

the mind of the  
aining part and  
ife. There is, of  
that the Public  
other Provinces  
essentially god-  
eatest amount of  
in the true sense  
ess we are able  
ive and too often  
separate schools  
re and make the  
e present of an-  
  
those enjoyed by  
outh—the least  
ents insist upon  
xt bearing upon  
some short por-  
e of some hymn  
hurch are con-  
ashion, such as  
holic catechism.  
rgyman and the  
e lightened and  
nday to explain  
e week. In the  
ities afforded by  
rtance, as "A  
here, cannot be  
erious difficulty  
element in the  
each others ex-  
d how can the  
achers are fore-  
hat must occur  
son? We fear  
thers are only a  
rs, or so want-  
to impart their  
leasing and in-  
k becomes per-  
lly both teach-  
p off—some of  
7 to the streets.  
e is a teachers'  
ake about this,  
is presided over  
sh, but by the  
y School, who  
p to his work.  
lference. The  
ead of clerical  
othing save a  
terfere with it,  
vledgment the  
e seed of the  
e always held  
influence may  
enfold greater  
ot the least of  
School teach-  
f the Sunday  
mere presence  
at the instruc-  
will do more  
children the  
ome religious  
ogether. Not  
the agency of  
d more exten-  
mply set forth  
the day, the  
rsede in great  
fidel and the  
y press into

their service the talents of the laity, many of whom if asked, could handle in a familiar and popular manner subjects bearing upon the Church, her history, her buildings, her ritual, and her formularies. The good results of such a course need not be particularised, not one of the least important being that thus laymen would be led to take an intelligent interest in Church work, while many non-Churchmen would be induced to come and hear from an unpaid fellow-layman what he would not listen to from a parson whom he considers paid to do such things as a matter of business. In the same way by means of guilds for each sex, mothers' meetings, and parish libraries, and societies of every sort the clergy of all our missions might effect much for the spread of Church principles and the instruction of both young and old in her doctrines and practices. In fact it is not too much to say that if our parish priests devoted a great deal more time in going round from house to house and catechising for a minute or two each juvenile in the family, they would do much with them and still more with the parents, who would thus see that the clergyman was one not only able to instruct them in their faith, but also willing to make himself all things to all men to win and keep souls for Christ. We do not deny that such work would involve great self-denial and entail a much greater expenditure of time than is now devoted to parochial visits, but to such an end is the life of a priest dedicated by his ordination vows, and such was the pattern laid down to be followed by Him of whom it is emphatically said that He did nothing else than go about "doing good."

CHURCH THOUGHTS.

BY A LAYMAN.

History versus Roman Legends.

IN the Bishop of Toronto's recent charge to the Synod he said, "We trace back the independent autonomy of our branch of the Church Catholic to Apostolic ages." This assertion of the historic continuity of our Church has naturally excited the Romanist Archbishop, Dr. Lynch, who has challenged the Bishop to prove that the Church of England had an independent autonomy before the Reformation. His Grace also reiterates the absurd theory that the old English Church was a branch of the Church of Rome, and that a new one was manufactured by the Reformers, just as men made the Odd Fellows or Good Templars' Societies, or the Wesleyan Church or other human organizations. A reply has been issued by the Rev. John Langtry, which proves to demonstration the following points. That in the early ages all national Churches were in communion as equals, that Churches founded by others were left free, and that the English Church after centuries of liberty was forced into unwilling submission to Rome until the Reformation broke the yoke of bondage; and further that a Church cannot be made by man at all but by God only, and that they who seek to found Churches assume the prerogative of the Divine Head of the Church. In Dr. Lynch's letter he sought to prove that the Reformers were neither "holy," "noble" nor "learned," as the Bishop said they were. His quotations were from Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, &c, elegant extracts from their Billingsgate which show that these men spoke of each other as "obscene pigs," "mad dogs," "asses," and so forth, are not adapted for family reading in these days. But all this only reveals the tone of

