

were such a Board as I speak of, acting on the broad lines I have suggested, then the messengers from the great mission fields of the Church would not have to meet apathy and even opposition where they have a right to expect sympathy. No; the doors that are now being closed to them would be opened for them by the far stronger hand of the Dominion Mission Board, whose requests for pulpits and meetings would demand and receive a respectful hearing where those of individual missionary Dioceses would not be listened to. And I can imagine no better way of rousing a genuine and abiding missionary spirit in the great centres of the East than by meetings either on Sundays or week days, carefully arranged for by the Executive of the Dominion Mission Board and addressed by picked men from the various mission fields who should tell their story not with the mere desire to augment their own funds, but with a view of informing the whole Church on the needs of its missionary work, and thus arousing it to a sense of its duty.

(To be continued.)

## ENGLAND AND ROME.

BY THE REV. J. R. PALMER.

The present time seems to require from all true members of the English Church a more consistent and faithful adherence to her doctrines and practices. Very few Churchmen who are at all awake to the special phase of life and activity which in one portion of our Church is becoming daily more and more manifest can doubt the wisdom of more faithfully following the principles of her true teaching. And believing that such teaching is drawn from the pure fount of Holy Scripture; that her principles are sound, her worship sober and reverent, her position rightly understood, impregnable; and her mission in something more than theory such as aims at the truest welfare of the English race, we have need not only to thank God, and say with the Psalmist: "The lines are fallen unto us in pleasant places; yea, we have a goodly heritage" (xvi. 6), but also to take heed how we use and profit by our God-given opportunities. We may not claim on behalf of a church which all reasonable men admit has many merits that of *perfection*. We may not be willing to stand by everything in her outward representation, or endorse every statement made in her name. We may feel conscientiously constrained to repudiate certain current theories of her character and office. We may be desirous of avoiding both *excess and defect*. But surely all reasonable Christians who profess to be members of the English Church, should, especially in these days, be most unwilling that any action of theirs should compromise her true Scriptural character. Common loyalty to a *sober* standard of religious worship, which is clearly the standard of our Church should make us profoundly unwilling, under any pretence, to add to it what is *foreign and unnecessary*. To make any such addition is not only to betray a feeling of discontent with what has already stood the test of ages and generations, but also in a very real sense to cast a slight upon the wisdom, piety, and learning of the most illustrious names in the history of our Church. In many instances it is to manifest a preference for ceremonies and theories which are at the best of doubtful value rather than for what the wisdom of the Church has decided to be of universal and permanent importance. It is to ignore that "wisdom of the Church of England," which the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer tells us, "hath been ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of

too much easiness in admitting any variation from it." Surely it cannot be wise or good to add to services which for the most part bear the impression and set forth the teaching of a venerable antiquity the "ceremonialist ultraisms" (to the use the phrase of Dr. W. E. Jellicoe) of the Roman Church. Decency and order do not require them, much less does the cause of Truth. And the wisdom which if from above will induce us to be careful not to rebel by our extravagance Christians who are far more in sympathy with the true teaching of our Church than are the members of a Church which compel all souls within her pale to repudiate what we hold as sacred. Moreover, if, in these days, any course is taken to extend the limits of our Church, and increase her wide-spreading usefulness, it certainly should not be in a direction which would be distinctly *retrogressive*, and from which very probably we should sooner or later be only to thankful to escape. The desire for reunion is one direction may be due to a feeling that the Church would gain in the matter of authority and power, but after all it is clearly conceivable that we might find the balance of these things in the wrong hands. And the sacrifices which we should necessarily have to make would far outweigh any real gain we may acquire by such a course. No words could be wiser, or more deserving of our earnest consideration, than those which have recently fell from the lips of no less an authority than the Archbishop of Canterbury: "It were well to draw out of the past the remarkable lessons it presents to the effect that great bodies may possess the *historic* episcopate (as Donatists and Novatianists did) and yet not be of the Church, to point out that an *unhistoric* episcopate adds to a Christian body no inheritance, no unity, nothing but a different business management; to point out the thinning out, the dilution of the historic episcopate in a Church which *intrudes scores of pretenders into historically occupied sees*, and creates scores of bishops to secure a majority in a pretended council of bishops." No indictment could be more telling than that which the last clause in this passage furnishes us with; and every word is fully confirmed by the history of the Vatican Council, 1870. Rome has more than once shown scant regard for the rights of the "historic episcopate" even within her own pale. Piety, learning, and age, even when combined, have all been sacrificed when their possessor has dared to follow the dictates of conscience, and claimed to be heard on the side of Truth. And in this respect we may well believe, from her recent utterances on Anglican Orders, that Rome is *semper eadem*.

