

ought to have been the missionary of Christian monotheism to the tribes of Arabia. And other consequences than the rise of Mohammedanism in lands specially destined to the Church (Ps. lx. 6-8; lxvii. 31; lxxxvii. 4), followed only too naturally. When the four Patriarchates of the Eastern Church fell under Moslem subjection the balance of influence in the Catholic Church was broken; and the claims of the Patriarch of the imperial city of Rome (always in council, "*primus inter pares*" amongst the five Patriarchates of Christendom) to take the central home position of the Mother-city of Christianity arose almost inevitably.

But I could trace the real source of all this evil further back, namely, to an error of the Catholic Church, more fatal and wider reaching than even the apathy of the Eastern Churches, with all their sad loss of the vital spirit of missionary energy. To those Churches there is yet a bright future, and a destined work for which they have doubtless been mercifully preserved through centuries of oppression. That error has been the neglect of missions to the Jews.

Christ after His rejection by the Jews, and on the eve of His Ascension, gave a missionary commission to His Church. It was given at the same time when He instituted Holy Baptism. His charge therefore rests upon every baptized member of His Church. It was invariably observed by His Apostles: it is barred by no canon of any general council. Who then relieved the Church of Christ from the sacred charge to evangelize the Jews? Christ, in His forgiving mercy, gave them even a primacy of interest in His Gospel ("beginning at Jerusalem," "to the Jew first"); and that not in order of time of proclamation, but in perpetuity. Why did not the Church cherish the Mother Church of Jerusalem? It was not destroyed in the fall of Jerusalem; the succession of its bishops is recorded to the date of Eusebius. It may not have been wholly Jewish, but it was the rallying centre of Hebrew Christianity. Who gave the Church a commission to set aside the order of Christ, and the uniform practice of His Apostles, and to substitute for missionary enterprise amongst the Jews a most unchristian persecution in all ages of the Church? Why should not the Church have met and softened the exile Jews in the sadness of their fall, wherever there was a Christian colony, with the tender greeting of Christ, that, for all their opposition, He had left them a message of reconciliation, a certain primacy, nay, a special destiny in His Church, like that of His message of forgiveness to St. Peter, "when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren"; "for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?"

Surely it is not too much to say that had the Church been obedient to the command of Christ, had she thus "turned back the captivity of Zion," the whole record of Church history must have been different. The due proportion of missionary work might have been preserved; missionary zeal might have burned steadily in the East. The evangelization of the Jewish colonies in and round Arabia, and of that historic colony at Alexandria, would have added strength and defence to the Eastern Church. The light would have brightened on the candlestick of the Mother-city of Jerusalem: the usurpation of her place by her strong sister in the West must have been held in check, and the influence of Rome in the Christian world might never have attained undue proportion. The development of the kingdom of Christ in the world must have been influenced by what

Christ declared to be His will as to the relative position of Hebrew Christianity.

The missions of Christ are "to the Jew first and also to the Gentile," but what even to-day is the Church herself doing for the Jew? Yet the position is changing back again; and an opportunity offers to the Church to retrieve the ancient error and her disobedience. The eye of the world is upon the East. In place of the handful of Jews who may have been hidden in the land, but are not chronicled between the second and the nineteenth centuries, there are now, in the face of every adverse law, three times as many Jews in Palestine as returned from the captivity in Babylon. Again the voice of Christ appeals to the Church, "Preach the Gospel . . . beginning at Jerusalem." And whilst no special blessing beyond the general assurance of success rests upon any Gentile mission field, missionary enterprise amongst the Jews is a "*first commandment with promise*." We have grown great, commercially and imperially, since we resumed obedience to missionary enterprise amongst the Gentiles. What healing of strife, schism and heresy, what unity of Christendom may not wait for our obedience to Jewish missionary enterprise?

I am here as the representative bishop of the Anglican Communion. We should be helping the rising tide of revival amongst our brethren of the East; we should be obedient to the charge of Christ concerning the Jew. But I have sadly insufficient means, men and money, intrusted to me by the great communion I represent. Other Churches (not for such objects as these, but to strengthen their political position in these lands) are lavishing expenditure here. The missions now in our hands offer as bright an encouragement, though their scale is so small, as any in the area of Christ's mission field can offer to the heart of those who promote them. Will the Church give me a general offertory on Good Friday\*, the Day of Christ's Dying for us all—an act which "rent in twain" the veil of partition, and included the Jew in the brotherhood of the Gospel, and thus inaugurated the unity of His Church. It is a season most appropriate for Jewish intercession. It is from want of the alms of the Church (and still more the prayers of the Church) which have not yet gone up as a memorial before God, in the offering of obedience to His missionary command, that our work is hindered, and the "showers of blessing" do not fall.

