

Rev. John Langtry, which, I regret to note, evades the real points at issue. I am not going to follow him in his personalities. He asked questions which I answered. To these answers he has not in fact replied. He has not chosen to take my language and answer it, but he begins with assumptions of his own, such as—"I gather from all that Mr. Blake, and you, Mr. Editor, have written,"—"I may safely assume,"—"I think the inference is fair." And then setting up the inferences, the creations of his own fancy, he proceeds to play with them according to his whim. Take two of these inferences: (1.) "That the only true loyal members of the Reformed Church of England are those who call themselves Evangelical." I never said so, and no inference of the kind can truly be drawn from what I have written; (2.) "That those who are called High Churchmen or Sacerdotalists, as the fashion now is, are false to Reformation principles." To this statement I make a similar reply. I think it most unfair to describe all High Churchmen as Sacerdotalists. I believe that a large body of old-fashioned High Churchmen in the Church of England cannot be classed as Sacerdotalists. I gave the verbatim language of Messrs. Langtry and Ford which proved, whether it be right or wrong, that not only they hold these views but that they claim that these views represent the true teaching of our Church, and therefore also represent the teaching which they are bound to give. In support of this (and I repeat it in evidence of the truth of my assertion), I quoted what Mr. Ford said in justification of such teaching, "The Lord and the Apostles taught a religion of the kind, commonly called Sacramental, Sacerdotal, High Church;" and Mr. Langtry stated "These persons sneered at the notion that the priest alone, because of his Sacerdotal powers, had authority to dispense the Sacraments and to bestow absolution, but no man could get away from the fact that these doctrines which were assailed, were the doctrines of the Church of England." I further quoted from Haddon and pointed to Blunt; but so far from any disapproval of the principles there enunciated, Mr. Langtry goes off on a side issue.

We protest against these very Sacerdotal principles, whether in the germ or the full grown tare. They have in the last fifty years wrought untold evil in our Church, and their growth must not be allowed here. When the teaching of these two gentlemen was objected to, the answer was, these are but temporary appointments—others will be appointed in their place, and it was stated that they would be sacrificed, but there is no warrant for the conclusion that those who appointed them will be satisfied with any teaching less pronounced in its Sacerdotalism than theirs. It certainly will be a new departure if the Bishop of Ontario assents to any change in that direction.

I asserted of Haddon's book that it was "pervaded with Romish teachings," and that it was a text book at Trinity. To this Mr. Langtry answers, "It is prescribed as a text-book for the Ordination Examination by the Bishop of Toronto, whom Mr. Blake has publicly endorsed and proclaimed as a thoroughly Protestant and Evangelical Bishop. The pupils in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School are, therefore, instructed in the book which Mr. Blake, the head-centre of the School, declares to be pervaded with Romish teaching."

The present Bishop of Toronto did not prescribe this as a text-book. The Sacerdotal party, in power before his appointment, prescribed it amongst other books. When the present Bishop succeeded to office he found these books prescribed; and, like most men, he was naturally slow to change the subjects for examination, prescribed and acted upon, before he became Bishop. As long as this book is prescribed, as one on which students are to be examined, it must be read by all candidates for Orders. If read under the direction of lecturers, who hold Haddon's views, the effect will manifestly be to indoctrinate the students with these most pernicious teachings. Whilst, if studied under the guidance of an earnest Evangelical teacher, the student will have pointed out to him the fallacies and errors of a theory contrary alike to Scripture and to history. Only in this way, and because it is on the diocesan list, is its use tolerated in the Divinity School. Students preparing for ordination at Trinity must also read it. But in this case with this essential difference, that those at least who formerly controlled its curriculum were those who moulded the diocesan list. The case is thus even worse than I had previously stated.

The misstatement of Mr. Langtry as to what took place on his introducing Blunt's Key to the Prayer Book into the Bishop Strachan School does not alter the fact. Mr. Langtry can at any moment learn, if the Bishop did not give him, as I believe he did,—if the name of the gentleman who made the remonstrance and who caused its withdrawal. Mr. Langtry says he has never read the book. Upon another occasion he stated that he was ignorant of the introduction of a catechism into his own Sunday-school, which, on a remonstrance being made, was withdrawn. It matters little whether it is ignorance or carelessness that causes these results. In any case it

shows the need of watchfulness, and the duty of all Christian men to use the right and the privilege which belongs to them of testing every claim and every doctrine by the Holy Scriptures.

