

January, 1560, that Dr. Parker had been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury during the preceding month." II. Had Barlow been consecrated? It is said that Barlow, who was the consecrating bishop, was not himself consecrated. The reason for this doubt is that no record of his consecration can be found, and that he himself held lax views on the subject. We cannot do better than give Lingard's statements on this point: "Though searches were repeatedly made in every likely repository, no traces of it could be found, nor, I believe, has any allusion or reference to it been discovered to the present day in any ancient writer or document. Still the absence of proof is no proof of non-consecration." (Dr. Lingard then refers to the consecration of Gardiner, of Winchester, of which no doubt had ever been expressed, although no record of it could be found. Recently, however, it has been discovered by the Dean of Winchester.) When, therefore, we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body." To this we may add that when he was deposed by Mary, no such reason was assigned as that he had not been duly ordained. He retired "*per liberam et spontaneam resignationem*," really, we believe, because he was a Protestant and married.

III. Was the form of consecration valid? It has been objected to it that it did not order the words "Receive the Holy Spirit" to be used; but it did; and also that it did not indicate the office of bishop in the words of consecration. But neither does the Roman rite, and the nature of the office is brought out in both, in the whole service. One objection may, perhaps, be noticed here. It has been said that the invalidity of the consecration was admitted by the passing of an Act of Parliament in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to legalize the position of the new bishop. But this did not arise from any doubt as to the validity of the consecration, which could not have been amended in any such way, but from the uncertain state of the law. The laws of King Henry had been altered under Edward VI. These of Edward VI. had been abolished under Queen Mary, and the state of things under Elizabeth was uncertain. To put an end to all questions of legality this new statute was passed. But irregularity of consecration is a widely different thing from invalidity.

IV. Was there a defect of intention? This is a very large question. But what we have to consider is the intention of the Church, not the intention of the individual priest or bishop. If we depend upon the latter, no human being could be perfectly certain that he was baptized, confirmed or ordained. But we may, in most cases, easily ascertain whether the minister has done what the Church ordered. And there can be no doubt on this point. The Church of Rome has decided that the private character or private opinions of the minister in no way affected the validity of his acts, and we hold the same doctrine. We might, therefore, dispense with any further discussion of the question of intention.

V. Was Parker a priest at the time of his

consecration? There was a double contention against this decision. It was urged that the ordinal employed in his case had not directed the delivery of the paten and chalice to him, and had made no mention of the power of offering the sacrifice, and that he had not received the unction. The answers to these objections were very simple. Martene, a great Roman ritualist, declares that the delivery of the vessels in the ordination of priests was unknown until the 8th or 9th century; and the same might be said of the reference to sacrifice. Moreover, unction was neither primitive nor universal. It had been urged by Roman Catholic writers that whilst these forms might have been adequate in early times, a national Church had no right to omit ceremonies decreed by the Church. But this was the very question in dispute between England and Rome. We maintained our right to reject doctrines and ceremonies which were innovations, not sanctioned by primitive belief and usage. If we conceded, for a moment, that we were under an obligation to preserve and use every innovation of later times, merely because it had been sanctioned by what was called Catholic authority, we should have to surrender the whole principle of the Reformation. If, indeed, it could be said that these were the ordinances of the whole Church, East as well as West, then there might be the appearance of an argument against the proceedings of the Anglican Reformers; but these passages were not found in the Oriental Liturgies any more than in the Anglican. In regard to such demands, therefore, we must make the same answer to the Pope which was made by the Patriarch of Constantinople, when he was invited to the Vatican Synod of 1870. They received, he said, the decisions of the seven œcumenical Synods, and needed no additions to them. It was with regret that we found we could not comply with the requirements of the Roman Pontiff. He is the first bishop of the Christian Church; but it was not we who broke off communion with Rome, it was Rome which cast us out. Some Roman Catholic controversialists had argued that our bishops had no jurisdiction; but this objection seemed now to be abandoned, and need, therefore, receive no attention here. We had won for ourselves liberties which we had no thought of abandoning; and of these liberties, to a large extent, Roman Catholics had the advantage no less than ourselves. In no countries had they more liberty than in those belonging to the English-speaking peoples, who were the children of the Reformation. We had no wish to deprive them of these liberties. Let us both work out our own destinies.

