

even to select a good sermon of another person's. There are others who have such judgment, and would be sure to select what is suitable, orthodox, and edifying. And it cannot be denied, in addition to all this, that there are certain laymen who, from their education, experience, biblical knowledge, and facility of speech, are well able to instruct congregations by matter of their own composition. Some laymen, when they attempt this, undoubtedly make fools of themselves. This, however, is an evil that very soon cures itself. For the matter of that, there are many clergymen who are not over-wise in utterances in the pulpit. It is not every Parish Priest who has the faculty of preaching well. Yet, preach he does, and must, for a congregation would hardly endure to see their own rector reading sermons out of a book. With regard to the extract from Justin Martyr, although our Church often appeals to the ancient Fathers, it cannot surely be pleaded that every utterance of every ancient Father is to be taken as authoritative. The ancient Fathers, with all their undoubted learning, ability, and in some cases, even great genius, are generally understood to have said some unwise things. Dr. Pusey once wrote to Keble about the serious difficulty of reconciling the Fathers with themselves, and with one another! But the extract quoted by your correspondent is pertinent to the case. Every man is, as this eminent Father observed, at liberty to speak to his fellowman and exhort him to become a Christian if he is not one already (of course, under the rules of courteousness and common sense.) But no man can stand up in any pulpit, anywhere, in any church or denomination, without being "commissioned," as the ancient Father puts it, or authorized, as we would say. Some denominations have lay preaching as a part of their system; but then such laymen undergo a system of careful preparation, and are subject to examination. In the Anglican Church, the services of laymen have been much brought into requisition of late years. And where a layman can fulfil the Scriptural standard quoted by your correspondent, a Bishop may conceive, in his wisdom, that it would be to the advantage of the Church to avail herself, at suitable times and opportunities, of such services as he can render.

Montreal, July 26th, 1895.

COMMON SENSE.

Clerical Holidays.

SIR.—The season is now upon us when we expect to read something about, as well as to enjoy, our annual holidays. Some good people of a pessimistic turn of mind seem to imagine that holidays are entirely unnecessary for both lay people and clergy, and in the case of the latter, very prejudicial to their parochial work. The layman is well able to defend himself. As for the clergy, whose work is supposed by many to be so light and pleasant, a season of entire change and rest at this time of the year is absolutely imperative, unless their work is to degenerate into a merely spiritless and monotonous round of duty, for the work of the clergyman is as much greater as his calling is above that of the layman. An instance or two of his all-round labours: The clergyman lives ever in the glare of a parish publicity. He must be the model and leader of the parish. That is moral tension. He must be a constant student, an omnivorous reader, a careful thinker. That is intellectual tension. He has to be as nearly ubiquitous as a mortal can be. That means physical tension. He must develop the highest spiritual forces of his own soul and the souls of others. That means spiritual tension. If he be in most missions he must be a good financier too. There is business acumen. And then to the outward eye, results are for the most part hidden. There is little of what the world finds to encourage itself in sympathy and visible success. The cleric works in faith—the results will appear in the revelation of the hereafter. And after all he is only human. Who then would deny to him, living at such high pressure on many sides, the fortnight or month of change of scene and air and occupation which the professional man and the tradesman find, with their far lighter labours, so very necessary? On the necessity of holidays, the late Bishop Thorold of Winchester said wisely and well in his "Practical Counsels" in his Diocesan Magazine: "Public opinion has long ago settled that they (holidays) are an indispensable feature of our modern hurrying times; and if prudence and considerateness fail to provide them, implacable nature suddenly appears upon her judgment seat and enacts, in her unfeeling fashion, the uttermost farthing for violating her inexorable laws. We preachers do not always suspect how even our kindest and most indulgent hearers are relieved, even unconsciously to themselves, by change of voice and treatment of subject, though the doctrine be the same and the service lose nothing of its reverent devoutness. Absence helps difficulties to look quite different, when much musing over them had magnified them into mountains. The first and most delightful impressions of holidays

