

preaching. The hearer is often led to inquire: What is all this for? What is the preacher's object? What end has he in view? So dimless and pointless is the discourse. No preacher, however, was ever so attractive that he could, in and of himself, draw a single sinner to Christ.

It is no doubt the experience of a large number of ministers, that strangers fail in their duty to the church. Numbers hold themselves aloof from the church services. They should make themselves known, and hold themselves ready to receive attention. They should let their voice be heard in the service of song and prayer. They should let the influence of their dollars and cents be felt in the revenue of the parish and in the benevolent offerings.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

May 6th.

PAROCHIAL SYSTEM.

SIR.—The pressing, urgent question before the Church at the present moment is, "Is the parochial system a sufficiently powerful engine for the performance of the work the Church is called upon to do?" We all agree that the parochial system is the backbone of the Church, to the parochial clergy we look for the ordinary ministrations of the Church among us, and the regular administration of the sacraments, but yet all this being so, is it not possible to bring some other power into play? We shall say very little about lay help, excepting that the Church has always used such help when her rulers deemed it advisable. Some of the most powerful religious movements within the Pre-Reformation Church, originated with laymen. Such movements as the Franciscan, which at first, at all events, did untold good, and as far as their light went were pre-eminently spiritually religious, could be copied now-a-days with great benefit to the Church. Of course, when I say copied, I mean shorn of all unnecessary externalism, and the spirit of the theory copied. If one thing more than another should by this time have become clear, it is the great difficulty the ordinary parochial clergy have in reaching many people in their parishes, in fact it is in many cases impossible. We all deplore the extravagance of the Salvation Army, and the separation of the Methodists from the Church, and yet the fact does not seem to be grasped by us yet. That what we call excitement and unseemly extravagance, and the presentation of religion in a very realistic, materialistic, and not over decorous manner, has, when nothing else has, the effect of strongly affecting and often changing the life and conduct of people the clergy have no influence over, for supposing they were to preach in a way likely to have an effect upon such people, (even if they got them into the Church) they would shock many, perhaps the majority of the congregation, and be doing more harm than good. Religion is a many sided thing, and certain sides have to be presented to certain people, but always, of course, the same religion.

We have no organization in the Church for presenting religion occasionally in an intensely realistic manner, and also to bring it within the ken of certain people, in highly materialistic, symbolic language. Not only should we be ministering to and feeding the flock, but we should be also roughly (for they are the majority of them not of highly spiritual or delicate religious organizations), shaking the sleeping nominals awake, this and the regular ministrations are beyond the power of the parochial clergy.

Until we have an organization to do this work, we must, I think, say nothing of that irregular organization the Salvation Army, with all its extravagance. How carefully the Pre-Reformation Church was in all her darkness to discern and patronize a spiritual movement, the dream of Innocent III. that he saw the grand church of St. John Lateran falling into ruins, and the miserable, poor, ill clad figure of St. Francis of Assisi running forward to uphold it with his hands, was something more than a dream, it should be a lesson to us and our spiritual Fathers in God, that a man so full of pride and world as Innocent III. had so much spiritual insight. It should be a reminder to us to keep our eyes open and read the "signs of the times."

It would be impossible to force such a movement into being, but if Innocent III. in his quickness in detecting the real article and using it, was followed, I think we should not be long without a strong organization in the Church, an enthusiastic organization belonging to no school, men of self-denial, being extraordinary not ordinary messengers; education should not be a condition of membership; I deny not the use of education to the Church, especially for her rulers, but it should not be required for membership of such an organization as this. The reason for this will be clear when it is remembered a man's usefulness in such a position is independent of education, as any one can see in looking at such movements in the past under and independent of the rulers of the Church.

What help to the parochial clergy such an organi-

zation would be, under the Metropolitan for the whole of Canada. Not preaching in the churches, that would be a fruitful way to miss the great number of the people to be got up, but preaching literally by the highways, and finding places (if required), to preach in for themselves. An organization of this kind, loyal to the Church, independent of the parochial clergy, under the direction of the Metropolitan, would be of great use to the cause, if any clergy should feel jealous of their authority, all we can say is, that according to the theory of the Primitive Church, all authority is from the bishop, and not to run necessarily through the clergy to any beyond; at all events the Bishop, and not the clergy, is the source of ecclesiastical authority, thus making it quite possible for such an organization to exist in perfect accord with Church principles.

W. B.

EPISCOPACY.

SIR.—We do not see how it is possible for any candid, honest and impartial mind to doubt that a three-fold ministry is of Scriptural and Apostolic origin. The example and promise of Christ, the practice of the inspired apostles, as seen in the pastoral epistles, and the revelation of St. John; the undoubted testimony of the apostolic fathers, those noble martyrs, all these set it forth as clear as the noon-day.

Even the great non-Episcopal historian Mosheim, acknowledges the fact. In his commentaries, the fruit of his most mature scholarship, he says:—

"In the more considerable ones (churches) at least, if not in others, it came, even during the life of the apostles, and with their approbation, to be the practice for some one man, more eminent than the rest, to be invested with the presidency, or chief direction. And, in support of this opinion, we are supplied with an argument of such strength, in those "angels" to whom St. John addressed the epistles, which, by the command of our Saviour Himself, he sent to the seven churches of Asia, Rev. ii. 8, as the Presbyterians, as they are termed, let them labour and strive what they may, will never be able to overcome." (Vol. 1, p. 170).

Again he admits that the Church of Jerusalem, at the time of that city's being taken, and finally laid waste by the Emperor Hadrian, towards the middle of the second century, (about the year of our Lord 137 or 138), had had fourteen Bishops; without reckoning James as one of them." (Vol. 1, p. 173).

