

learned, arguments are drawn from the phraseology of our Authorized Version as found in St. Matt. iii. 16, and xviii. 19. The former verse, "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." From this it is argued that He must first have gone down into, or even under the water, and so was of course immersed, when immediately He came up out of the water. Against this their argument we can now not only refer to the passage in the Revised Version, but also, and perhaps with more silencing effect to the passage as translated in the Baptist New Testament. There we find this: "And having been immersed, Jesus went up immediately from the water." But of course it is there stated that He had been immersed. The other verse in our A. V. reads: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." As the other passage is quoted to support the Baptist mode of Baptizing, so this is quoted to support their view of the alone proper subjects for baptism. They argue that the Apostles were to teach the people first and then baptize them, whence they must be of intelligent age. Now, against this, we can quote not only the R. V., but the very Immersion Testament itself. There it reads: "Go, therefore, and disciple all the nations."

This criticism or review of the Baptist New Testament will not increase any sort of regard for the scholarship, not to say for the sincerity and honesty of its translators, nor for the cause it was meant to serve. The Baptists still use the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, made by the Church of England, and exert all their ingenuity and casuistry to turn its teachings against the teaching and practice of the Church of England.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE ROMANISTS.

The following letter, dealing with the oath of Canonical obedience in use in pro-Reformation times, from the pen of Canon Dixon, is of considerable importance, and throws new light on a matter which has been obscured by the efforts of Roman controversialists to deny the independence of the English Church before the breach with Rome:—

Sir: The points raised by the Romanists in support of their contention that the Church of England is not the same that existed in England before the Reformation, are mainly concerning the Supremacy and concerning property.

Thus, it is said that "every Bishop in England before the so-called Reformation was obliged to take an oath acknowledging the Papal Supremacy." The oath in question was, I suppose the oath of canonical obedience given in Burnet (Pt. i. Bk. ii., year 1532), "to St. Peter and to the Holy Church of Rome, and to my lord the Pope and his successors, canonically entering." This oath is of some length and goes into various branches, containing, among other things, as perhaps its strongest point, a promise "to defend and augment the rights, honours, privileges authorities of the see of Rome," and also a promise to "prosecute all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Holy Father." It contains no acknowledgment of Papal Supremacy: nor does such a term occur in it.

It was regularly limited by the oath which pre-Reformation Bishops took at the same time to the King; the first words of which were that they did "utterly renounce and clearly forsake all such clauses, words, sentences and grants which they had or should hereafter have of the Pope's holiness that in any wise had been, was, or hereafter might be, hurtful or prejudicial" to the King, his dignity or state royal.

The one oath was so qualified by the other as

to leave the Royal supremacy intact. The Royal supremacy always existed in England—that is, the doctrine that the King had no superior in his dominions. When Henry VIII. took the title of Supreme Head he did not bring in a new principle, but asserted (too violently, it may be) an inherent principle of the English realm.

What the Pope had in England was not supremacy, but primacy, with a certain admitted jurisdiction, which he had unfortunately a tendency to augment unduly.

This oath to the Pope has a somewhat curious history. It was not of very venerable antiquity, if it was no older than the time of Archbishop Dene about 1500, under whose name Parker gives it (*De Antiq. Brit.* 452). When Cranmer was consecrated he took this oath; and it has been remarked that in taking it, he omitted or altered several clauses. It has not, however, been remarked by any writer that Cranmer did not originate these alterations himself. He simply returned to the oath as it was in Dene's time, and his oath at his consecration was word for word the same that Dene took at his. In the interval between them the oath had grown stronger by receiving the additions which Cranmer took away. Among them were the above quoted promises to defend and augment the rights, honours, privileges and authorities of the see of Rome, and to prosecute all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Holy Father. It is remarkable, further, in the history of this oath, that all these additions were omitted not only by Cranmer, but by Pole also at his consecration; and that Pole's oath and Cranmer's oath were word for word the same. It may be added as to Pole that he received his temporalities and letters patent containing a clause that he renounced anything prejudicial to the realm in the Papal Bull providing him to Canterbury; and this clause was inserted after the reconciliation of the kingdom in Mary's reign, and was used in about a dozen episcopal appointments.

