

to so. If the form of this protest, and the writer of the wishes to in a deliberate and of the rest of the ng of the likeness is wrong, then it is a picture book or a photograph taken. hallow display of make the utter unding more on. e cross has been of Jesus Christ, it attempting to mop sure writer to at that the whole and that the cross, ke the emblem of othing but an old being the sign of Tamning. But it of Assyria, wore ore it is inferred now! But Samsi- lothes, therefore id this obtuse in- ear clothes now, St. Peter's con- e apparition of a oles, as a protest f wearing clothes. iveness of this kes exception to the proceedings ground that the at remains is "a uch evidence be umphantly asks. Testament is a nes removed, and lered to be very ous purposes. hristian symbol at the Cross up- ad, as a matter elined to think ore! Such an he objection of n who objected saint's day, be the event com- n the particular commemoration, the commemora- Pope of Rome! it can be called. ch of Ireland, e its own affairs, use of crosses therefore such y the Church of as just as per- as the Church urch of Ireland, people to wor- itly passed the to them from at present are y such sin, and r Irishmen may for Canadians, anon would be both on their Considering we nation of the oned upon its osses, that in o emblazoned mean anything Province, and e is our glory s, we think a rinciples as a province, and

yet object to the symbol of the cross on the grounds set forth in this tract, is ill deserving of citizenship. His puerile objections are not only an offence to his fellow Christians, but an insult to the nation whose protection he enjoys.

H.

PROFESSOR CLARK'S LECTURES ON REASON AND FAITH.

IV.—CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

THE preacher said that while there was a general agreement as to the advantages of modern civilization, there was great diversity of opinion as to its origin and the manner of its development. According to one school it had a merely natural origin, and was the result of the regular development of the race. According to another it had a supernatural origin, springing out of the revelation of God in CHRIST JESUS; while an intermediate school held that although religion had once promoted civilization, it was no longer needed. When he had shown, as he proposed to do, that the origin of the highest and noblest ideas in human civilization was in the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, they would then be able to judge how far it was now independent of that from which it had its beginning.

First, he would consider human civilization as it was before CHRIST. Broadly the whole was vitiated by the principle of selfishness. And this principle was but partially corrected by the association given in communities, for the privileges of humanity were not extended beyond those who were citizens. All outside the favoured country were barbarians, who were supposed to have no rights. And it was the same with the weaker classes within the State. This he illustrated by the case of (1) women, who were not indeed slaves in Greece or Rome, but little better. A daughter passed from her father to her husband as an article of property, and a wife might be left by her husband to another man (2) Workingmen. These were regarded by the ancient philosophers as incapable of virtue, and were neglected in old age, and left, it might be, to perish from want. (3) Slaves. These were mere property, and might be sold or maimed or killed; and although many masters might be humane, the servile class were liable to these sufferings.

All this was changed not by philosophers or law-givers, or by the gradual development of civilization, but by the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, which proclaimed a kingdom of God into which all might enter, the common brotherhood of humanity and the supremacy of love—and which not only proclaimed these new principles, but brought with it a new power for their realization. This he illustrated by reference to the change effected in the condition (1) of women, (2) of the working classes, (3) of the poor, (4) of the slave. Women were now admitted to the same privileges as men, and the effect was soon witnessed, when a heathen was forced to exclaim, "What wives these Christians have!" The very fact that the Author of the Gospel was a carpenter, His first followers fishermen, and His greatest apostle a tentmaker, necessitated an entire change of view with regard to workmen and such. The poor were not only introduced into Church communion, but were cared for by those who were endowed with sufficient means. Julian the Apostate lamented that the worshippers of the old gods left their poor to be provided for by the Christians. With regard to slavery, it was true that Christianity had not for-

mally abolished it—a course perhaps impossible and certainly dangerous—it had done better: it had taught the principles which undermined the institution. He referred further to the counsels given to masters in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and St. Paul's letter to Philemon respecting his runaway slave Onesimus. There were many who would concede a great deal of this, who would, however, suggest that Christianity had done its work and was no more needed. These ideas were now the common property of humanity, and could not again be lost. This was a dangerous experiment. Wherever the love of CHRIST was forgotten, selfishness revived, and the working classes would be very much misguided if they were induced to believe that the brotherhood of humanity could be retained, when GOD the FATHER, and the great ELDER BROTHER who revealed Him, were forgotten. All that endangered the Gospel endangered the brotherhood of man, and therefore, if we love our fellow-men, we should do what we could to preserve the memory and the Word and the grace of CHRIST.

THE PRIMITIVE EPISCOPATE.

1. The question of the existence of an Episcopate from the very foundation of the Christian Church has been much complicated by the modesty of the Bishops of the first ages. Instead of calling themselves Apostles, they called themselves "Successors of the Apostles," fearing that by the assumption of the former name they might seem to arrogate to themselves an equality with the disciples of the Lord, and the twelve (lesser) foundations of the Church (Rev. xxi. 14). Casting about for a name, they assumed to themselves one which accurately described their office, but which had hitherto been applied to the second order of ministers in the Church. The function of oversight was common to them and to the Presbyters, the only difference being that their duty was to oversee the whole Church; while the Presbyter's duty was confined to the oversight of particular congregations. The fact that the names of Bishop and Presbyter were both applied in Scripture to the second order is clear from a comparison of Acts xx. 17, with xx. 28; and Titus i. 5, with i. 7, though the reference is somewhat obscured in our version by the translation "overseers" in Acts xx. 28. Hence has arisen all the confusion in modern, and even in ancient times. We find St. Jerome, when wishing to depreciate the Episcopal order, arguing vehemently for the original equality of Bishop and Presbyter. And the fallacy has been repeated to an indefinite extent now that non-Episcopal bodies exist, and are anxious to find a defence for their position in primitive Church history. It is untrue that the office of oversight of the whole Church was ever common to the second and third order of the Church. The office of oversight, it is true, was common to those two orders then, and is common to them now. What was never common to them was the sphere of its exercise.

