

but when he concludes from this truth that "What ever proceeds out of this essential life is unchangeable, and shaped by the mind of the Spirit," he simply begs the question, at least in the first half of the sentence. Were his arguments expressed in the form of a syllogism it would run thus:

1. Whatever the Holy Ghost ordains is unchangeable.
2. The ministry was ordained by God the Holy Ghost.
3. Therefore the ministry is unchangeable.

Thus "Hoosier" calmly assumes his major promise, which is just the point at issue. Must everything that has been Divinely ordained be unchangeable? That is a question easily and certainly answered in the negative. What of the Jewish law? Or to take the question of the Christian ministry. Where can we find clearer statements of the Divine origin of ministerial offices than the following? "And He gave some to be Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers," and, "God hath set some in the Church, firstly, Apostles, secondly, prophets, thirdly, teachers," etc. Upon which passages I remark: 1. These offices have changed; and, 2. How strange that there is no mention in either of these passages of either Bishops, priests or deacons. The explanation of both the omissions of bishops, priests and deacons, and the disappearance of prophets, evangelists, teachers, is given in High Church books on the ministry. The latter were orders of a travelling, the former of a stationary ministry. When the stationary ministry established itself, then the need of the travelling ministry ceased. In other words, these things were not unchangeably ordained by the Holy Spirit, but shaped themselves under His guidance out of the free life, and according to the varying needs of the Church.

"Workman," in your issue of Sept. 2nd, quite unconsciously, I do not doubt, puts the central point of the discussion very excellently, without any "mist or intricacies of words and sentences," as is my poor manner of writing, when he says: "The three orders—Bishops, priests and deacons—were to be found as soon as we should expect to find them, as soon as there was need of them." Exactly so.

With Mr. Craig, who thinks my sermon bad, and my letters worse, I have but small dispute. The end of his column of argument is that detailed instructions and commandments of our Saviour are not to be found in the Acts of the Apostles. In this conclusion I concur. But I do not agree with him that when the Acts of the Apostles were written the organization of the Church was practically complete, for this I suppose is what he means by the extraordinary sentence: "Whatever organization there was, was more or less complete." Unless Mr. Craig is in accord with those critics who think the Acts a very late document, he will find my reason for demurring to his statement in an earlier part of this letter. Certainly there is not to-day any writer with a reputation for scholarship worth having, who will say that the organization of the Church was practically complete about the time of St. Paul's first imprisonment.

I am unfeignedly grieved that "Missionary" should find my sermon "painful and unwholesome reading." But may I remind him that many things that now seem to be helpful and wholesome, appeared to be painful and unwholesome when first written. New teachings, new ways of looking at things, are always painful at first. Even the Prince of Peace was forced sadly to bid His disciples to think not that He was come to send peace upon the earth, but a sword. Whilst not a point to be argued about, it is one to be much considered in silence, that Our Lord was found guilty of heresy and blasphemy, by the Divinely ordained Church of His day.

In conclusion, sir, let me say that whilst the exigencies of controversy have given a negative appearance to my argument, it is in reality positive. My plea is for a larger fellowship, because out of fellowship springs love, and where love is, there God is also. Is there no need to-day of a Moses who shall lift up a voice that will win consent, and

cry as we contend, together: "Sirs ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?"

HERBERT SYMONDS.

## Family Reading.

### SOME TIME.

Last night, my darling, as you slept  
I thought I heard you sigh,  
And to your little crib I crept,  
And watched a space thereby:  
And then I stooped and kissed your brow,  
For oh! I love you so—  
You are too young to know it now,  
But some time you will know!

Some time when, in a darkened place  
Where others come to weep,  
Your eyes shall look upon a face  
Calm in eternal sleep;  
The voiceless lips, the wrinkled brow,  
The patient smile will show—  
You are too young to know it now,  
But some time you will know!

Look backward, then, into the years,  
And see me here to-night—  
See, O my darling! how my tears  
Are falling as I write;  
And feel once more upon your brow  
The kiss of long ago—  
You are too young to know it now,  
But some time you will know.

—Eugene Field.