What warning, then, could be more necessary, or wiser and better for our present needs, in view of the theories and practices which are daily finding a more prominent place in the English Church, than that given by its Primate: "Solicitude for decayed usages, for which, perhaps, some shred of a verbal plea can be found, is weak. It is worse than weak to pursue *novelties*, and add *trivialities* to our very alters such as Romanism never knew. . . . What a moment to be fingering the trinkets of Rome, when it was denying, not the 'power' (that would be hopeless), but 'authority' of the Church of this country with an audacity never used before! Large minded men might be amused, but surely not without indignation, at being assured that 1,200 Roman Catholic bishops had refused to admit the validity of English orders; that a *pallium* not being received, here from Rome was a proof that the continuity of the British and English Church was broken; and that England had been just dedicated as 'Mary's Dowry,' and placed under the patronage of St. Peter." And then the same great authority powerfully adds: "It is a time to be introducing among our simple ones the devotional life of that body? Is it a time

to run down masculine sense and the unsurpassed knowledge and the keen historic insight of our Reformers? He had touched—he trusted not too harshly—on the *unmeasured and daily intensifying necessity for carefulness* lest any one of the great schools in the Church should, as in past times, adopt or admit *working substitutes* for their own peculiar *spiritual power*."

These words, which admit of a very extensive application, point to some of the greatest dangers of the present time. They are not the utterance of one who is likely from inexperience or inadequate knowledge, or lack of the truest devotion to the English Church, to misunderstand or misrepresent "the signs of times." They are the warning of one who has again and again given the fullest proof of ability to grapple with the greatest difficulties which beset the work of the Church. Comparing recent utterances of Roman Catholic authorities with the only too evident meaning of so many excesses in our midst, the Primate of the English Church has doubtless fulfilled a most solemn duty in admonishing us to adhere to those sounder principles and more primitive practices which are not only a distinguishing characteristic of our Church, but are also more consistent with the teaching of the Word of God and the Christian Religion. Instead of *adding unnecessarily to the ceremonies expressly sanctioned and enjoined by the Book of Common Prayer*, it would be well if Churchmen would make it their aim to live more fully in the *spirit* of its true teaching. This effort would not only be in the right direction but also would do much towards promoting that "unity, peace, and concord" for which we pray. The words "Endue Thy ministers with righteousness" would lose none of their influence upon the minds of those who are "committed to our charge" by reason of a more general concession of things now essential. The cause of truth, righteousness, and peace never was or can be served by an excessive attention to matters of no weight or consequence.

While with regard to Rome we shall do well to remember not only the weighty words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but also the clear and sound teaching and judgment of past and present writers, whose claim to be considered as by no means deficient in the matter of sound *churchmanship* no one denies. For instance, Isaac Williams in "Prefatory Thoughts: a Dialogue," prefixed to his little work, entitled "*The Bapetistry*," gives utterance to sentiments which we should at least carefully consider. And as all readers are not acquainted with the little book, a few quotations from it may not be useless or uninteresting:—

"The rosary, the amice, cowl, and veil,  
Are so allied with evil, that they seem  
As deeply steep'd in some enchanter's well,  
And not in Holy Baptism."

And referring to an excessive symbolism, we find the following warning so thoroughly in agreement with our Lord's words in the New Testament—

"But *grant* no sign of Rome in these appears;—  
Yet these appeals to the more sensual eye  
Do *Savour of her worship*; in her courts  
Imagination holds too high a place,  
Leagued with material things, and charms the heart

Prone to idolatry, *unconscious glides*  
To sense from spirit."

And again we read—

"Yet in these days  
I would hold back and fear. There are, 'tis said,  
Spirits abroad impatient of our Church,  
Her weakness and her children's;,"  
and of some of these "spirits" it is said that they have—

"*unfilial thoughts*,  
And yearn for union with *intruding Rome*."  
—C. E. S. S. Magazine.