christian, and an American, and was not at all disposed to join any branch of the Catholic Church whose stronghold was in a foreign land. The Church in England and her daughter in America are identified with English civilization, and have been moulding, and will continue to mould, the thought of all English speaking people. Thus it is that we Americans, if we find that the Episcopal Church in America is really and truly catholic and episcopal, must then recognize it as a part of the historic Catholic Church, and join it. This I have done—thanks be to God.

REVIEWS.

GENERAL GORDON, THE CHRISTIAN HERO. By Major Seton Churchill: London, Nisbet & Co. Toronto, Rowsell & Hutchison.

Though so many "series" of this unique modern hero have been written, there was certainly room for this popular religious version of his life, by the living hand of Major Seton Churchill. The manner in which the Christian principle diffused itself through a soldier's life is very finely brought out, so that he was mastered by a very passion for saving life. The binding and typography make this book a very pleasant one to handle and to read.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE. By Canon Luckock: London, Longman's. New York, Whitaker. Toronto, Rowsell & Hutchison.

This book is brought out as a "sequel" to "After Death," a remarkable work by the same author. In very clear and simple language, but with convincing force, the author argues for such views as probation for the heathen after death, intercourse and progress in Paradise, prayers for the dead, prayers of the dead for us. No such fascinating work on Eschatology has been written since Farrar's *Eternal Hope*.

LENTEN THOUGHTS. New York, Whitaker. Toronto, Rowsell & Hutchison.

This is a well-bound paper-covered book of over two hundred pages. It contains excellent "Meditations" for the morning and evening of every day in Lent. A most useful book where the daily offices are well attended.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By Henry Forrester: New York, Whitaker.

This is a pamphlet of thirty pages, chiefly on the "Unfermented Wine" question, intended as an