

condition of affairs politically and religiously which led to that Roman monk's presence in England. Familiar to everybody, it is yet well to draw attention to the fact that Augustine came to *Anglo-Saxon* England, but that long before the Angles and Saxons had conquered the Island it was inhabited by a noble race of fierce and impetuous warriors, who first, under Cassivelaunus, and subsequently under Caractacus and others, nobly and heroically resisted the inroads of Rome's bravest generals and soldiers. And it is an important and gratifying historical fact, which may have had much to do with the subsequent history not only of that country but of the world, from a religious standpoint, that the Romans never absolutely conquered this brave and patriotic people, and that the necessity for maintaining a large standing army led Constantius Chlorus to take up his abode there, and subsequently to his marriage to a British lady, Helena, by whom he had a son—Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor of Rome. The earliest religion of the Britons was Druidism, that mysterious system of worship which exercised so remarkable an influence over its devotees. The Early Britons were eminently a religious people, and therefore the substitution of the religion of Christ for the religion of their forefathers, when accomplished, found them as faithful and devoted in maintaining the new as they had been in their faithfulness and devotion to the old. We are not surprised, consequently, to find the Early Britons as eager in propagating and as self-sacrificing in defending the Christian Faith as they formerly had been in upholding their strange worship. We have been speaking of the Early Britons in the time of the Roman occupation. But now a time arrived when the Roman soldiers had to be withdrawn from Britain to guard the heart of the Empire, and with their withdrawal came dangers and trials which the Britons were ill-prepared to meet. Attacked on the North by the Picts and Scots, and on the East and South by Danish and German Pirates, and weakened by internal feuds, the Britons were to experience what history tells us has been universally the lot of those weaker nations who have had to seek the help of their more powerful neighbours—those called in to their aid not only driving out their enemies, but eventually driving the Britons themselves into Wales, and possessing the country as their own. These invaders—the Jutes, Angles and Saxons—founded between the year 457 and 582 the seven Kingdoms or Saxon Heptarchy, which were afterwards united to form the Anglo-Saxon England of a later period. We have had to briefly review these years of British history, so well known to every school child, in order to show that while the country had been Christian for a long time, it lost its Christian character owing to the British Christians having been driven into Wales, and their place occupied by the heathen hordes who took possession of the country. But the British Church still existed, and, as we shall presently see, when Augustine came to convert the heathen Anglo-Saxons, the Church in Wales, of whose existence at the time he and those who sent him appear to have known nothing, was under the care of seven Bishops and an Archbishop.

And now, as to the origin of this British Church. Many writers believe that while St. Paul may have first brought the knowledge of Christ to Britain, the British Church owed her organization to Eas-

tern sources. Sir Roger Twisden, in his "Historical Vindication of the Church of England," asserts that she derived her succession from St. John through a Greek or Asiatic channel, from that whence the Roman itself came, namely, from the Mother of all Churches, the Church of Jerusalem." Indeed, it is not a wild statement which has been made by eminent persons, namely, that there is much reason for supposing that as an organized body the Church of England is more ancient than the Church of Rome. Certain it is, according to Bingham, that 150 years before Augustine's arrival in England, that is to say at the time of the Saxon invasion, the Church had so long existed, and had grown to such proportions, that there were more Bishops in England than there are at this day. And it is also an important fact, that long before Christianity was tolerated in Rome by the State, it was as free as the air in Britain, and the recognized religion of the country. That her origin was not Roman, we have many conclusive proofs. Among others, we may point out that "the English word Church is from the Greek *Kuriakē*, a term which no Roman ever applied to the Church (which he called *Ecclesia*, and by no other name), and it is not credible that if the Church of England had been derived from Rome, it should have been designated by a title *foreign* to Rome. It must also be considered a very important fact that the British Church followed the Asiatic Churches in keeping Easter, and in the manner of administering Baptism; and in other matters also, which were considered of great importance, as we shall see further on, to which Augustine took exception, the rule was opposed to the practice of the Roman Church. Besides, it is well to note that the British Bishops claimed Eastern origin, and would not admit any jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, or any connection, save as a sister Church, with the Church of Augustine.

