

hold together in which the privileges of the members are not balanced by their responsibilities. A canon for the discipline of the laity should be passed together with any such privilege as this—the bitter and sweet should go together. Then it seems that the vestry is the body to which this power is to belong. Some people seem to forget that vestries (like some few other things) we inherit from a time when the national Church of England was the Church of the vast overwhelming mass of the people, and have never had anything to do with anything but temporalities. Considering of whom vestries may be composed, it is a very serious matter when it is proposed that they should step out of their old position, and middle for instance in the matter of patronage. That is a question for communicants—if for laymen at all. Do the Methodists or Presbyterians even allow any but their communicants to possess a voice on these matters? And of whom are vestries composed? "All pew-holders whether holding the same by purchase or lease, and all persons holding sittings shall form a vestry" (see Ch. Tem. Act.) That is, a vestry may be composed partly of unbaptized persons, people who may not even believe in Christ or accept the creed,—and partly of Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Roman Catholics, who may take a pew or sitting, for many reasons, or because they happen to like the "English Church minister" and sometimes to listen to his preaching. I have actually known instances of this kind. And it is proposed to hand to such a body the patronage of the Church. It seemed to me too extravagant to be believed until I saw it in your last issue under the Niagara Diocese news. I can understand a godly layman desirous of regaining all the privileges of his order and wishing to see a simple, clear system of discipline restored for the purpose, but a proposition to hand such a power over to a body of men under no ecclesiastical responsibility whatever—why it cannot be seriously meant? Is every nerve to be strained to produce a body of politico-religious clergy, who generally degenerate into mere sensation mongers? Do our fellow-churchmen of the Evangelical school imagine for a moment that the old time serious and godly type of Churchmanship would be the result? Nay, rather let them look to the weak spot in the American Church, where, in many cases, a mere light, æsthetic ritualism, produced to suit the tastes of the day, and abhorrent to all serious minded men, is the outcome of handing over the selection of a clergyman to such a body as a vestry. Let each school of thought, or the wiser men in each, seriously consider how far they are going in this matter of bidding for the approbation of crowd. (1) Then it seems to me no Synod can deprive, nor can any Bishop rid himself of the power and responsibility of *appointment*, and surely it is not seriously proposed to hand over the privilege of *nomination* to any but communicants of the Church—and not even to communicants until the Church of England safeguards this privilege by a canon for the discipline of the laity; it is only the common sense view of the matter. Surely we should be as careful as the Presbyterians and Methodists. I am personally acquainted with a case that happened not very long ago. An incumbent of a parish sent word to a notorious character in his congregation that he could not give him communion; a lawyer's letter came back saying a law suit would be the consequence of refusal. The matter was referred to the Bishop, who was quite helpless, and here was a clergyman compelled to communicate a person whom he was *positively certain* was living in deadly, serious sin. Until the laity are willing to accept (in common with the clergy) a system of discipline, it is outside of all common sense to make any claim to patronage. The present position is those who *pay* are free of all rule, those who accept a stipend are by no means free. The lay people are shouting themselves hoarse (some of them) with the cry that they are "kings and priests" in common with the clergy. All this while privileges are in sight, but when submission to discipline and responsibilities are in view the "ministers of the Gospel" are very free to consider themselves a separate caste.]

W. BEVAN.

Mount Forest, Ont.

P.S.—What do those who agree with Dr. Hatch think of the Doctor's *main point*, viz., that the clergy were mainly officers of *discipline*? Queer position clergy hold now, ministers of discipline with nothing to do; there being no discipline excepting for clergy themselves.

W. B.

St. John iv. 35.

SIR,—A very few lines will suffice for the termination of the discussion of this passage, so far as I am concerned. Dr. Gammack's rather severe strictures on the legality of my upholding a traditional interpretation, were sufficiently met in anticipation by the let-

ter which Dr. Carry (whose removal from amongst us by death we all so grievously deplore) published on this subject in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, and I need, therefore, say no more on this head. The main point, however, between Dr. Gammack and myself, is connected with the question I raised as to the rendering of the word *tetrameenos*, without the article, by "the period called tetrameenos." Dr. Gammack offers no justification for taking this liberty with the Greek language, in which he has moreover violated one of his own first principles of interpretation. The result of Dr. Gammack's exegesis is that we have a choice of difficulties, and I think even those who have a respect for the Greek, will still prefer the traditional interpretation to one which entirely rests upon a very serious assumption.

HERBERT SYMONDS.

Trinity College.

Notes and Queries.

SIR,—I notice in your article on "Church Unity and Discipline" mention of the word "heresy"; we also have the word in our Litany, when we pray to be delivered from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism. Will you kindly give a correct definition of the word "heresy?"

C. F.

Ans.—Heresy is wilful denial of some article of the Creed,—as distinct from matters of opinion, custom, or discipline.

SIR,—How many General Councils of the undivided Church were there, and what are their dates?

ENQUIRER.