morals among Roman theologians, and proves the need of a reformation. Besides, revolutions are not made with rose water, and we do not select refined men as scavengers. We have reason too to thank God that the English Church reformers were not Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin, but Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and a brilliant company of holy and learned theologians, who scraped off the Church the vile accretions of Rome and restored its ancient Catholic purity of doctrine and beauty of ritual; and with these, Apostolic orders,—the golden links which bind us to the visible Catholic militant Church of time, and the invisible triumphant Church of heaven and eternity. We shall now offer evidence beyond cavil that the English Church was not a mere branch of a branch, but enjoyed autonomous life for centuries prior to the Reformation. We select our quotations from Freeman's great work on the Norman Conquest, the authority of which is unchallenged, as it is scientifically built up from documentary, contemporary official sources. We beg especial attention to these extracts, as they have never been used yet in this connection. "By the end of the seventh century the independent, insular, Teutonic, i. e., English, Church had become one of the brightest lights of the Christian firmament." Again, "The English Church reverencing Rome, but not bowing down to her," &c. "The Christian faith professed in Britain in the sixth century was not the orthodoxy of old or new Rome." (Vol. I. 20-22). More significant still is the following on the causes of the Norman invasion: "The crime of England in the eyes of Rome, the crime to punish which the crusade of William was approved, and blessed was the independence still retained by the English Church." (Vol. iii. 191.) But even under the usurper William this proud spirited, self-governing Church resisted all efforts to make her "bow down to Rome." Freeman writes, "Lanfranc (Archbishop of Canterbury) refused unlimited submission to the Pope; and it is plain that both he and the King had made up their minds that all the obedience Rome was likely to win from them, that is from the English Church and State, did not go beyond a decent ceremonial observance." (Vol. iv. 295.) Mark that word "win," that is, they had yet to be induced to give even "ceremonial observance" of the claims of Rome, although to enforce the submission of our Church the conquest was organized and carried out. The identity of Church and nation was then so absolute that the assemblies which acted as Parliaments were also Synods. Bishops and Ealdormen were appointed and deposed by the same authority. There never was in all history such a spectacle of unity in Church and State, and to assert that the Church was governed from and by Rome is to assert that England as a nation was also governed from Rome. From Freeman we turn to an equal authority, Prof. Stubbs, who writes: "The unity of the Church in England was the pattern of the unity of the State: it was to an extraordinary degree a National Church for a great part of the period under our view (before the conquest), the interference of foreign Churches was scarcely if at all felt. There was no Roman legation from the days of Theodore to Offa (A.D. 650-750), and there are only scanty vestiges of such interference for the next three centuries." (Cons. History of Eng., Vol. i., 245.) We refer our readers also to Bright's new work on the early History of Britain for matter of extreme interest on this question and as to the origin of the British Church, which he states hardly admits of a doubt, was founded by Gallic missionaries and had intimate connections with the East. Indeed,

if we only consider that the district first evangelized by the dispersed disciples was in close intimacy with Britain, where their merchants traded for tin, &c., we see how likely an interest would be excited in the heathen of the "Isles of the West," and an effort made to raise there the standard of the Cross. That Eastern influences are traceable in our Church's early history is certain, and that central England was evangelized by Celtic priests is demonstrable, for we have seen the tomb stones of Saxon Christians in Derbyshire, and one, that of a priest, is alike in design to sculptured stones found in Ireland. It is a strange error, but a universal one, that the ancient British Church was annihilated by the massacres of the fifth century. But all historical and philological evidence shows that the males only were killed, though some fled into the mountains of Wales. Surely the Christian women left would in their homes be witnesses for Christ. They would tell the story of the cross to their young, and thus was the ground prepared and the seed sown for that harvest reaped by missionaries in the next century—a harvest which but for such a preparation would be miraculous. Should our conjecture be sound, another jewel is added to the crown of woman, and our race and Church are more than ever her debtor. We however reserve to the last the crowning proof of the independence of the English Church. We commend a study of it to those who ask "Where was your church before Henry?" "Show us your line of Bishops," to others also who ignorantly designate ours "the Church of the Reformation" and use such like phrases, dear alike to the Romanist and Puritan, but ludicrous in the judgment of all who have learned enough to disentangle the legends of Rome from the facts of history. Our proof then is this, the Statute laws of England recognises the Church of to-day as being absolutely the same Church Corporation or body or institution as that existing before the Reformation for many centuries. The laws are the same which related to the Church under all the successive dynasties which have ruled England since her settlement as a nation. The law of England practically affirms and witnesses to the fact that the Church of England never was the Church of Rome in England, but was ever a national, independent, insular, self-governed church, and that its temporary subjection to Rome was a mere episode effecting not its historic identity or continuity. The words then of the Bishop, "we trace back the independent autonomy of our branch of the Church Catholic beyond the Reformation" were those of truth and soberness, the taunts of the Romanist Archbishop and the protests of our Evangelical friends are on the one hand the mere dreams of disappointed ambition, and on the other, the miserable display of sectarian feeling which is irritated by the demonstration by history that the church is not a sect, is not, nor ever was a branch of the Church of Rome, not a manufactured product of the Reformers, but a true, living branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. Every Churchman may say of the Church in the words of the greatest theologian of this age: "I trust to her, for I believe that the Apostles fully and faithfully delivered the whole truth which they received to those whom they appointed in their stead to carry on the lamp of the truth to the end," and from these the lamp of the English Church was lighted. —Ideas go through the world louder than cannon. Thoughts are mightier than armies. Principles have achieved more victories than horsemen or chariots.