2. The fact, that whatever their names may have been, the orders existed in the Apostolic Church cannot be disputed. The existence of presbyters and deacons must be admitted. The third order consisted then of the Apostles themselves, who indisputably exercised jurisdiction over clergy as well as laity. (See Acts xx. 17-35; 1 Peter v. 1, 2; also Phil. i. 1; where what we should now call the Bishop addresses the Church at Philippi, under the clergy). The question is, whether this state of things existed continuously, or whether it ceased with the death of the Apostles, and was revived almost immediately afterwards. There can be no question that a very short interval elapsed between St. John's death and the institution of an Episcopate. St. John is supposed to have died in A. D. 97. Ignatius was martyred in 107 or 117, it is not quite certain which. Every reconstruction of his letters—even that mutilated one which has recently been discovered in the Syriac, which only contains three out of the seven letters he is known to have written—testifies most clearly to the existence at the date of his martyrdom, of the three orders in the Christian Church, known by the same names as those by which they are now known. The question is, whether ten or even twenty years would be

sufficient for "development," in so definite and unmistakable a form, of the Episcopate as we find it existing at the time of the death of Ignatius. And it would have displayed little of that remarkable practical wisdom possessed in so eminent a degree by the Apostles, if they had left to chance the form that ecclesiastical institutions would take in so important a particular, and would have been inconsistent with the fact that the Apostles had received directions from Christ Himself concerning the foundation of the Church (Acts i. 3). Moreover, we are not left without indications of the fact that the Apostles did institute Episcopacy. Eusebius, one of the most painstaking and accurate of historians, whose credit has been most unfairly assailed on grounds of pure theological prejudice, without the slightest support from facts, states explicitly that certain persons were appointed by the Apostles to the Episcopate in various churches; and we must remember that Eusebius had access to many sources of information now lost to us. Irenaeus, who was personally acquainted with Polycarp, states that Polycarp was placed over the Church at Smyrna by the Apostles. And not only this, but we have Scriptural evidence, which, to say the least, points strongly in this direction. Some have supposed that Timothy and Titus were only temporary deputies of the Apostles. It may be so, but there is no proof that it was so. And in the face of the evidence which I have already mentioned for the Apostolic origin of the Episcopate, it is certainly remarkable that just precisely those powers of ordination and general oversight are ascribed by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus which have been exercised by the Bishops of the Christian Church from A. D. 107 (or 117) until this very day.

3. One thing may have added to the confusion. We are all apt to import into our views of the past the ideas of the present. Our notion of a Bishop is of an officer exercising his office over a defined portion of territory. This is no necessary part of the office of a Bishop, any more than of that of a priest. It is simply a regulation of mere convenience. It can hardly be supposed possible that the Primitive Church could have elaborated an extensive scheme of territorial jurisdiction when she had to struggle for her very existence. There can be little doubt that the government of the Church was at first Collegiate. The whole Episcopate governed the whole Church. Each particular Bishop resided in a particular city, and exercised special jurisdiction in that city. But the limits of his jurisdiction outside the bounds of that city were not clearly defined until later. This accounts for St. Clement's letter to Corinth, even before the death of St. John. This is the meaning of St. Cyprian's famous declaration (I quote from memory), "*Episcopatus unus est, Cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*" And this is the reason why, when any particular diocese has fallen into disorder, it is the prerogative of the rest of the Episcopate to step in and remedy those disorders.

J. J. LILIAS.
—Church Bells

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

MONTREAL.

MONTREAL.—The Cathedral.—The consecration of Dean Baldwin as Bishop of Huron, is appointed to take place here on St. Andrew's Day. A successor to the Dean has not yet been appointed. It is not improbable that the new rector will be some person from England.

HULL.—Rev. Frank Smith has been elected rector of the parish in the room of the greatly lamented Canon Johnston, recently deceased. Mr. Smith has entered upon his duties.

BENEFACTIONS.—An anonymous benefactor has given to the endowment of Dunham parish \$1,000, a little sum to Stanbridge parish, and a little sum to the Dunham Ladies College, also \$850 to the endowment of the Mission of Glen Sutton.

S. S. LEAFLET.—A very excellent Sunday School Leaflet, (endorsed by the Living Church), is issued by Messrs. C. H. Roper & Co., 27 Ross St., New York. It is sold at 9c. per copy per annum, and gives great satisfaction, not so much on account of its cheapness as because of the simple excellence of its teaching.

DIOCESAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.—A meeting of the governors was held on 18th inst. at which Messrs. Summer and Drummond were elected to the council of the college. The Archdeacon of Bedford, on 14th inst. addressed the students and dwelt amongst other