THE NEW BISHOP OF ALGOMA.

We believe that the election of the new Bishop of Algoma gives perfect satisfaction to the Church in Canada. Several of the candidates nominated would have been quite acceptable if the choice of the Synod had fallen upon them, and outside the Synod, as within it, one or the other of those candidates might have been preferred by individuals, but the choice of the majority of the electors would certainly be the choice of the Church at large. Canon Thorneloe was not unknown to the Church people of the Dominion. He is clerical secretary of the Provincial Synod, which shows that he stands well with his brother clergy. He was very nearly being elected as Bishop of New Westminster, so that his fitness for the office has been extensively recognized. We understand also that his Churchmanship is sound and moderate, so that his administration is likely to

be just and wise. Perhaps the best assurance of his fitness is the fact that he has been a devoted and successful parish priest. Of course there will be some disappointments in connection with this election. But that was inevitable. And those disappointments may lead to serious reflections as to the wisdom of eager partisans putting forth their favourite candidates in the newspapers. Doubtless there are times when the claims of some particular person may properly be urged—especially by some competent agent or organ; but the habit of writing anonymous letters, and inserting unauthorized paragraphs in the daily papers, is not only becoming a nuisance, but is actually calculated to prejudice the claims and prospects of the person so commended. In regard to the Diocese of Algoma, it is apparent that several changes will have to be made. Our readers will probably be surprised to hear that, while the late Bishop of Algoma got \$4,000 a year, the Bishop of Toronto has been receiving \$3,000. This latter fact would be disgraceful to the diocese were it not that we believe it is known only to a few. It is surely to be hoped that such a disgrace will soon be removed. There are many laymen in the diocese any one of whom would make up the deficiency. Besides the question of the bishop's stipend in Algoma, there are other questions which will have to be considered. But on these we will not at present enter. We can only further assure the new bishop that the Church in Canada is deeply sensible of the importance of the work to which he has been called, and that he will have the prayers and the effectual help of the clergy and laity throughout the Dominion.

REVIEWS.

GEMS OF HOPE.—In Memory of the Faithful Departed. Selected and arranged by Fanny Bate. Price 75c. Toronto: W. Briggs.

Miss Bate has here provided us with a book which will be welcome to those who wish to preserve the remembrance of the departure of friends. Birthday books are common. We are not acquainted with any book similar to the present, which gives on one side of the page three spaces (for three days) in which the names of those may be inserted who have died on those days, whilst over against each day there is an appropriate and consolatory text. We have examined the little book with care, and can testify that the choice of texts is excellent, that each month is introduced by an appropriate poem, and that the paper, printing and binding are excellent. Those who want such a book are not likely to meet with a better.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.—By Lyman Abbot. Price \$1.25. Boston: Houghton & Co. 1896. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

Dr. Lyman Abbot, the successor of Mrs. Ward Beecher, is too well known to need any introduction to those who are interested in contemporary theology; and here he makes a contribution of value which may well be considered even by those who are far from being in sympathy with his ecclesiastical and theological line. The writer says, "Jesus Christ's object was not to save some—few or many—from a wrecked and lost world; it was to recover the world itself and make it righteous. Consequently he views the whole work of Christ from this standpoint, and discusses in the volume before us such questions as Christianity and Democracy, Christianity and Communism, Christianity and Socialism, Christ's Law of the Family, etc. Take the discourse on Christianity and Communism as an example. Dr. Abbot fully recognizes the evils of accumulated wealth and the like; but he strongly protests against the notion that property is robbery. There is a broad and deep human sympathy in these sermons, and much may be learned from them.