

Cephas, I of Apollos. We clergy are sworn to believe and teach according to the Prayer Book.

If we cannot accept its dogmas then we ought to go into lay communion in order to maintain a clear conscience and an honest heart. If we are zealous to reform its doctrine, by all means let us deliver our souls from the ranks of our laymen. But we cannot fulfil our oath taken at ordination and at the same time follow private opinions in our public utterances. To conscientiously differ from some parts of the Prayer Book is the lot of a great many in passing from darkness to light, and is of course pardonable. But what can be said in mitigation of the crime of eating the bread of a priest while breaking the oath by which we came to be entrusted with the sacred office? The Prayer Book says, It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture that from the Apostles' time there have been Bishops, priests, and deacons in Christ's Church. Some men say, It is evident to us diligently reading Holy Scripture that there is no evidence that the episcopate was established at the hands of the Apostles. The Prayer Book says, These orders of priest and deacon are necessary in the Church. Some men say, These orders were suggested to meet emergencies, and may be altered to meet future difficulties. The Prayer Book says, O God, who by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers orders in the Church. Some men say, These things shaped themselves. The Apostles happened to have a happy thought in proposing a certain order, and the people's vote settled the matter. The Prayer Book says, St. John xx. 19-23 applies to the consecration of Bishops. Some men say, It has no reference to the apostolate or episcopate. The words were said to all the disciples. The Prayer Book appeals to ancient authors. Dissidents quote very recent authors. Ancient authors who knew more about the Apostles a great deal than Lightfoot and Westcott combined, assign the origin of the three-fold ministry to Christ, while latter-day divines flounder in a deep sea of doubt and conjecture, trying to prove that the ministry arose by chance and good luck. The primitive fathers assert with perfect confidence that it is rooted in the will of God. Lightfoot ventures to think that Christians would form a synagogue, and the synagogue would naturally adopt the synagogue form of government, and a body of presbyters would be chosen. Even this learned prelate can give us only fancies. These fancies are solemnly put forth as argument! On what language of her ancient authors does the Church rely? "God is my witness that I got not my information from man. Bishops settled to the utmost bounds are so by the will of Christ. Bishops, presbyters, and deacons who have been appointed according to the mind of Jesus Christ, whom He has appointed in security after His own will and by His Holy Spirit." And so on from author to author. Now anyone of these divergencies from the Prayer Book might not be very strong evidence of wrong, but when we find men propagating each point of difference, it is proof overwhelming that neither is the mind in agreement with the letter, nor the heart in agreement with the spirit of the teaching of the Church as recorded in her authorized text-book. Such preaching endeavours to destroy the very rock upon which the Church of England has taken her stand as a national Church, independent of the Pope, yet far removed from sectarianism in that she possesses and faithfully holds in trust for generations to come all that is necessary by Divine Providence for the existence of the Church of the living God. Upon the same rock we stand. Must we not take heed lest we be induced to step off upon the quick sand of agnosticism, the not knowing whether our priesthood is permanent or changeable, necessary or convenient, of God or of chance.

HOOSIER.

THE LAMBETH ENCYCLICAL.

Sir,—Allow me, through you, to address the clergy of the Diocese of Ontario and express the hope that they will make their congregations everywhere acquainted with the Lambeth encyclical letter. I feel that it is due to our fathers in God, the greatest assemblage of Bishops that the Anglo-Catholic

communion has ever seen—it is due to ourselves as loyal and attached members of that communion, and it is due to the important document itself, the result of the Lambeth deliberations, that our people should all be informed of its contents and their significance. Only in this way, through their clergy, will Churchmen be impressed with the mind and aims of our spiritual rulers on subjects of supreme interest to the Church Catholic, and of vital consequence to our own well-being at home and abroad. I would therefore respectfully request my reverend brethren to read as a sermon or otherwise, and as soon as convenient, the encyclical letter and the resolutions which embody the matured judgment of this greatest Episcopal conference.

T. BEDFORD-JONES,

Archdeacon, Commissary of the Archbishop of Ontario.

Brockville, Aug. 28th, 1897.

PAINFUL AND UNWHOLESOME READING.

