

meaning of my words, scandalous laxity. Some years ago a young man desired to marry one of our Churchwomen, and found acceptance upon promise of helping his hoped-for wife to worship as her faith desired. I went to visit the couple, and afterward gave warning to them about their duty to their child. For several years these souls have been absent from the house of God, although living among neighbours who attend very regularly, and being quite able to do this commonplace duty, at last the delinquents have gone to a clergyman out of their own mission and have had their child baptized. How can I convince their souls of sin and righteousness, if they are allowed to slip away and receive attention, as though quite innocent, from one who naturally knows nothing of their state toward God? What relation must now exist between them and myself? If in this, then in every case, they can gain the sacraments of the Church, whilst their lives are a scandal to the faithful who labour steadfastly to do their duty in their own parish. Again, a few months ago a man went out of his own mission and asked a neighbouring clergyman to come and marry him. I received notice, but told the priest to send the young man home. A few days after the bride and groom drove a mile or two across the boundary and were united in some fashion by the obliging cleric before mentioned. Now, this man is confirmed, but ashamed to kneel in the congregation for the Blessed Sacrament; ashamed to appear in church for marriage, yet although in a most dangerous spiritual state, was helped to avoid me, his rightful pastor, who would deal with him according to knowledge of his sin, and was blessed in the name of the Trinity, as though witnessing a good confession for Christ instead of cringing to ungodly men. The poor wretch has in all probability been hardened in his cowardice and self-satisfaction. Once more, a young woman communicant slyly packed her best dress and went out of her parents' house under pretence of taking a drive. Shortly afterward the deceitful child came home, and informed the household of her marriage by a clergyman in another parish. Again, disrespect of parents and cruelty to a kind mother were all tolerated and blessed, because the clergyman was not obliged to make any inquiries. Such things are scandals, causing Dis-senters to point in scorn at our unrighteous ways, scandals to earnest Church folk who hate trifling with sin. It is written, "Cursed are they who do the work of the Lord negligently. Cursed are they who withhold the sword from blood." What injury to innumerable souls the effeminate easiness of the Church of England has caused and is daily producing, is horrible to contemplate. Shall not God visit for these things? Yes.

S. D. H.

"In it Thou Shalt do no Manner of Work."

SIR,—Familiar words referring to the day of rest, and a command from the beneficent Creator of all creatures. The Jews of to-day owe their fine physique to the obedience of their fathers to above mandate from the Divine Judge of all law-breakers. The human race, as well as the animal kingdom, absolutely require one day of rest in the seven; and, strange to say, the great world of electrical and other machinery is all the better for a day of rest. And now that those philanthropic societies, the Anti-Sunday Car and Lord's Day Alliance, have declared themselves anew in favour of a Saturday half-holiday, we may hope that this much-to-be-desired people's own half-day will soon be given them by the strong arm of the law. The writer has long been convinced that all work would be better done, that the wage-earners would throw more heart, more muscle into their work if their "tale of bricks" was lessened, and that half of Saturday was their very own, in which to stretch out weary arms, yawn, or lounge at will; their own in which to learn to be wise from pages of long closed books, or in those blessed hours of freedom to visit friends, or picnic with their little ones and aged amid the many rural spots encircling our broad city.

We have all witnessed the partial blotting out of the day of rest "across the line," nay, we may say, the wholesale surrender of its restfulness. But to cease throwing stones, and rather to ask ourselves, Are we much better than they? We women are to blame for the Saturday 18 hours' toil of milliner and of butcher. By placing our order early on Saturday, or even on Friday, with our butcher, we would prevent the midnight toil; we would not hear the rattle-rattle, rumble-rumble of the wheels of the butcher-cart; we would not hear the lash strike the back of the poor, tired horse—nor the voice of a reproving conscience. God have pity on the midnight toilers, for we have none. A little milliner whom the writer had occasion to employ has stated that during the busy season the clocks from our city towers rang out the hour of midnight as her "tale of bricks" ended, and, with aching back, weary fingers and despairing heart, she dropped her needle—the steel of which is not harder nor colder

than are our hearts who will insist on having our head gear appear on the Sabbath. What a boon a Saturday half-holiday would be to all wage-earners; and it would be just as easy to extend the gift to butcher and to milliner as to banker.