"It will be equally well placed beyond dispute, that the Church of Jerusalem had over it a Bishop long enough before the close of the first century after Christ." (Ib. p. 178).

Again, that these Bishops were, on their creation, invested with certain peculiar rights, and a degree of power, which placed them much above the Presbyters, will not be disputed by any unprejudiced or impartial persons." (Ib. p. 174).

How is such an argument met at our present day? In what way do men, who are the leaders of the masses of the people, manage to evade the practical conclusions which, and apparently without the slightest uneasiness of conscience, is certain. How is this done?

Some men say that all these things are of not the slightest consequence. But this is being wiser than God.

Some men say that what Christ and His Apostles established as to faith, and order, and sacraments, was not a finality, and was not meant to be. They tell us that all the things were only germs. But by what progress these germs are to expand and develop this they cannot agree about. The Romanists differ from each other; and so do the Rationalists. But the fruits which they offer never came from the Apostolic germ. Under the true "law of development," the fruit tree yields fruit "after his kind."

Here is the strong ground on which our branch of the church stands. In this respect her "strength is to sit still." She only betrays her trust and becomes weak, when she shows a readiness to trim her sails to every passing gale, and to compromise the truths of the faith, and the ordinances of Christ. Let her do the work which Christ has given her to do, and leave the result to God.

H. J. B.

ERRORS OF W. B. ON CONVERSION.

(Continued).

SIR.—In replying to W. B's. last letter, I beg to remind him that his first letter contains the following sentence: "Our Lord foreseeing the denial and fall of St. Peter, calls the recovery of that penitent apostle a conversion, and it is no less a conversion than the turning of a heathen from his idols to the faith of Christ." I absolutely denied this, and contended that there was on the part of St. Peter simply true

repentance, and that there was no evidence at all that our blessed Lord had ever applied to it any language indicating conversion. I moreover complained that W. B. had in his first letter "failed to distinguish between conversion and repentance, probably because from his point of view there is little or no distinction between them." He attempts in his second letter to argue that our blessed Lord did apply the word convert to St. Peter's case referred to, and quotes St. Luke xxii. 32, by way of proof, and in his third letter says; "I should not say, as Layman insinuates, that to repent and to be converted are synonymous." I did not insinuate any such thing, but I hinted that probably from W. B's. point of view there was little or no distinction between conversion and repentance, and I must remind W. B. that it is not much of a denial of what I had thus charged, to say he does not consider them synonymous. He admits a distinction does exist between these two things. It is quite clear that W. B's. view of conversion makes of necessity the distinction very slight indeed, in fact more imaginary than real, and this is one of my reasons for objecting to his view of it.

The popular modern notion of conversion is simply the natural outcome and result of ignoring altogether true and genuine repentance, and setting up in its place a foolish modern invention, which has been dubbed with the name of conversion. W. B. in his first letter has labored hard to show that his view of conversion is not the popular modern view of it, but he has utterly failed in the attempt, except so far as his view of repentance may be more correct than the popular modern view of it. I think that W. B. will at once admit that repentance is and must of necessity be an every day matter with every one who possesses and exercises any true and genuine repentance. Now let us couple such an admission with W. B's. definition of conversion as given at the commencement of his first letter in these words: "Conversion is . . . a mental, a spiritual, an actual turning from imperfection towards perfection. This change is often needed by the regenerate, and as often as the two wills within the regenerate conflict and the spiritual man gains a victory over the fleshly, it will occur." Well, these two wills do conflict every day, and in the case of him who has the true repentance referred to, there is doubtless an every day victory also, but there is not an every day conversion, though W. B's. words clearly imply that there is. If, indeed, there may be in a man every day conversion, and every day repentance, can W. B., or any other human being define the difference between the two, so that any person of ordinary understanding may perceive the distinction, for he it remembered that W. B. admits there is a distinction? Or let W. B. explain the distinction between St. Peter's repentance (for he calls him correctly enough "the penitent apostle") and the conversion which he says then took place. Can he tell us which happened first, the repentance or the conversion, or whether they were simultaneous? Let him explain, if he is able, the distinction between the two; and moreover, tell us if he can, what was the state of the other ten apostles at that time, and up till the time of the "glorious ascension, and the coming of the Holy Ghost." Were they converted men as well as St. Peter, and if so can W. B. tell us when their conversion took place, and how it came to pass that converted men (according to W. B's. idea of conversion) should be upbraided by their Divine Lord and Master "for their unbelief and hardness of heart?" How it happened that to some of them his just and righteous language immediately after his "glorious resurrection" was "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." If, however, W. B. should say that the ten were not at that time in a converted state, but only St. Peter, in such case will he kindly explain how it was that this converted St. Peter came in quite as much for the rebuke referred to as did the unconverted ten, and how it came to pass that St. Peter, notwithstanding his supposed conversion, did not immediately give some evidence of it by strengthening his brethren according to Christ's injunction laid upon him, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

Unless these things can be explained in some satisfactory manner, I must still maintain, that up till the great day of Pentecost, neither St. Peter or any of the ten, nor any other human being was converted at all, with that conversion without which our blessed Lord had declared that even his own apostles, much favored and highly privileged as they were, "could not enter into the kingdom of heaven" on earth; could not enter into His church on earth, in which from the very beginning of its existence there were to be tares as well as wheat; bad fish as well as good; foolish virgins as well as wise virgins; unprofitable servants as well as profitable ones.

LAYMAN.

—He who can take advice is sometimes superior to him who can give it.—Von Knebel