Sir,—The sermon preached before the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto by Rev. Herbert Symonds, M.A., and published in your issue of July 15th, is painful and unwholesome reading. The preacher, in answer to some critics, tries hard to shelter himself behind a number of modern scholars who have never been celebrated either for soundness in the faith or loyalty to the claims of the Church. These gentlemen make assertions and state opinions without giving one word from Holy Scripture or ancient authors to prove what they set forth. When men set out to destroy our faith in the Divine origin of the three-fold ministry and its perpetual continuity we want to know upon what ground such conclusions are arrived at. If the Church has been in error in teaching that "the fundamental principle of the Christian ministry is, that it is derived from the Blessed Lord Himself, who became the fountain of all ministerial authority through virtue of that full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," surely the Apostles, who come to give us the new light, should be prepared to give us their authority. Did not the Lord give an earnest of a permanent ministry deriving its authority and power from Himself when He sent forth the twelve Apostles and the seventy evangelists on their mission during the time of His own personal ministry? Did He not promise His perpetual presence with such a ministry when he declared to the Apostles: Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, and establish the twelve as the chief ministerial channels through which the ministerial life was to flow, when having stated their commission: As My Father hath sent me, even so send I you? Did not our Blessed Lord institute the sacrament of Holy Communion and command it to be perpetually celebrated, using the words, This do in remembrance of Me, thus imposing a certain form upon the Apostles as the one which they were to use in the celebration, and which would ever after be considered as essential by them and the rest of the Church, as was the form given by Christ for Holy Baptism? In the face of these records, how can we accept the rash and unwarranted statement of Dr. Latham, that our Lord "never instituted rites, laws or fasts"? that it is not until He leaves the earth that He enjoins the sacraments of His Church, or the equally preposterous assertion of Bishop Brooks, "All these things shaped themselves out of the free life of the Church." MISSIONARY.

REV. MR. SYMONDS' REPLY

Sir,—I willingly make the attempt to answer the question so courteously asked by "N.C.E." in your issue of Aug. 26, although I wish he had stated the difficulties or objections of his learned friend all at once. When in Rom. xvi. 17, St. Paul says we should mark them which cause divisions and avoid them, there is no doubt he is referring to some special schismatics flourishing at Rome. The commentators, so far as I have been able to consult them, agree that these were Antinomians, but certainly they were men not merely doctrinally opposed to the sound teaching of the Apostles, but morally,

as the context clearly shows. For this reason I do not think St. Paul's words in this passage are to be converted into the statement of a general principle. But there is another point of greater importance. Assuming that St. Paul did mean his words to have a general reference, we are bound to ask: "Who are responsible for this or that division?" and if our withers are not altogether unwrung, is it not better that we should cast the beam out of our own eye, before we seek to cast the mote out of our brother's eye? In this connection then, let me quote the language of one who has been a staunch defender of the high Anglican position against Rome on the one hand, and non-conformity on the other. Canon Gore, in "The Mission of the Church," says: "If you... dwell upon the rise and progress of non-conformity, there can be no question at all—it is, in fact, hardly questioned—that it was due in the past, not to any spirit of schism, but at least in the great majority of instances, to the fact that the Anglican Church was not behaving as the true mother of the people." It would seem, then, that the guilt of division must be shared by ourselves, and I trust that after one reflection upon this consideration, "N.C.E." will advocate in the future as he has done in the past, the glorious cause of Christian unity.

HERBERT SYMONDS.

Aug. 27, 1897.

P.S.—"N.C.E." is a little astray when he says that I "would like to form a circle containing common ground, etc." My contention, supported by reference to the Lambeth Quadrilateral Conference, and so far uncontroverted, is that such a circle already exists, and that it is a very much larger circle than that of our differences.

BISHOPS SHOULD LIVE ON THE FREE-WILL OFFERINGS.

Sir,—An extract from a sermon by the Rev. C. Kendrick appeared in the Canadian Churchman a short time ago, in which it was advocated that the extension of the Episcopate should not depend on the raising of large endowments, but that Bishops should be content to live on the free-will offerings of the people, as the clergy do. The idea is too good a one to let fall into oblivion. Faith in God's providential care for the Church must be sadly wanting if our spiritual fathers hesitate concerning the practicability of the scheme. There are surely good men who would be willing, for the welfare of the Church, to take the high office under such conditions, even if involving much personal sacrifice. It was under these conditions the Church was planted, and prospered far in excess of anything we see to-day. If the extension of the Episcopate be necessary in the more settled portion of the country, it is far more necessary in such a province as this. The present Bishop is totally unable to adequately act as chief pastor, over so large an area as Saskatchewan and Calgary. Sympathy was expressed with him at the General Synod, I believe, in this respect, and it was agreed a Bishop for Saskatchewan was urgently required. Why any delay, then? The Church in Saskatchewan has been crying out for a Bishop for a long time, perhaps not always in the wisest way. In the present state of affairs the Church is losing, and must lose ground. Candidates are anxious for confirmation, but there is no likelihood of our seeing the Bishop for a year yet. The clergy are left a great deal too much to themselves, to their own spiritual detriment, and the lay people's, and there is generally a great want of proper discipline. Surely a large endowment in the face of these facts is as nothing. But there is an endowment, and a chief pastor such as we desire—for we are asking for bread, and do not want a stone—would cheerfully, of his own free will, give to Calgary a fair portion of the interest, and this without in any way touching the principal, and look to the people to voluntarily contribute whatever might be lacking, and would not find his confidence misplaced. Why, then, any further delay? A land of promise is before the Church: is there no faith to go in and possess it? Like Macedonia of old time, we stretch out our hands to our spiritual fathers, and beg that without delay they will come and help us. JAIRUS.