

era," that would come and lead away disciples after them [Matt. vii, 15; xxix, 11; 2 Tim. iv, 8.]

Now I know of but two ways, as indicated in Holy Scriptures, by the one or the other of which alone can we determine whom we may regard as Divinely appointed, and to whom we may safely trust ourselves in these most sacred and most important concerns. The one is Apostolic descent by actual, visible, tactual succession from those whom our Lord appointed; and the other is miracles performed by those who claim to speak in God's name and be His ministers.

We have in the Old Testament two classes of Divine teachers clearly distinguished from each other in this way,—Priests and Prophets, though of course the same individual may have in some cases been both a Priest and a Prophet.

But the Priesthood, including High-Priests, Priests, and Levites, came to their office by descent from Levi, Aaron, etc., and needed no other testimony or vindication of their right to perform the duties and claim the privileges and prerogatives of their office. But the Prophets who were not in the priestly line vindicated their claim to speak from God, and in His name, by miracles, as in the case of Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah, to name no others.

It would seem, therefore, that there are and can be but the two classes, each with its appropriate sign and verification of authority,—lineal descent from those who were at first Divinely appointed, and miracles.

But this is not all. The position which this view of the last named of the elements furnished for us in the Holy Scriptures puts Christianity itself on a level with the heathen religions already named. The founders of those religions did not found or build a Church, and they instituted no ministry or priesthood, who should take their writings or verbal messages, preach them to the world, explain and expound them for all who might desire information and guidance, and preserve, protect, and appeal to those sacred writings forever, to the end of the world.

Hence when degeneracy came, as it was sure to come, and when diversities of opinion should arise among honest and sincere inquirers, or be suggested by ambitious aspirants, which were no less sure to come in the order of time and events,—should arise and plead some one or another of the doctrine of the founder of their religion more distinctly or emphatically than the rest,—there was no one to decide, no one to whom it was a duty to refer, no one having any special authority, any more than any other who might happen to be as intelligent and have as much confidence in himself—perhaps I ought to say as much spiritual pride and conceit,—to whom appeal could be made; there was no Divinely appointed Church, ministry, or priesthood, and the result was a division,—the rising of a new sect. Possibly the new sect was an improvement upon the state of things that existed before it arose, so far as mere purity of doctrine was concerned, and possibly it was not.

But there was no help for it. There was no adequate basis or bond of unity; and the followers and disciples of the old religion formed as numerous sects, and became as diverse from one another as our modern Christian denominations. There was no help for it, and nothing that could be done, except for each of these persons to start off, get as many followers as he could, and make a sect,—a Church of his and their own.

The only remedy for this evil is "the Church idea," the doctrine and belief that the Author and Giver of our Salvation instituted a Church and appointed a ministry whom believers must receive, if they would receive Him [Matt. x, 46; Mark ix, 37; John xiii, 20].—the ministry of Whom we read in the Acts and Epistles as actually doing the work He had appointed

them to do, and with whom he promised to be "always, even unto the end of the world."

But from the days when the Bishop of Rome began to claim the supremacy, the idea of the Church began to disappear and be lost and swallowed up in that of the Papacy, so that now the Pope is all in all; and at the reaction that began to prevail during the Reformation, the idea came into vogue that Church authority was little or nothing, and doctrine was the one essential thing, and the individual became the all in all, each one for himself.

(To be Continued.)

AN EVANGELICAL PROTEST AGAINST THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION'S ACTION.

The following memorial, numerously signed by clergymen, has been addressed to the promoters of the suit against the Bishop of Lincoln:—

Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned clergymen of the Church of England, desire to express to you, the promoters of the suit against the Bishop of Lincoln, in which judgment was pronounced by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 21st inst., our strong sense of the responsibility which now rests upon you, and of the opportunity now before you of forwarding or hindering the best interests of the Church of England.

"It has been asserted in the public press that your intention is to appeal from the Archbishop's judgment, and our object is most earnestly to deprecate such a course. It is not from any want of attachment to the reformed principles of our Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine articles that we thus address you, but just because our attachment to those principles is deep and cordial, and because we fear that they may be seriously compromised by your carrying the matter on appeal to the Privy Council.