Ans.—Six General Councils: 1st, Nice; held A.D. 325, in Nice, a town in Asia Minor, about 75 miles S. E. of Constantinople. Present 318 bishops and over 1,500 other clergy. President, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova. 2nd, First Council of Constantinople; held A.D. 381, in city of Constantinople. Present 150 bishops. President, Meletius, Patriarch of Antioch (died); then St. Gregory of Nazianzus (resigned); then Timothy of Alexandria; lastly Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople. 3rd, Ephesus; held A.D. 431, in Ephesus, a city on the Western coast of Asia Minor, across the Ægean sea from Athens. Present 200 bishops. President, St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. 4th, Chalcedon; held A.D. 451, in Chalcedon, a town on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, immediately opposite Constantinople. Present 650 bishops. President, the Emperor Marcian, who, of course, had no vote. 5th, Second Constantinople; held A.D. 553, in the city of Constantinople itself. Present 255 bishops. President Eutychius, the Patriarch of Constantinople. 6th, Third Constantinople; held A.D. 680, in the city of that name. Present 299 bishops. President, the Emperor Constantine IV. Their business was (1) to compare all the different creeds and the credentials of the bishops who used them, thus fixing a standard of belief; (2) to judge all new heresies by reference to their standard; (3) to repress schismatic movements in different parts of Christendom, and keep the Church well together.

SIR,—Who are "the Druses" of the Holy Land?

Ans.—They are a tribe supposed to be descended from the Phenician mountaineers of King Solomon's time. They are almost a "secret nation," with passwords and signs almost identical with those of Freemasons. Their present religion was invented about the year 1000 A.D., is a curious jumble of Perisan, Grecian, Egyptian, Mohammedan, and Christian ideas. Their secrecy and exclusiveness makes it very difficult to ascertain their real sentiments.

Family Reading.

Third Sunday after Epiphany.

PRAYING.

"Mind you say your prayers, my boy. Don't forget that, whatever you do."

Didn't your father or mother say something like that to you when you went away from home the first time? You remember it well, I dare say. And you took a card with you to hang up by your bedside, or a little book of prayers with your name written in it. For though you know the Morning and Evening Prayers by heart, yet they were printed, in case you should forget them.

And you do say them pretty regularly, for there would be a disagreeable sort of *prick* in your mind if you did not. So the great thing is to be able to feel you have said your prayers, for you don't have the disagreeable prick then.

But, dear boy, just stop a minute, this quiet Sunday morning. I want to ask you something. Do you find that saying prayers helps you much in the day?

Now last night and this morning, I am almost sure, you asked God to give you a certain thing.

What was it? His Grace?

Yes, and that was one of the best possible things to ask for. God's Grace means a wonderful sort of strength that comes from Him, and which He will give to you if you ask Him.

How did you find that you got it? Did Grace come and help you, just when you wanted help?

For instance, think of yesterday afternoon. Your master was out; yet you knew it was right to keep on at work just the same, just as though he were looking on. But after the first half-hour it was hard. Work seemed to get very tiresome; and a book with a capital tale in it lay near, ah! how temptingly near! The two things—the one pleasant, the other hard—were before you.

Now here was an occasion clearly when you wanted help. Something that would make you do the hard right thing—your work, and not the easy wrong thing—read the story. Now *did* anything come to your aid just in time, just when you were in need of help?

That Grace of God we have been speaking of, that strength from the Lord Himself, did it come?

Ah no, I am afraid not. The book was taken up and the work let alone. And the clock struck once, twice, and then there was an unsatisfactory sort of scramble to finish off the work in time. Of course it wasn't well done, and you were annoyed and vexed with yourself, and abused yourself roundly.

"Bother! what a fool I am! I mean one thing and do another."

Now how was that?

Why did not Grace help you? It was the very thing you wanted. And you mentioned it in your prayer yesterday, and many other days—"Lord, give me Thy Grace to do everything as in Thy sight;" or words something like that, if not exactly those words.

I am quite sure there was something about grace in your prayer, wasn't there?

Then why did not God give grace just when you wanted it?

I think I can tell you how it was. You said a prayer about grace, but you did not *really* ask for it—ask for it, that is, in good earnest.

Do you know that saying a prayer needn't be praying at all.

Suppose you wanted your father to give you a knife for a Christmas present. Should you just say to him, as if you were unwillingly repeating a lesson—"Please give me a knife"? No, you would put your *heart* into the words, and go up to him looking eager and earnest—"Father, *do* give me a knife, I want one so very much."

Wouldn't he be inclined to give it just because you are so anxious for it, and ask so earnestly?

Yes, I am sure he would. For that would be real asking, not saying some formal words, and it is real asking that gets its reward. For nobody cares to give what isn't wanted. Haven't you noticed that in every-day life?

Well, then, can you wonder that God does not give, if you actually don't care at all about getting the thing prayed for? For God can see into hearts, remember that. Can He give when He sees there is no real asking at all, and not even a wish to get the thing prayed for?

Some words are repeated, they are not said to God.

Think of all this the next time you kneel down to say your prayers. You want to be helped, don't you? Helped in that fight with Sin that must come every day, and in which, alas! you fall and are beaten without that help which "cometh of the Lord."

You know God is ready to give it you, this best of all gifts, because he is kinder than the very kindest of earthly fathers. He wants you to have it, and has always wanted you to have it from the very day you were baptized. He only says, "Ask, and ye shall have."

And now you see what real asking is. *Putting all your heart into it.*

And what a difference it will make in your daily life, just all the difference in the world.

There won't be nearly so much of that unsatisfactory sort of *dallying*, when you are about half inclined to do right and half inclined to do wrong. Which dallying generally ends in the right half of you being vanquished and done for.