Oh that the workingman was not so easily deluded by those who tell him they desire to blot out the Sabbath, in order that he may divert himself at the parks or elsewhere. If those who try to delude him, in order to secure his vote, really had his interest at heart, they would let our peaceful Sunday alone, and exert themselves to give him a Saturday half-holiday, and they would instruct him most earnestly never to part with his best friend, the day of rest, but to hand such blessed heritage down the ages to his children and to his children's children—even as his forefathers, having been faithful to their trust, have passed it down to him; a necessary rest for the weary. A necessary rest? Yes! For the wage earner's only capital is his physical health and strength. Let him, then, guard the day of rest as he would guard what he holds most precious in life; for so surely as he lends his aid to those who advocate Sunday labour in the running of Sunday cars and pleasure excursions, so surely will he waste his capital of health and strength in the seven-day week of toil which will follow.

A. G. SAVIGNY.

The Meaning of Kephas.

SIR,—Upon the general question of Bible teaching there is and can be no difference between Mr. Mackenzie and myself. For practical and devotional purposes no method could be better than to compare spiritual things with spiritual—to interpret Scripture by Scripture. Nor can there be any difference between us as to the great truth that "God is our Rock." But the question which Mr. Mackenzie has raised is as to the meaning of the name Kephas, or its bearing on our case as against Rome. He asks us to teach our children that Kephas means a stone, and not a rock, because to teach the latter is to give away our case. Is Rome such a bugbear that we are to hide or disguise the truth? Christ called Peter Kephas. It was the name by which he was known among the Apostles. St. Paul calls him by that name some eight times. And, as Smith's Bible Dictionary says, "It must have been the word actually pronounced by our Lord in Matt. xvi. 18, and on subsequent occasions when the Apostle was addressed by Him or other Hebrews by his new name." Christ's words to St. Peter then were as follows: "Thou art Kephas, and upon this Kephas I will build My Church." The word must mean the same in both clauses. We dare not teach, for controversial reasons, that while the word certainly means rock in the second clause, it means a stone in the first clause. It seems to me that to get at the real meaning of Kephas we must put out of sight the controversies which have raged round the word, and ask why did Christ give Peter this name, and what meaning did it convey to those who heard Him? In those days names were significant of character. Why, then, did Christ give His Apostle the name Kephas? What was its significance? Surely it was that, as St. Ambrose says, St. Peter had "the solidity of constancy and the firmness of faith." Christ commended his firm, unswerving faith, and therefore called him—a stone? no, but a rock. Suppose an Anglican, with no fear of the Roman bugbear, discussing the matter with a Romanist. Anglican loquitur: "As Anglicans we have no hesitation in holding that Christ called Peter Kephas, or rock, on account of his firm and solid faith." Roman loq.: "In so holding you concede our claim that on Peter Christ built His Church." Anglican: "By no means. It is one thing to say that Peter is a rock on account of the firmness of his faith. It is quite another thing to say that he was the rock on which Christ built His Church." Roman: "Yet many ancient fathers, as Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, St. Basil, thought Christ intended St. Peter by 'this rock.'" Anglican: "Can you name one among all the ancients who believed that Christ said that on St. Peter alone He would build His Church?" Roman: "No, of course not. The Church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets." Anglican: "Then how do you prove the headship of Peter by this text?" Unless the Romanist can show that on St. Peter alone Christ said He would build His Church, the Roman case breaks down. But to make play upon the words *Petra* and *Petros*, as if our case rested upon a quibble of words, is to give it away. When the evangelist translates the Aramaic Kephas into Greek, he must, of course, use the masculine form in speaking of Peter; but in the words used by our Lord the word is the same in both clauses. The real question, after all, is, What was the significance of the name in its bearing on St. Peter's confession of faith? Whatever word or meaning best expresses the firmness of his faith, that is the meaning of Kephas. The Bible is not so jealous about words as my

good friend, Mr. Mackenzie, would have us think. To call St. Peter a rock is no more a denial of Christ as the true Rock, on whom alone we can build, or be built up, than St. Paul's teaching that "the Church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," is a denial of the truth that "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." Christ Himself is called "a Living Stone," while all believers are called "lively stones." We all acknowledge Christ to be our one true Priest, Prophet, King, Shepherd and Bishop, and yet men are also priests, prophets, kings, shepherds and bishops.