is to have nothing to do and doing it—in the sense of official routine. Another use of holidays is just pure happiness. Why are some of us so afraid of being happy? Is it that God grudges us happiness; or that it is in itself selfish and sinful, or that it is too perilous to be enjoyed for its own sake, since it impoverishes and enfeebles the soul? If so, why does the lark sing, and the bee hum, and the dog bark with pure delight, and the innocent child crow on its mother's knee? The faculty of enjoyment for its own sake is a sort of Divine gift. No one need be ashamed of it. To make but one person happy is to help to make him to be good. And why is a man's self to be left out of the calculation? Another use of holidays is rest, quite compatible with physical exercise and intellectual occupation, music and drawing, the reading of books and the society of friends. For the best kind of rest is recreation; and just as the most fatiguing of all kinds of walking is on a dead level, where there is no relief for the muscles, so the tired man will often find himself refreshed and restored by a holiday of which the least accurate account would be that it had been a *dolce far niente*. There has been plenty to occupy, to interest, to instruct, but nothing to worry or exhaust. The meaning of holidays could not be better stated than this.

C. SYDNEY GOODMAN.

West Mono, Orangeville.

The Law of Marriage in Ontario.

SIR.—A question of the gravest importance has been asked lately, and on the answer to it depends the worldly happiness of many, as well as the ownership of property. The marriage law of Ontario enacts that the person officiating at a marriage ceremony must be resident in the Province. It appears to follow that a ceremony at which a non-resident clergyman or minister officiates is not a legal marriage. That is to say, as example, the Archbishop nor the Bishops of the N. W., nor the Bishops of the Eastern Provinces, nor any of their respective clergy, can validly marry couples in Ontario. The American Episcopate and their clergy are in same case, as well as, last but not least, the Archbishops, Bishops and clergy of England. Will some of your readers say if the above statements are correct? A question of less importance is, can a deacon canonically or legally (*i. e.*, by civil law,) perform the marriage ceremony. Another question, since the officials of the "Salvation Army" have been authorized by the Local Legislature to perform a marriage ceremony, are the female officials also authorized? Recently in Toronto a woman official was advertised to officiate, but I do not know if she did so, either alone or with "assistance." There are other anomalies in the law of marriage to which if allowed I will ask attention.

M.

Anglican Fallacies.

LETTER II.

"The Anglican Church is assumed to be the unbroken successor of the Ancient British Church." Not only is it the common impression amongst the rank and file of the lay members of the Anglican Church that their ecclesiastical institution has come down in unbroken continuity from the Ancient British Church, but this opinion is constantly met with in the writings of less noted Anglican historians, whose works, unfortunately, are more widely read than productions of a more scholarly character. In Bishop Garrett's "Historical Continuity," we read in his preface to that little work, that the assertion that the Church of England had the Church of Rome for its mother is an "absurd statement," which, he adds, "is reiterated by every propagator of an *ism*." After such a declaration one may well wonder whether the shade of the great Freeman will ever be able to rest in peace, since its owner once stated, "Theologians may dispute over the inferences which may be drawn from the fact; but the historical fact cannot be altered to please any man. The Church of England is the daughter of the Church of Rome. She is so, perhaps, more directly than any other Church in Europe." (Ency. Brit., article "England.") Again, in Rev. J. H. Fry's work, "The Church of England ever a True Branch of the Catholic Church, and never a Branch of the Church of Rome," the writer tells us, "perhaps some of you think that the Church was planted in England by St. Augustine, at the end of the sixth century. . . I will prove to you that this is positively untrue." And he then adds that our own natural and national branch of Christ's Church, "is a branch which, in point of antiquity, etc., can boast of prouder records than any other branch, be it that of Greece or Rome." In that very scholarly work, "A Defence of the Church of England," by the late Earl of Selborne, sometime Chancellor of England, the writer speaks of Augustine as "the founder of the Anglo-Saxon Church," otherwise the Church of England. The

