

A FLOWER FOR HIS GRAVE.

THE death of the Rev. Canon Trevor takes from the Church one of her ablest sons, who for some reason, we could never fathom, failed to reach a position to which others have been advanced who were far his inferiors in all that constitutes worthiness and fitness for elevated ecclesiastical rank.

Canon Trevor at one time was personally known to us, and we gratefully remember and thankfully acknowledge the happy influence he exercised over a large body of young men, whom he aroused from apathy and indifference as to the Church and their duties as Churchmen. In connection with the parish church at Sheffield was a Trust Fund, out of which three chaplains were each paid £300 per year. One of these was held by the Rev. Samuel Earnshaw, of mathematical fame, the other by a genial Irishman of no fame beyond his amiability, and the other was conferred by the Trustees upon Canon Trevor as a recognition of his eminent abilities, especially as a preacher. When he was appointed to this chaplaincy the Church in that town was in the lowest state of deadness, the extremest form of Low Churchism prevailed, all attempts to introduce livelier services, or more reverence and dignity into worship were frowned upon by the Vicar, who claimed power to control every church in the town. When Dr. Hook came to preach at St. John's, one of the town churches, the vicar of the parish church caused the door of the pulpit to be locked against this eminent and godly divine!

As a specimen of the shameful slovenliness that prevailed, it is known that one Easter Monday when marrying a large number of couples, which ceremony was performed wholesale, there was an outcry that the brides and bridegrooms had got mixed up and the wrong men and women were married! The vicar exclaimed in his half jocular, half petulant way, "Sort yourselves, sort yourselves!"

This abominable indifference characterized every other sacred function. The consequence was—deserted churches and crowded chapels, but the clergy were popular, so popular with dissenters. The advent of Canon Trevor was like a shock of earthquake, the whole town was roused. A new vicar had come of the same school as the last one, and he refused to allow Chaplain Trevor to officiate. This tyrannous act stirred the young men of the whole district greatly. We banded together to support the eloquent Canon, who soon found that although shunned by the great body of the clergy, he had very numerous and highly enthusiastic supporters amongst the laity. A war of tracts broke out, and to the dismay of the Canon's opponents it was discovered by them that they had raised a controversy for which they were miserably equipped.

We cannot follow this portion of his life, but this we know, that thousands of Churchmen in South Yorkshire, the whole Church indeed, has reason to thank God for the work, and the teaching, and the personal influence exercised by Canon Trevor.

The deceased was a man of fine stature and native dignity, he used little gesture in pulpit or platform; generally stood when speaking with his left hand behind his back, his voice was sympathetic and powerful, without effort he filled the largest churches, he spoke slowly, emphasized words or sentences rarely, never hesitated for a word, and always used the right one. His teaching, then thought so advanced, would to day cause him to be ranked as a very moderate High Churchman. We remembering Canon Trevor for forty years with affection, throw a flower upon his honored grave.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

THE following concludes Dr. Salmon's article on the Ministry.

What I have here to speak of is the prophetic office as it appears in Hermas. In Justin Martyr's account of Christian worship, he makes no mention of exhortations addressed to the assembly by any one but the president. Ignatius frequently speaks of "the prophets," and he always means the Old Testament prophets, and gives no indication that there is any ambiguity in the term, or that it was then used to denote an order of men in the Christian Church. In Hermas, on the contrary, we find the prophetic office in full vigor. We learn (Mandat. xii.) that in the public assembly for worship, after prayer made, the angel of the prophetic spirit would fill the prophet, who would then speak unto the people as the Lord willed. Hermas finds the necessity of distinguishing between the true prophet and sham prophets. The former was meek, lowly, and unwordly, and would only deliver his prophecies in public in the manner just described the latter were self-seeking, ambitious of precedence, luxurious in their life, would act as soothsayers in private, answering questions put to them and taking money for it, but were dumb in public assembly. From this point alone it is evident that Hermas, who evidently was himself a prophet, belongs to an earlier period of ecclesiastical organization than Ignatius. In the Pauline epistles (1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 2.) we read of prophets and teachers as bearing office in the Church, the former word no doubt denoting uninspired teachers. We find from 1 Corinthians xiv, that those endowed with prophetic gifts were allowed to address the assembly in turn, and therefore we have reason to think that in the first age of the Church the right of publicly addressing the assembly was not the exclusive privilege of the presbyters. We cannot say how long miraculous gifts continued in the Church; but though the Teaching of the Apostles and Hermas both indicate that addresses in the assembly were, when these books were written, still given by those who were recognised as prophets, it is also evident from both writings that the Church was then embarrassed by the difficulty of distinguishing true prophets from false pretenders; and though Hermas himself was apparently recognised as a prophet in the Church of his day, his claims to inspiration were, after about

a century, generally rejected. When speaking of prophetic gifts I must say something about Montanism, concerning which I consider that two mistakes are sometimes made. The first is to regard it a survival of the primitive constitution of the Church; whereas I believe it to be, not a survival, but an unsuccessful attempt at revival. Montanism is not earlier than the last quarter of the second century, but by the end of the first quarter the gift of prophecy, though not supposed to be completely withdrawn from the Church, had ceased to be an ordinary feature of Church life, and the attempt to revive it in Phrygia was discredited by the frantic behaviour of the so-called prophets.

But it is a more important mistake to treat it as a thing to be regretted that the Church rulers refused to obey the command given in these utterances supposed to be inspired; that, for example, when the prophetesses proclaimed themselves authorized to institute new annual fasts, they treated the new institution as of no authority; that they regarded the question whether a person who had been excommunicated ought or ought not to be restored as one to be settled by the calm deliberation of the Church rulers, and not by what a prophetess might declare herself inspired to pronounce for or against his readmission. If the Church had taken a different line, its doctrine and discipline, instead of being guided by calm and thoughtful men, would have been left at the mercy of excitable women. It is true that the Montanist prophetesses uttered nothing repugnant to the orthodoxy in which they had been brought up; but what guarantee could there be for the soundness of doctrine if left to be developed by such hands? It seems to me that the ancient Church, which rejected the Montanist pretensions, was far wiser than the modern Church of Rome, which has yielded to them; as when, for example, she instituted the feast of Corpus Christi in obedience to the inspired direction of one prophetess, or sanctions the devotion to the sacred heart of Jesus in compliance with another.

I return now to the question of gradations of rank in the ministry, which, as I already said, presents a different aspect when looked at from different ends of the dimly-lighted period. The distinction between bishop and presbyter, which remains so marked as we go back from Irenæus to Ignatius, seems to disappear when we consult the earlier authorities. In the Acts we read of the apostolic missionaries appointing each Church presbyters, not a bishop and presbyters. In the same book (xx. 17, 28), the same persons are called both presbyteri and episcopi. Only two orders in the ministry, bishop and deacons, are recognised in St. Paul's later Epistles (Phil. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii); the same two orders only are mentioned in Clement's epistle, and in the Didachi. Hermas, though he makes special mention of Clement, who, according to early tradition, was bishop, and certainly was a prominent member, of the Church of Rome, yet speaks of the government of that Church as in the hands of "the