"In the first place, let us remind you that the advocates of extravagant ritual have since the commencement of the prosecutions aided by the Church Association, declared their readiness to acquiesce in the judgment of a Spiritual Court, and have based their resistance to the law, as declared by the Privy Council, upon the non-spirituality of that court. A Spiritual Court is now at length accorded to their desire, and they will be bound by their own contention to acquiesce in the finding of this court, if you will do the same. We earnestly hope that they will acquiesce; but, in any event, their only plausible ground for resistance is gone, if the case is allowed to rest in the Archbishop's Court. Surely it is an immense gain to have called into existence or resuscitated a Court which is spiritual, if any possible court in this country can be so accounted, and this you have now done. But if you carry the case on appeal to the Privy Council, you will lose for yourselves, and for us, and for the Church at large, the whole benefit of what you have now accomplished; for we shall then be in exactly the same position as before with respect to the courts and their authority, a position of grief to ourselves and scorn to our enemies.

"Then, in the next place, on the assumption that your object is not to snatch a personal triumph for your own party; nor to inflict a personal wound on those who differ from you, but to promote true religion in the Church of England, we would urge upon you that *bona fide* submission to the judgment now pronounced will be a great advance upon the lawlessness which has of late years become common. Decisions of the Privy Council, even if in every particular such as we could wish, only exasperate the feelings of those who deny the authority of that court; and when they are insisted upon and enforced, to the extent of imprisoning clergymen who refuse to obey them, the

further result is the alienation of many of our friends. You cannot be ignorant that such has been largely the case of late years, and that which was intended to check excessive ritual has in reality caused a revulsion of feeling in its favour. The Archbishop's judgment offers a new departure, and though it sanctions some practices which we have hitherto understood to be unlawful in our Church, we submit that the cause of true religion will be very much better served by our all resting together upon his new platform than by making an attempt to enforce greater simplicity in ritual, when experience has proved that such an attempt is sure to fail, and that less, not greater, simplicity will be largely practised in consequence.

"It is true that all such reasoning would be false if the points at issue were settled by Divine law—if, *i. e.*, Holy Scripture had decided them. But we submit that neither the use of watered wine in the cup, nor the allowing candles to burn in the day-time during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, nor the so-called Eastward Position, nor the singing of words from the *Gloria* at any other part of the service, nor the rinsing out of the cup after the conclusion of the service, is in itself in contravention of any word of Scripture. That these things are connected with false doctrine in the minds of some who practice them is no sufficient reason for our wishing to abjure them; else we ought in like manner to recede from uttering the Absolution, reading the Prayer of Consecration, and, indeed, from the whole act of administration. The points of ritual above named can only have been rightly objected to on the ground of their being forbidden by our own Church; and if now we find that this is not so, we are no longer required by our loyalty as Churchmen to aim at their suppression—the more so, as the grounds on which the Archbishop's judgment is based are entirely in accordance with what we regard as true Church principles.

"Finally, we would suggest to you that the action of all thoughtful men at such a crisis as this must have regard to the future, and not only to the present. And looking to the future the Church's foremost needs unquestionably are consolidation and united counsels in the face of many grievous foes outside. We therefore now appeal to you, as true and loyal Churchmen, to set an example of forbearance, and so to realise the benefit which the Holy Spirit has commended to us in the words of the Apostle James—"the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace."

Many signatures have already been received, and additional ones will be gladly received, by the Rev. J. Wagstaff, vicar of Christ Church, Macclesfield; or the Rev. H. McNeile, vicar of Pott-Surridge, Macclesfield.

The following is the reply of the promoters of the suit against the Bishop of Lincoln to the above memorial:—"Cleethorpe, Great Grimsby, December 17, 1890:—Sir,—We beg to acknowledge the receipt of a memorial adopted at a meeting of clergy lately held at Macclesfield, urging us, as the promoters in the case of *Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln*, not to proceed in the appeal to the Privy Council against the late decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, in reply, we desire to enter our most solemn protest against the injustice of your intervening to prejudice a suit which is, in due progress of law, about to be adjudicated upon by the Supreme Court of Appeals. Yours faithfully, E. DE LAOR READ (on behalf of the promoters.). The Rev. J. Wagstaff, Macclesfield."—*The Church Review*.

We want additional subscribers in Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Toronto, Ottawa, London, Hamilton. Liberal commission will be allowed to qualified Canvasser—lady or gentleman—in every one or more of these cities.