### A GOOD OLD FIRM—ALWAYS MAKING AN ADVANCE.

One of the oldest firms in Toronto is that of the well-known boot and shoe house of H. & C. Blachford. It is more than thirty-five years since they first established themselves here, by opening a store east of Church street, in 1864. Finding trade prosper, and patrons more numerous, they removed to larger premises, 83-85 King street east, where they remained upwards of twenty years, at the end of which time they found themselves occupying the adjacent stores. The name of Blachford is synonymous throughout Ontario for the finest and highest-grade footwear—a name that has taken firm foothold with the oldest and most aristocratic families of Upper Canada, who not only deal with H. & C. Blachford year after year, but who look upon this firm as old friends, from the unexcelled reliability and trustworthiness of their goods. To meet the requirements of constantly increasing patronage this firm has now removed from its well-known premises on King street to newer and more fashionable quarters, 114 Yonge street. The writer had the pleasure of being shown through the premises, and found it one of the handsomest and best-equipped stores on the street, and worthy of its high-class patronage. A large window, with a door on either side, adds greatly to the attractiveness of the surroundings. This window has a charming effect by day from the new prismatic glass employed in its construction. By night it is even more pleasing, being illuminated by thirty or forty electric lights, whose silvery shades lend a brilliant lustre. The fittings of this elegant store are all handsomely finished in polished oak, while the ceiling is of metal of very tasteful design. Bicycle ladders are one of the many new improvements. Lady patrons are pleased to note that there are no tiresome stairs to mount, for the business is wholly conducted upon the ground floor—the gentlemen's department at the front, the ladies' at the rear, which is furnished with a dressing-room, well equipped in every particular. We predict, under these conditions, an even greater

increase of society trade for this popular firm in their new and elegant home. Patrons of either sex appreciate reliable goods at reasonable figures, and they are confidently aware that no trashy footgear ever left the store of H. & C. Blachford.

### SOME FAMOUS OLD MAIDS.

Look at the list: Elizabeth of England, one of the most illustrious of modern sovereigns. Her rule over Great Britain certainly comprised the most brilliant literary age of the English-speaking people. Her political acumen was put to as severe tests as that of any other ruler the world ever saw. Maria Edgeworth was an old maid. It was this woman's writings that first suggested the thought of writing similarly to Sir Walter Scott. Her brain might well be called the mother of the Waverley novels. Jane Porter lived and died an old maid. The children of her busy brain were "Thaddeus of Warsaw" and the "Scottish Chiefs," which have moved the hearts of millions with excitement and tears. Joanna Baillie, poet and play-writer, was "one of 'em." Florence Nightingale, most gracious lady, heroine of Inkerman and Balaclava hospitals, has, to the present, written "Miss" before her name.

### SOME ALWAYS DISSATISFIED.

The Jews, in our Lord's time, found fault with every teacher whom God sent among them. First came John the Baptist, preaching repentance, an austere man—a man who withdrew himself from society, and lived an ascetic life. Did this satisfy the Jews? No! They found fault, and said, "He hath a devil." Then came Jesus the Son of God, preaching the Gospel, living as other men lived, and practising none of John the Baptist's peculiar austerities. And did this satisfy the Jews? No! They found fault again, and said, "Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." In short, they were as perverse and hard to please as wayward children. It is a mournful fact that there are always thousands of professing Christians just as unreasonable as these Jews. They are equally perverse, and equally hard to please. Whatever we teach and preach, they find fault; whatever be our manner of life, they are dissatisfied. Do we tell them of salvation by grace and justification by faith? At once they cry out against our doctrine as licentious and Antinomian. Do we tell them of the holiness which the Gospel requires? At once they exclaim that we are too strict, and precise, and righteous overmuch. Are we cheerful? They accuse us of levity. Are we grave? They call us gloomy and sour. Do we keep aloof from balls and races and plays? They denounce us as puritanical, exclusive, and narrow-minded. Do we eat and drink and dress like other people, and attend to our worldly callings, and go into society? They sneeringly insinuate that they see no difference between us and those who make no religious profession at all; and that we are not better than other men. What is all this but the conduct of the Jews over again? "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented." He who spake these words knew the hearts of men! The plain truth is, that true believers must not expect unconverted men to be satisfied, either with their faith or their practice. If they do, they expect what they will not find. They must make up their minds to hear objections, cavils, and excuses, however holy their own lives may be. Well says Quesnel, "Whatever measures good men take they will never escape the censures of the world." The best way is not to be concerned at them.—John Charles Ryle, D.D.