statements by two such scholars as Freeman and Selborne that the Church of England was founded from Rome by Augustine are surely sufficient of themselves to set aside the assertions of writers like Garrett and Fry. It is not well, however, to depend too much on the utterances of any party writer without first examining their reliability in the face of actual evidence. Mr. Fry, perhaps, is the most important writer (?) on the early introduction of Christianity in Britain that I have read, as he tells us quite positively that the first Bishop of the British Church was "Aristobolus, mentioned in the New Testament, and having been probably ordained by St. Paul himself." No wonder he views our national Church as capable of boasting a greater antiquity than any other branch of the mother Church of Jerusalem. The sole authority, however, for this valuable piece of information given by Mr. Fry, is the sixteenth century Jesuit historian Alford, "a learned Roman Catholic," we are informed. Canon Perry, the well-known Anglican writer, sums up the traditions of the early planting of Christianity in Britain, as, if they are rejected, "there is nevertheless a high probability that its origin in Britain was due to the intercourse of that country with the East," and he contents himself with telling us that "the British Church had by the end of the third century made a considerable number of converts." Canon Venables, however, does not hesitate to say that "the Eastern theory is certainly baseless (Ency. Brit., Episcopacy)." Canon Browne, in a set of lectures recently delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, entitled "The Christian Church in these Islands before the coming of Augustine," sums up the investigation of Haddan and Stubbs in the traditions of the introduction of Christianity into Britain as follows: "This is evidence, and very interesting evidence, of the general belief that Britain was Christianized early in the history of Christianity, but it practically amounts to nothing more definite than that." Again this writer tells us, "There is no sign of any one great man, to introduce Christianity into our land. It came, we cannot doubt in the natural way, simply and quietly, through the nearest continental neighbours of the Britons, and their nearest kinsfolk, the people of Gaul." The question is, however, when did it come from Gaul, which can only be answered by first ascertaining the growth of Christianity in Gaul itself. At the time Irenæus wrote his "Adversus Hæreses" (176) Christianity, as a definite Church, does not seem to have entered Britain, since in that work, while mentioning all the surrounding countries into which Christianity had penetrated, he makes no mention of Britain. Prof. Hole in his "Early Missions to and within the British Islands," thinks that it was through the persecution which resulted in the death of Pothinus in 177 that Christianity first penetrated into Britain, brought by the fugitives who, by fleeing to that island, sought to escape destruction. Here we see that both Canon Browne and Professor Hole agree in thinking that British Christianity came originally from Gaul. But Christianity, even of a definite character, without the presence of the Episcopate, is minus its chief factor, and the question therefore becomes of great importance, viz., when did the first Bishops arrive in Britain. Palmer in his "Origines Liturgicæ" tells us that we do not read of Bishops in Britain before the fourth century. Canon Browne estimates their arrival between 260 and 280. Personally, however, I do not think they appeared at so early a date, at all events not as diocesan prelates. Palmer and others are of opinion that Irenæus was the only Bishop in Gaul. He succeeded Pothinus in 178, the year after his martyrdom. Gregory, of Tours, places the foundation of all the principal Sees of Gaul a hundred years after the time of Pothinus, about 260. Palmer quotes from Tillemont touching the martyrdom of several disciples of Irenæus, in 211 to 212, including presbyters and deacons, but there is no mention of any Bishops before the seven missionary prelates appeared from Rome in 244, after which Christianity, which up to that time had spread very slowly, and only to within comparatively easy reach of Lyons, commenced to extend rapidly all over Gaul. Now, as it is to Gaul that modern critics are looking for Britain's gift of Episcopacy, so, too, is it to that part of Gaul most accessible to Britain that they are looking for the source of that gift. The earliest ecclesiastical centre of Northern Gaul may be said to be the Archdiocese of Rouen. The Church in this city was founded by St. Mello, about 260. The first Roman missionary prelate, however, had reached the banks of the Seine somewhat earlier, for in 250 or '51, St. Denis, one of the seven Latin Bishops, to use the words of Dean Kitchen, with his two deacons, founded the Church of Paris. But perhaps the most accessible Episcopate to the Britains was that of the Archdiocese of Rheims, into which Christianity was introduced in the latter end of the third century. The first two Bishops of Rheims are paired together, and assigned to 290, while the first Bishops of Beauvais and Chalons, which were within the diocese, date from 250 and 280 respectively, but the others not till