With your permission I shall reply to other points Mr. Langtry has raised, in your next.

Yours truly,
Toronto, March 13, 1882. S. H. BLAKE.

THE HON. S. H. BLAKE ON SACERDOTALISM.

To the Editor of the Evangelical Churchman.

SIR,—Mr. Blake belongs to a profession in which the precept "If you have no case, abuse the plaintiff and browbeat the witnesses of the opposite side," is too widely acted upon. The hon. gentleman enjoys the reputation of having reduced this anti-Christian precept to practical and scientific perfection. He is evidently trying its power over your readers, and so begins by accusing me of "personalities," and of drawing unfounded "assumptions." It is fortunate that in holding over my letter until an attempt could be made to counteract its effects, you have put in the power of your readers to see for themselves, without the trouble of turning back, what foundation there is for those accusations. I have no doubt, from what I know of some of them, that they will not feel very grateful to the hon. gentleman for treating them as intellectual ninnyes.

Mr. Blake says that it is a foolish assumption of mine that he and you, Mr. Editor, have implied in all that you have said and written, "That the only true, loyal members of the Reformed Church of England are those who call themselves Evangelicals, and that those who are called High Churchmen, or Sacerdotalists, as the fashion now is, are false to Reformation principles." He denies that he has ever said anything of the kind, or that any such inference can truly be drawn from what he has written!!! This is news indeed. I am certain that there is not one in a hundred of his followers, or of your readers, who has not with myself been guilty of this "unfounded assumption." The very reason for the existence of the Church Association, the Evangelical Churchman, and the Divinity School, was the alleged departure of High Churchmen from Reformation principles. And in the very speech which gave occasion to this correspondence, Mr. Blake expressed his conviction that it was hardly less than a miracle that so many people had stuck to the Church in spite of the teaching of the men (all old-fashioned High Churchmen) who have for a long time had possession of the parishes.

But now it appears that all this was mere buncombe. He did not mean anything by these accusations. High Churchmen are good Protestants and right royal members of the Church of England after all! only they must be OLD FASHIONED High Churchmen. Mr. Blake reads me out of that list, and denounces me as a Sacerdotalist because I said that "the Church of England undoubtedly teaches that the priest alone, because of his sacerdotal powers, has authority to dispense the Sacraments and to bestow absolution." Now can Mr. Blake mention any High Churchmen, old fashioned or new fashioned, in England, the United States, or Canada, who will not endorse every word of this statement. Nay, can he point to any Low Churchman, who has ever read his Prayer Book through, who will deny that the Church of England does by express statement limit absolution and the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to the priest alone. And yet for saying what the Church of England says, he denounces me as unfit to be trusted as one of her teachers.

Mr. Blake says, "I asserted of Haddon's book that it was pervaded with Romish teaching, and that it was a text-book at Trinity." I told Mr. Blake, on authority, that the latter part of this statement was wholly untrue, that Haddon was not, and never had been, a text-book at Trinity. And yet he does not retract his statement, or express any sorrow for it, but implies again, though he dare not say so, that it is true. I pointed out to him that in spite of his denunciation of it, as being pervaded with Romish teaching, it was prescribed by the Bishop of Toronto as a text-book for the Ordination Examination. Mr. Blake says this was the evil work of the Sacerdotal party who were in power here before the Bishop's appointment, and that the poor Bishop of Toronto has not yet had courage to change the poisoned list his predecessor had left him. I can only say for myself that I do not believe a word of Mr. Blake's impudent accusation of my Bishop. I am persuaded that if Haddon's book were justly chargeable with the errors which Mr. Blake says it is, no consideration of fear or interest would induce the Bishop to have it on the list of Ordination text-books for a single hour. Mr. Blake tells us further that so long as Haddon "is prescribed as a text-book, it must be read by all candidates for Orders, even though it be pervaded with Romish errors; but if studied under an earnest evangelical teacher, the student will have pointed out