Will you become fellow-workers with me and strengthen the hands of your representative bishop here? Shall we by our apathy rivet the bond upon Eastern Church life, and tie down the veil which God's hand is lifting according to His promise from the heart of the Jews? Is there no present call to our Church, no instant responsibility, no reward worth her winning? Do "come over and help us!"

#### "THE CANADIAN CHURCHMAN" CATHEDRAL FUND.

The Cathedral of St. Alban's, Toronto, is in dire financial straits. The scheme was generally approved of and endorsed by the Synod of Toronto as a noble one, when it was started many years ago, and so much has been done that a handsome chancel has been finished, and is used as a parish church as well as the nucleus of the future cathedral. But the promised subscriptions have failed to come in, and it seems as if all that has been expended would be lost to the church by the

\*Or on any more convenient day during Lent in the Holy Week.

apathy of the people. The honour of all of us is bound up in this matter, and the sweeping away of this land and building would mean everlasting shame to the Diocese of Toronto. The Bishop has appealed without avail; the conscience of the people has not been impressed. A subscription equal to one dollar from each communicant would relieve the Bishop from this anxiety, but the clergy cannot be aware of this, or they would have taken action long ago. We now appeal earnestly to all. Send us what you can, and the funds received will be duly acknowledged and handed over. Stir up your clergy, your friends and neighbours, and see that their contributions are forwarded. Organize and act. Cheques and P.O. orders to be made payable to Frank Wootton, Toronto.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED.

Previously acknowledged.....\$280 00  
From a member of St. Luke's, Toronto... 5 00

#### REVIEWS.

THE CHURCH FOR AMERICANS. By William Montgomery Brown, Archdeacon of Ohio, and Lecturer at Bexley Hall, the Theological Seminary of Kenyon College. Pp. xiii., 440. \$1.25. New York: Thos. Whittaker. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

For general use and as presenting the Church's principles and practice in an easy readable form, this latest contribution to our controversial literature is the best we have met with. It is written by a convert, and thus the arguments have a directness that comes from experience, and a fullness of expression in some directions that a hereditary Churchman would not have thought of. The earlier lectures are directed to questions that stand between us and denominationalism on the one side, and Romanism on the other, but with this peculiar difference, that one author shows to the one that they misunderstand our position, and the Scriptures we both use, and to the other that we have a stability and unity of teaching which no papal infallibility can secure. The later lectures discuss the history and principles of the English Church, and her daughter, the American. The appendices are full of information and appropriate. Our author makes no pretence to learning or deep research, but we feel that he knows what he is saying, and he always produces ample authority for every position he takes up, illustrating it, where suitable, with very clever diagrams. In Lecture VII., having the general caption, "why Americans should be Episcopalians," there is much curious and valuable matter. Thus it is stated on the authority of Bishop Perry, historiographer of the American Church, that "two-thirds of the deputies of the First Continental Congress held at Philadelphia, 1774, were Churchmen. The same proportion obtained in the Congress which declared our independence. Of the fifty-five actual signers of the Declaration of Independence, thirty-four were Episcopalians. The resolution offered in the Continental Congress of 1776, declaring the thirteen colonies free and independent, was moved by Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, an Episcopalian and a vestryman. Of the twelve generals appointed by Washington early in the war, eight were his fellow-Episcopalians. It is not too much to claim, indeed it was admitted by the Puritan, Adams, that the issue of the struggle for independence, and the history of this country, would in all probability have been very different but for these illustrious Episcopalian patriots" (pp. 378-9). We can and do entirely commend the volume both for use in the study and for a place in the lending library; there is a useful index for reference.

The Bishop of Toronto has consented to the transfer of the Rev. H. R. A. O'Malley, M.A., from Longford Mills and Atherley, to Lindsay, to fill the position of curate of St. Paul's Church, left vacant by the removal of the Rev. Carl Smith to Peterborough. Mr. O'Malley will enter on his new duties on the Sunday after Easter.