J. D. CAYLEY.

The Reunion of Christendom.

SIR,—In the *English Church Times* of the 15th of February, is a full report of a great speech of the Right Hon. Viscount Halifax—President of the English Church Union—on "The Reunion of Christendom: England and Rome." It may be presumption on my part to criticize the utterances of so distinguished and able a man as Lord Halifax. For while there is much said by him that is worthy of a careful consideration of every thoughtful and earnest Churchman, yet, on the other hand, there is much that as Anglicans we may fairly protest against, when, as the following extract will show that the origin of the Early English Church is credited to Rome, to this we may be sure English Churchmen can never give their support, and give up a birth-right which for antiquity and apostolic order and doctrine is equal to that of Rome itself. Lord Halifax, after speaking of the Romish Church and its connection with the Western Church, says: "But in the case of England it was the source from which our Saxon forefathers derived their Christianity. It was to a Bishop of Rome—one of the greatest of the Popes—that the conversion of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers was due. St. Augustine was the Apostle of England and it was to St. Gregory the Great that we owe his mission to these shores. . . . It was to Rome that the eyes of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers turned, as the seat of the Bishop whose help and assistance, and the authority of whose See, were acknowledged by all the churches of the West. . . and further, the Ancient British Church . . . has nothing to prove . . . the evidence goes the other way . . . that it was not itself the daughter of Rome. On the other hand, when for controversial purposes it is attempted to discover for the English Church an origin other than that of Rome . . . those who are acquainted with the facts are tempted to doubt either our honesty, or at least the trustworthiness of our historical methods." Without any desire to impugn the motive of this noble Lord, who has so ably pleaded the cause of the reunion of Christendom, yet surely such doctrines emanating from so pronounced a Churchman and the President of E. C. U., are difficult to account for, when compared with the known historical facts of the origin of the early British Church. How can St. Augustine be the *Apostle of England* when he, as the first Roman missionary, only reached our shores in 596, which mission was only successful in Kent, and even here the ground was prepared for him, for the Queen of that little kingdom was already a Christian. And what of his first memorable meeting with some seven of the then existing Bishops of England, and their at once repudiating his Romish authority. He was not even consecrated as a Bishop at Rome, but by the Bishop of Arles in Gaul—and do we not know that at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, the Archbishops of York, London and Caerleon were present, nearly three hundred years before this Romish monk set foot in England. The first instance of a direct consecration of an Archbishop for the British Isles was when Pope Vitalian consecrated Theodore in A.D. 668, and after Theodore there was not another Roman Archbishop for 350 years; all who succeeded him were Englishmen. To Theodore is due the credit of uniting the Anglo-Saxon Church, but all his appointments to the new sees, etc., were made from the English Church, and not from Rome. He acknowledged himself as Archbishop of the Saxon Church, and determined not to allow any foreign Bishop to dictate to the Church in Britain. Space will not admit for further historical facts, which are endless, to prove that the origin of the Saxon Church was not from Rome. It is true that the early Church was united, as said by Lord Halifax, "That as there was but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Eucharist, so there was but one Church—for Rome was first Catholic, then Papal. But this was not the reason alone that could satisfy Rome, for her Pope's Primacy claimed *jure Divino*, and demands more than such union; it could only be satisfied with an organization throughout the whole world having its roots in Rome. As a proof of this assumption of Rome in the English Church, has it not been a continued protest, from the first meeting of the Bishops with St. Augustine, down to Reformation days, both of Church and State, as against Romish claims and authority?

CANADIAN ANGLICAN.

London, March 15th, 1895.