FORMS OF WORSHIP.

(Written for the Church Guardian)

BY D. I. F. WILKINS, B. A.

THE following recently appeared in a Detroit "Society" paper:—"Undoubtedly there are a large number of Episcopal communicants to whom the form of worship seems more vital than the spirit, people who like candles and incense and genuflections, because these things give their senses and their bodies something to do. With people of weak minds symbolism performs the very necessary office of enabling them to worship without drawing on their inadequate stock of brains. To these people the Episcopal Church rightly extends a hand of fellowship so long as too much inherent efficacy is not claimed for the symbols." Like only too many other secular writers, the author of the scrap assumes that all who believe in and use symbols in religious worship are brainless fools. The astute, noble-minded, broad-souled writer does not, however, seem to notice that he involves in the same condemnation all Freemasons, Orangemen, Knights of Pythias, and other organizations, which have a formal ritual for opening and closing, etc., etc. What is the use of all the Ritual of Freemasonry, grotesque and meaningless as it appears to an outsider, except to present to the mind of the Freemason, certain principles and first truths which he believes are embodied in the Constitution of the Universe? Yet what Free-

mason either feels self-degraded, or is looked upon as a "weak-minded idiot" for his performance of a piece of downright Ritualism? Ritualism in its true sense, Ritualism teaching and symbolising, if not Christian doctrine, is at least an approach thereto? Again, what is the use of the coloured vestments and other adornments of the Orange Order? That they are intended for a mere gew-gaw show, no one pretends to believe. They are symbols of certain facts, and as such, no Orangeman feels his manhood debased and insulted by either his vestments or his ritual. Further, I have been told, although I do not know from experience, that in every Orange Lodge the Bible stands open, not for use, but solely for a symbol of freedom of thought, and right of private judgment. This is Ritualism or nothing.

But going further, why should all pay respect to a piece of red, white and blue rag, whether it be a combination of crosses, or one of "stars and bars?" Why in certain plays when one of these is displayed will the audience spring to their feet, and in some instances cheer till the very building shakes? Whose mind is emasculated by such an act as this? Yet this is Ritualism and Symbolism throughout. That coloured bunting is the symbol of the power, the greatness and the intelligence of the Anglo-Saxon race, whether it be that of the English Empire or of the United States, no one feels the worse for his homage to the flag of his country, or indeed of any others; on the contrary, he is rather elated and edified by the performance of the act.

It is when we come to Christianity and Christian Ritual, when we endeavour to symbolize certain doctrines by certain acts and positions, when we place the emblems not of the present fading world, but of the realities of Eternity, clergy and laity are stigmatized as "wanting in ballast," "brainless fools," or "double-dyed scoundrels;" the last epithet being applied where the accused display a little more intelligence than their kind-hearted, liberal-minded, charitable opponents.

It were almost worth one's while to inquire how much of this opposition to Symbolism is due to savage spite, how much to mere slovenly laziness, and how much to real, conscientious ignorance, misconception or idiosyncratic peculiarities. Leaving out the first and the last, it may be fairly premised, nay, affirmed, that the second, in only too many cases, is one great cause. Every truth is liable to perversion; the greater the truth, the greater the liability to perversion. Truth can be so perverted as just to suit the requirements of a lazy, shiftless mind. so, in fact, that by taking a part for a whole, this mind is satisfied. Thus the great and glorious truth that "God is a Spirit, and that they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth;" and that hence heartfelt prayer, although the lips may not visibly move, is heard and answered by God, has been so perverted as to exclude the necessity of bodily worshipping, and even of prayer itself, both public and private. Hence to sit or loll during the solemn hours of prayer in church, and to dispense with such a service altogether in private, on the ground that God *can* hear and answer prayer everywhere and anywhere, has been frequently asserted. While undoubtedly this does suit a lazy, shiftless mind, and while undoubtedly this does expose the unfortunate man who dares to kneel facing altar-wise to great ridicule and scorn, it is manifestly a deliberate perversion of the truth and a lowering of its value.

(To be continued.)