

THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

(From our own special correspondent.)

The Rev. T. W. Nickerson, M.A., rector of Paterson, in the Diocese of Newark, has been promoted to the rectorship of the Church of the Messiah, Boston city. The rev. gentleman married the daughter of the Very Rev. Dean Hoffman, D.C.L., of the New York General Theological Seminary.

Alaska will soon now—it is hoped—have a Bishop. To send missionaries to any country without a Bishop is a most grievous mistake.

The Venerable James F. Powers, D.D., Archdeacon of Reading, delivered a most powerful address to his convocation in the Central Pennsylvania Diocese on "The Origin of the Church of England." The Archdeacon showed clearly that it was founded A.D. 150 at the very latest, and was the national Church of England as early as A.D. 700. It is sincerely hoped that the Archdeacon will publish the address. Dr. Powers is certainly a born orator and is universally admired by his clerical brethren.

Consent has been given by the Ecclesiastical authority for the founding of a Missionary Episcopate in the northern part of Minnesota.

The Rev. B. S. E. Oliveira, a deacon in the Brazilian Mission, has been deposed for immorality by the Bishop of West Virginia.

The Rev. Canon Pentreath has taken up his clerical duties at Brainerd, Minn.

The new St. John's College has been solemnly opened by the Bishop of Shanghai.

The Rev. J. Thompson Cole has been appointed secretary of the Am. C.M.S.

They spend eight thousand dollars annually on music alone at St. Ignatius Church, New York City, of which Father Ritchie is the rector.

that man that eateth blood and will cut him off from among his people."—Lev. xvii. 10. A friend of the writer has very ably written that this being the strict Jewish law given by God Himself, is it conceivable that Jesus, the Son of that God Who came to fulfil His whole law, would direct His disciples to break that law by drinking His own blood? Is it conceivable that if the disciples understood Jesus to say that the wine was turned into blood, they would have drunk it? Would they not have turned from it with horror and disgust? Would they not have asked Jesus what He meant by offering to them, who were strict Jews, a drink of which if they dared to partake God had assured them in His law that He would cut them off from the land of the living? Now what clearly proved that they understood Jesus to speak of the bread and wine as mere symbols of his broken body and shed blood, and his whole language as figurative, is the fact that they neither exhibited repugnance to drink the wine, nor asked explanations as to how the wine could be called His blood, when they saw Him standing before them, His body whole and His blood unshed. They had the evidence, besides, of their senses, that the bread was bread and wine, wine; and if any one of us leaves the evidence of his senses, he has nothing else to guide him in this world. The above argument, then, is quite conclusive of the absurdity of the Real Presence or transubstantiation theory, and all true Christians of the Reformation would do well to banish from their minds the word *mystery* in any discussion or explanation of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and be content with the comforting and assuring words, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

J. SYMONS.

Toronto, June 29th, 1895.

"Whosoever Sins ye Remit, They are Remitted."

SIR,—XVI. Further discourse to His disciples, which is heard by others standing near. XVII. After turning to the Pharisees in ch. xvi., our Lord turned back to His disciples. "Then said He to His disciples, 'Offences must come, forgive those who offend you.' Verse 5 continues, 'And the apostles said, Lord increase our faith.' The mind is led to infer that our Lord had been addressing the twelve whilst others were present. Verse 22 only carries on the idea. XVIII. 'Then He took unto Him the twelve and said, We go up to Jerusalem.' The old rule helping to understand the inference when it is said He spoke privately to the disciples. XIX. 'He sends two of His disciples for the ass.' Few will care to dispute about these being apostles. A great crowd gather and follow Christ into the city. Verse 37. 'The whole multitude of His disciples, began to rejoice.' Here again we come back to the wide meaning of the term, the loose assemblage of followers, uncalled and unsum. XX. After much speaking to Scribes, Pharisees and lawyers, our Lord, 'in the audience of all the people, said unto His disciples beware of the Scribes.' St. Luke returns again to the stricter use of the term. The same people who were called disciples in ch. xix. 37, were present with the Scribes, etc. In the hearing of these people He addresses 'His disciples'—as clear a distinction as could be made between the regular twelve and the irregular crowd. XXII. St. Peter and St. John are sent to prepare the Passover. This confirms our conjecture upon St. Mark xiv. 13, 'He sent two of His disciples,' and makes it more likely that the two sent for the ass were likewise apostles. In verse 11 our Lord says, 'Where is the quiet chamber where I may eat the passover with My disciples?' Then verse 14, 'He sat down with the twelve apostles.' It would be hard to find a stronger proof of our argument. The Christ Himself reveals His mind, and gives us the primary meaning of the term disciples, showing us upon whom His mind was set in speaking of His disciples. After supper He went out and 'His disciples followed Him.' XXIV. Verse 10. 'Mary Magdalen told these things unto the apostles.' A plain commentary upon St. Mark xvi. 7, 'Go your way and tell His disciples,' and St. John xx. 18, 'Mary came and told the disciples.' Verse 13. 'Behold, two of them went to Emmaus.' Let us turn to St. John XX. 'He breathed on them and saith unto them, as the Father sent Me, even so send I you.' Upon this passage Westcott sagely remarks, 'There is nothing in the context to limit the pronoun to the ten.' What weight, then, is this argument in the light of these verses of St. Luke, 'Mary went and told the apostles,' 'And behold, two of them went to Emmaus'? The context limits the pronoun to the apostles—exactly the wrong conclusion, because neither of them was an apostle. The casual mention of Cleopas five verses further on, alone saves us from a complete misunderstanding. Now let us put things together. St. Luke xxiv. 10, 'Mary and the other women told these things unto the apostles.' St. John xx. 18, 'Mary came and told the disciples,' i.e., apostles according to St. Luke, though Westcott thinks differently. Then, the same day, Jesus came and said, 'Peace be unto you. Then

