

the best of our houses of the like curiosity, but the most parte farre much worse workmanship, that could neither well defend wind or raine; yet we had daily Common Prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two Sermons and every three months the Holy Communion, till our Minister died.' It was under this canvass on the third Sunday after Trinity, June 21st, 1607, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered for the first time in America of which we have any record. The name of Robert Hunt, the clergyman who ministered to these struggling colonists, should have an honorable place in our annals.—*Church News.*

THE ST. ANDREWS BROTHERHOOD AND THE MINISTRY.

The chief pastors of the Church and all who rightly estimate its future work give emphatic expression to the need so sorely felt for an increase in the numbers of the ordained ministry. To this need it would be well for Brotherhood men to give personal attention; for they have it in their power to aid greatly in supplying it. It is most natural that a man interested through his Brotherhood membership in the mission of the Church and trained to the doing of service therein, should be called on to take his place among the officers of the Lord's army. In fact, Chapter work is a good preparation for the ministry, and one who has thus done work as a genuine layman will not be likely to sink his manly character in an obnoxious professionalism. We are right in believing that our prayer for laborers to be sent into the harvest has a direct application to the work of laymen; but, in making this discovery, to many of us quite new, we should not fall into the error of supposing that the petition has pointed application to the need of recruits for the ministry. These are evidently quite as necessary as active laymen; and out of the ranks of such laymen, whether young or old, they will naturally be drawn. As we come to emphasize the active function of the laity in the Church, we must avoid any tendency to overlook the importance of the other order. It is only necessary to consider the place that a rector holds in his parochial Chapter of the Brotherhood and how essential his active interest and oversight are to its success, to realize how completely the usefulness of the laity is dependent upon the character of the clergy

Now, the call to the ministry, which, we take it, the Brotherhood should continually repeat and emphasize, does not come merely to those who are yet at school or just starting in life. Those who were present at the Brotherhood Convention in New York two years ago, will not soon forget Bishop Dudley's strong appeal that men who had already gained the experience that only years of practical business life can give, should come forward with all their trained faculties and devote themselves to the work of the Church. So, too, the Bishop of Maine, in addressing his diocesan convention calls for "young men, or, better still, men who have already had experience in other callings." From the days of the Apostles, indeed, men of such training have been found willing, for the sake of entering upon the work of the ministry, to sacrifice all other opportunities, a sacrifice greater at forty years of age than at twenty. Ambrose, governor of Milan, prevailed upon by the voice of the people to become their Bishop, is a familiar instance. Such a selection of a layman to the episcopate would hardly be in order to day, but very many of our best Bishops and strongest rectors have had years of experience as lawyers, as business men, or, by reason of the late war, as soldiers. Not long ago in Michigan, a State conspicuous for its strong educational system, the principal of the State Normal School, well known as an educator and an active lay worker in his parish and diocese,

applied for and received Deacon's Orders, that he might serve the Church more effectually in preaching and in its other ministrations. This is a recent instance of a not unusual nor unnatural course. It is a precedent that deserves a following.

In connection with all this, attention should be called to another part of Bishop Neely's recent address. In speaking of the trials and discomforts to which the ambassadors of Christ must often submit, he reminds the laymen that these are often due to their indifference or neglect. "The ministers of Christ's word and sacraments are sent forth by Him and they come to you in His name, clothed with His authority. They are your servants, but 'your servants for Jesus' sake,' not to do your will, but His will. There is due to them reverent regard, a generous support, 'a high esteem in love for their works' sake.' Where these are rendered, the most grievous trials in the ordinary lot of the ministry disappear." If for no other reason than is given in this last sentence, the earnest layman will cultivate an affectionate regard and esteem for his pastor; but when he considers that unity of sentiment and a cordial understanding between priests and people are absolutely essential to the well-being of the Church and the evangelization of this country, he will allow nothing to interfere with the maintenance of mutual relations of friendship, respect, and confidence. That this can be done without any loss of his Christian liberty and independent status in the Church we do not hesitate to maintain.