to him the fallacies and errors of a theory contrary alike to Scripture and history." Now what does this mean? The Bishop prescribes a text-book to be mastered by candidates for Ordination because he wishes them to be instructed in the theory which it sets forth, as the theory that is in full harmony with Scripture and history. But the earnest evangelical teacher helps them to get up the book, so as to be able to pass the examination, and be accepted by the Bishop as orthodox Churchmen, while he has taught them to believe the very opposite of what their answers imply that they believe. That the theory which their answers imply is based upon fallacies and errors, contrary alike to Scripture and history, Mr. Editor, if I were in your place, I would cut off my right hand before I would be guilty of such dishonesty, before I would allow students, for whom I was responsible, to study a book which I believed to be pervaded with Romish error.

But again Mr. Blake says that "the diocesan list which contains the Romish book was moulded by those who formerly controlled the curriculum of Trinity College." Now I speak with authority when I tell Mr. Blake that that statement is a pure fiction, absolutely, and in every sense of the word, untrue. Those who controlled the curriculum of Trinity College had nothing whatever to do with moulding that list. The late Bishop Bethune and the present examining chaplain, Mr. Stennett, are alone responsible for that list, and if they are to be described as "the Sacerdotal party," I would like to know where Mr. Blake will find the old-fashioned High Churchmen of whom he speaks.

Mr. Blake denounces Haddon in his last letter as a Sacerdotalist, because he says without bishop no presbyters; without bishops and presbyters no legitimate certainty of Sacraments, without Sacraments no certain union with the Body of Christ, viz: with His Church; without this no certain union with Christ; and without that union no salvation." This is all Mr. Blake quotes, and upon this he remarks as follows: "It thus substitutes external conformity to an Episcopal Church, and the partaking of the Sacraments for faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the means of salvation. It is, therefore, a system in direct opposition to the plain teaching of the Gospel." Now, will it be believed that the following words, as Mr. Ross Brown pointed out in the DOMINION CHURCHMAN of last week, follow immediately upon those quoted by Mr. Blake? Yet with these necessary provisos at each step, by the very nature of the moral laws and attributes of Almighty God—first, if those outward things may be had, and next with every allowance for ignorance, prejudice, or necessity; and lastly and above all, as a system subservient and ministering, both to a true faith, and to a living religion and hearty love of Christ in the soul. The units of God's Church must each be themselves centres of God's truth and grace; they must be living stones, and yet none the less built into one temple. Anyone then who holds apostolic succession, which is indeed otherwise unmeaning and superfluous, holds, of necessity, this whole scheme of doctrine." This Mr. Blake omits, because it shows that Haddon teaches the very opposite of what he says he teaches. I do not know how such conduct may be regarded in the sphere of what Mr. Blake calls Evangelicalism. But I do know that the saintly founders of that School and every man who is worthy of the name will look with simple abhorrence on it. Nay, a Seneca, or a Plato, or a Cato, or any decent heathen who had not perverted his natural conscience, would have scorned to be guilty of such dishonest and dishonourable conduct.

Mr. Blake says: "The misstatement of Mr. Langtry as to what took place on introducing Blunt's Key to the Prayer Book into the Bishop Strachan School, does not alter the fact." Now, if Mr. Blake had the instincts of a gentleman, I would ask him either to prove that I have been guilty of misstating the facts, or to retract and apologise for the accusation. But if Mr. Blake had the instincts of a gentleman he would not have written it, and therefore I make no request from him. In his former letter he asserted that Blunt's Key to the Prayer Book was ordered out of the Bishop Strachan School by the late Bishop, on a remonstrance made to him by a layman of this diocese." I told him that this statement was simply and in every sense untrue. He has not the manliness to retract and apologise for that statement, but substitutes for it the following statement: "Mr. Langtry can at any moment learn, if the Bishop did not give him, as I believe he did, the name of the gentleman who made the remonstrance, and who caused the withdrawal." I beg to tell Mr. Blake that his amended statement is equally with the other absolutely, and in every sense of the word, untrue. The Bishop never gave me any name, and never spoke to me about the book at all. And so if Mr. Blake is satisfied with the position in which he has placed himself in this matter, have nothing to urge against it.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN LANGTRY.