were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord. Then said He unto them, As the Father sent me, even so send I you,' etc. May we not say there is everything in the context to limit the pronoun to the ten, and to show that the gift was confined to a particular group, viz., the apostles? Whether Westcott's imagination or St. Luke's statement be nearer the truth as taught of the Holy Spirit, who will doubt? The two not apostles returned and "found the eleven gathered together and them that were with them." The comparative insignificance of "them that were with them" is plainly, almost painfully, marked by the very words which reveal their presence. If St. Luke had not incidentally slipped in this slightly contemptuous notice, we should have no doubt whatever as to the persons addressed in St. John xx. 21, 22. The whole context of St. John fastens the mind upon the chosen band. Our conclusion reached by consecutive reading of passages in his gospel containing mention of the disciples and apostles is supported by the text of St. Luke just recited, "Mary went and told the apostles." St. Matthew uses the term disciples with the same prevailing and unrestricted meaning up to the most uncompromising statement, "Then the eleven went to the mount appointed them by Christ, and He spake unto them and said, Go ye and baptize all nations." St. Mark leaves no doubt all through his gospel of whom he speaks in using the word disciples, and adds, above all, the flat assertion that our Lord appeared "unto the eleven and said unto them, Go ye and preach the Gospel to every creature." Westcott, in speaking upon St. John xx. 23, "Whosoever sins ye remit," informs his readers that "the pronoun 'ye' is emphatic. The main thought which the words convey is that of the reality of the power of absolution from sin granted to the Church." With due reverence to His Lordship, we must take this information with a pinch of salt—a pinch of salt from St. Mark. "Afterward He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat. And He said unto them, Go ye and preach the Gospel." The pronouns are emphatic; rather dogmatic also. St. Luke is rather more indefinite in his narrative, but adds quite a little to the general argument. Against all this cumulative evidence, there is to be cited only these brief words of casual remark, "Them that were with them." Shall we set this finical evidence to give the lie direct to St. Mark and turn St. Matthew into a false witness? Was St. Luke under inspiration correcting St. Mark under inspiration? Shall we begin to say, "I am of St. Luke, I of St. Mark and St. Matthew"? It is easy to see how all bear witness to the truth. The apostles were assembled, others were present, our Lord appeared and spoke in the audience of others—as often before—certain words directly to the apostles. St. Luke, in mentioning "those that were with them," had not the same intention as St. John, St. Matthew and St. Mark. These meant to bring out clearly that authority for the work of the ministry was given directly to the apostolic band, and consequently left out all mention of others who were present. St. Luke, not intending to mention this particular point, slipped in passing notices of others, and made no reference whatever to the final commission, recorded in St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. John. Yet St. Luke had a very definite doctrine to teach, as we shall see in another letter. Even in his gospel the mind of Christ is as forcibly revealed as in any portion of Scripture. "Then He called unto Him the twelve and gave them authority and power." "He appointed seventy, and said, He who despiseth you, despiseth Me; behold I give you power." The context always points to a particular group as recipients of the Master's commission to preach and heal in His name. What shadow of turning was then in the mind of the unchanging will of God when He said, "As the Father sent Me, even so send I you"?

S. D. HAGUE.

Otherwise.

SIR,—With your permission, I wish to remove any wrong impressions which may have arisen from a misconception of the actual scope of my motion in the Synod, from the colouring given it by the Lord Bishop, and from the abbreviated form in which it appears in your paper of the 20th ult. A glance at the order of proceedings will show that the words of the motion are, "That all future appointments to rectories, parishes or missions lapse at the end of five years." In my humble opinion this motion does not contain a word or words, direct or indirect, prohibiting the Bishop from re-appointing to the same rectory, parish or mission, as the case may be. Evidently His Lordship thinks otherwise, for in speaking on the motion he said, "The Church of England is opposed to the itinerant principle of the Methodist Church." And the whole tenor of His Lordship's speech will leave, on susceptible minds, the impression that any change from life appointments will of necessity be itinerancy. I may here state that the Roman, Greek and Old Catholic

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

Ontario Synod.

SIR,—In the editorial notes on the Ontario Synod published in your issue of 27th June, you say: "The number of clergy who made the lazyman's communion was smaller than last year." Apart from the objectionable flippancy shown in speaking of the 10 a.m. celebration of the Holy Communion as the "lazyman's communion," you will permit me to say that your reference to this particular celebration is in especially bad taste—a stronger term might be used—inasmuch as His Grace the Lord Archbishop of the diocese had ordered it and was himself the celebrant.

HERBERT S. McDONALD.

Brockville, 1st July, 1895.

The Real Presence.

SIR,—In Mr. A. P. Coe's letter in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, of 27th June, occurs the word "mysterious," which seems to be entirely out of place as applied to the institution of our Lord's Supper. And it is a word which would not be used so frequently in this connection if parties would be governed by the teachings of the Bible—particularly the laws and polity of the Jews—and Prayer Book; for it is the forerunner and leads to the very foundation of transubstantiation. We know that our Lord frequently addressed his hearers by means of parables. It was, in fact, the usual manner in which the Jews expressed themselves, Jesus Himself said, "I am the door," "I am the vine," "This cup is My blood," and we find in the Scriptures similar passages, as, "God is a Rock," "God is a Shield," "All flesh is grass," "Your life is a vapour," etc., etc. On one occasion, indeed, He explained that His words were figurative, saying, "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."—John vi. 62. But there is one incident which will clearly show what our Saviour really means by the words which He used in instituting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the understanding His disciples had of His words. One of the most binding laws of the Jews, and one which the race observes most rigorously to this very day, is the prohibition to eat blood, "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."—Gen. ix. 4. "And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against