In the ranks of the Brotherhood are found men who have realized their responsibility for the actual performance of the Church's work. The clergy have recognized their zeal and, with but few exceptions, have welcomed their earnest and united action. It is for the members of the Brotherhood to be loyal to their pastors, to cultivate their acquaintance, to claim their confidence by faithful service and to show them "a high esteem in love for their works' sake." And it might be well for many a Brotherhood man to consider whether the field and the need do not constitute a call to him for an unreserved application of his time and faculties to the serving of Christ's people in the ministry of the Church.—*St. Andrew's Cross.*

LIMITS OF TOLERATION.

It is not many years since the appearance of that keen satire upon the Anglican Church, entitled "The Comedy of Convocation." A supposed meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury is described. The assembly of notable dignitaries and divines takes place with all due solemnity. At the proper moment the subject of discussion is proposed in the following terms: "Whether there be a God?" Of course the point of the satire was to indicate that the Church of England was so very broad and liberal that it was quite a matter of course that the Being of God should be an open question. Of course, also, such an imputation was felt to be an unwarrantable and wanton attack upon a branch of the Catholic Church which has preserved in her authoritative formularies the true Faith of Christ in integrity, and has, through her ritual, secured the presentation of that Faith as constantly and fully as any other Church in the world.

Nevertheless, as we read the signs of the times, the question will sometimes occur, whether there is not a somewhat wide prevalence of a kind of liberality which comes dangerously near the position ascribed to the Church in the satire referred to; which, at least, is inclined to tolerate as venial even the explicit denial of articles of the Faith as expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and that by men who have been solemnly set apart by ordination to teach that very Faith.

We fully admit that a somewhat wide latitude may be wisely allowed, that much material heresy may from time to time be heard from the pulpits of the Church; but so long as it is not by way of an intentional and explicit departure from sound doctrine, and is not part of a deliberately formed system subversive of the creeds of the Church, authority may well consider whether other means may not in many cases be more effectual in the long run than a direct attempt at repression. Time and the wonderful power of the services of the Church will in a vast number of cases preserve the body of our people sound in the Faith, notwithstanding the ignorance, the self-conceit, or the eccentric vagaries of individual teachers. And it is no uncommon experience to find that a priest who at one period of his ministry has gone astray through some knowledge or "science falsely so called," at a later time becomes as conservative and orthodox as could be desired. Sometimes his deflection has hardly been a conscious divergence from the truth at any time, and better knowledge insensibly amends his definitions. Sometimes, in the case of a more daring or sensational character, the failure to obtain a following or to induce the Church to put his new wine into her old bottles, has in the end brought him to his senses and taught him the needed lesson of humility. And doubtless cases are not wanting where the dealer in novelties has distinctly perceived the errors of his earlier ways and has returned with comfort and with joy to "stand in the old paths."

But when all due allowance has been made for such cases as these—and even here grave responsibility is involved in too great forbearance—it must still be remembered that both the Bishops and other clergy are under the most solemn vows that can be bound upon men to be "ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." It is evident, therefore, that there must be a limit, somewhere, beyond which toleration is a sin. The Church pledges herself before the world and to her own children to uphold the standard of revealed truth as it has been handed down from the beginning, and as she has received it. This is a sacred trust, to which if she prove faithless, her work in the world is done, and her call upon the allegiance of men becomes an impertinence.

Every one sees at once the enormity of supposing that the existence of a personal God could for a moment be left an open question, or of allowing a man who has taken upon himself the solemn vows of the priesthood, to stand up in his pulpit and suggest doubts upon that fundamental dogma. But is it any more tolerable that an authorized teacher holding the commission of the Church should be allowed to deny any other of the articles of the Creed? Shall such a man after leading his people in the great confession: "I believe in Jesus Christ . . . Who was . . . Born of the Virgin Mary," and "I believe in . . . the Resurrection of the Body," then be allowed to turn around and in his place as teacher declare: "He was not born of a virgin," "there is no resurrection of the body?" This is not simply to subvert the Faith, but to undermine the foundations of morality, to confound truth and falsehood, and ensnare the souls for whom Christ died. If the categorical denial of the articles of the simplest of all the creeds of Christendom is not "erroneous and strange doctrine," if such an exigency does not impose a solemn duty upon those who are sworn "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away" such things, then we should like to ask what conceivable condition of things would call for such action? What depth of error, what degree of strangeness of doctrine, will demand the interposition as those who are set to feed the flock of Christ and protect it from the ravaging wolf?—*Living Church.*