An oath with such a history shows, what everything else shows, that the natural independence of the Church of England was not taken away by the admitted primacy of the Church of Rome. The Bishops who took it were not Roman Catholics, but English Catholics in communion with Rome. Our forefathers were always very watchful of the Pope.

At the reformation, as some have said, men who had taken this oath to the Pope took an oath against him, declaring that "neither the See nor the Bishop of Rome hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, or authority within this realm, neither by God's law, nor by any other just law or means;" and this oath was, by Act of Parliament in the year 1544 (35 Hen. 8. 1). They would not have done so if they had held that their Church was Roman Catholic, that to be of the Roman obedience was necessary to the being of their Church, or that none could be Catholic but Roman Catholics. So far were they from this opinion that fourteen years before, in 1530, at the beginning of the Reformation, the Convocation of the clergy petitioned the King to stop the various exactions of the Pope, which impoverished their benefices; affirming that to pay first fruits to the Pope was alienation, and requesting that, if the Pope endeavoured to enforce his imposts, the King would withdraw the obedience of himself and his people from the see of Rome. [*Address to the King for an Act to abolish Annates.*—*Strype*, 2 *Mem.*, App. 41.] R. W. DIXON.
—*Church Times*.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

In most places of any size in these days we find a number of men formed into a society to look into the history of the past as regards the life of the families to which its members belong.

The desire to trace their genealogy is a laudable one, and the facts gathered together regarding the peculiar traits and dispositions of their ancestors serve to induce them to live their own lives along the historic lines. Now we Churchmen profess and call ourselves members of the family and household of God, and we include all in one term, "the Church of Christ." In this family we trace our genealogy as Christians back to the days of the Apostles, and the more diligently we study the records, and the more reverently we trace the evidences of our connection with the saints of old, the more are we impressed with the grandeur of our family history, and with the goodness of our heritage. To remind ourselves of these things, let us recall briefly the principal points of that history, and the facts upon which as a sure foundation the glorious superstructure, the Church, has been built.

It can scarcely be denied that in these days, if ever, there is urgent need on the part of Churchmen to look to the ground of their faith, and to their reasons for strictly maintaining that faith. Unpalatable as the statement may be to some of us, it is, nevertheless, true that many Churchmen have not yet grasped the full meaning of their membership in Christ's family, and are, in consequence, unaware of the duties they owe to its Divine Founder and Head.

It may help to a better understanding of their duties if the following notes by the Rev. H. H. Morrill, of Missouri, are carefully considered:

a.—"Christianity a Divine Religion."

The religion of Jesus Christ is not only the dominant religion of the English speaking people, but it is the ultimate religion for the whole human race; in it alone are all of man's religious needs met and satisfied; in it alone can man find cleansing from the pollution of sin, freedom from its power, and eternal life in the presence of God hereafter. This religion was established by the Divine Head of the Church more than eighteen hundred years ago, and has been perpetuated among men by the instrumentality which Christ Himself provided, His Holy Church, the pillar and ground of truth, the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, the mystical body of Christ, indwelt by the Holy Spirit, Her guide and comforter.

b.—"The Church planted in Britain."

This Holy Church of Christ was planted in the British Isles in the Apostolic Age, and has had a continuous, unbroken existence from that day to this. She is the same Church now that she was in the days of the Apostles, and numbers in her communion thirty million souls. She is found all over the world, in India, China, Japan, Africa, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, the United States, and everywhere she is the same Church, with the same holy ministry, the same Holy Scripture, the same holy Sacraments, the same Apostolic Doctrine, the same divine Liturgy; a constant witness to the unchangeable religion of her divine Head and Founder.

c.—"The Church Comprehensive."

The English Church has not only taught the divine religion of the Christ from the earliest ages, in all its fullness, without diminution or addition, but she has shown herself to be possessed in the highest degree of the flexibility or adaptability to all classes and conditions of men, that alone renders the spread of the Gospel so universal. She has brought under its sway the Dane, the Celt, the Saxon, the Norman, and moulded them into one harmonious whole. And in her foreign missions, in China, Japan, India, Africa, Australia, in fact in all the world, she produces the same type of sturdy, honest, energetic, self-respecting manhood which is characteristic of her power to shape