

will he also say that the average Church sermon is similarly "permeated" by the ordinary pulpit so "dominated"? He will not say that. The Prayer-Book cries aloud for conversion; the preacher feebly responds, ignores, or hushes the voice. Let me draw a contrast here. The "idea" of the Church and her claims "permeates" the services not less than does that of conversion. Here, then, are two great themes given full and equal prominence in the Prayer-Book: will "A Layman" or any man aver that they get equal prominence in the pulpit? I appeal to Church-goers generally. How comes it to pass that the one subject receives vigorous reiterated enforcement in sermons, whilst the other is ignored, neglected, or shunned? If, as your correspondent seems to contend, the printed presence of a theme in the Liturgy is sufficient in the one case, why not in the other? He proves either nothing or too much. His logic would silence the pulpit on the Church, her mission, and her claims; for are these not fully set forth in the Prayer-Book? Now, is any faithful clergyman, in these Babel days, content to let the Prayer-Book exhaust the Church question? No. He knows this would never do. He digs up the "idea" from its place on the printed page or in the Churchman's semi-slumbrous consciousness; takes it to the pulpit, and there breathes into it the breath of life. And this thousands of our clergy rightly do who fail to treat conversion in the same way. Why? There can be but one answer: they realize the importance of the one subject, but not of the other,—thus departing from the Prayer Book. Here is disproportion, the great source of practical doctrinal error. If repeated, persistent, fervid inculcation is necessary in the one case—and it is—then why not in the other? The Church Militant is a grand theme, and of world-wide and time-long importance; but his own endless lot is, to the individual, the one question of questions. The fact is that the Church must be preached, and conversion must be preached, though in Bible and Prayer-Book imbedded both. Conversion asleep in the services is not enough. The living hand must set it on its feet; the living voice cry "Turn ye! why will ye die?" It must ring perpetually in the preacher's tones—from lips pouring forth fiery streams of conviction on frozen consciences as from wells of flame! Nothing less will do. On "A Layman's" own showing, consistency demands that conversion must be thus preached, or preaching "the Church" be stopped. Can he face the alternative? When this change comes over the pulpit, the phrase "Church losses" will be heard no more. Thus falls the mainstay of "A Layman's" argument. But there are worse things in his letter than misconception and fragile logic. It may be "smart" to paint conviction of sin and its sudden renunciation with the attendant spiritual disturbances, as a "psychological convulsive fit"; but it is not too reverent. Had Saul of Tarsus, the crucified robber, the thousands whom Peter's words "cut to the heart," and the tens of thousands since in whose consciences have quivered the arrows of the Almighty—had all these "convulsions"? Even a layman is not free to speak flippantly of that most solemn thing known among men—the Good Spirit snatching an immortal from the grasp of the Evil One. Spurious conversions, how numerous soever, no more than counterfeit money, discredit the genuine coin. I, too, "speak experimentally" when I say that genuine sudden conversions are visible everywhere. "A Layman's" sweeping verdict on "those who have been converted in the Methodist sense," is not fully justified by the evidence. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." It is not for man to set bounds to the Spirit's operations. There are zephyrs, orderly trade winds, and hurricanes. He works in and through the Church; but who dares tie Him to that, in its failures? When its life beats low, as in the days of Wesley, offshoots arise as around an unvigorous fruit-tree, with the sap of God's Spirit flowing in them as it could not flow in the parent stem. Thus became England the very hot bed of Sectism. But I am not on apologist for these "offshoots." I am using "A Layman's" help in urging—not wild, or eccentric, or peripatetic, or perambulatory, or even Methodist, methods of conversion, of which he says I am so fond, and to which I would "drag down Church people"; but—that style of conversion which he confesses the Prayer-book demands. To this I would fain "drag Church people" up. Should I "take to the road" I shall be in the grandest of company. And now I would ask "A Layman" this question: If the Prayer-Book supersedes the necessity of preaching on the subject of conversion, why not also on that of "the Church" and her Sacraments?

JOHN MAY.

Farrar's "Life of Christ."

SIR,—A good deal has been written in your paper just now against Farrar's books. It is well to remember that there are judges whose orthodoxy and scholarship are unquestionable who deliberately recommend Farrar's "Life of Christ," which has

been especially attacked by your correspondents. For example, Bishop Wynne, the present Bishop of Killaloe and Clonfert, Ireland, who has written and lectured much on Pastoral Theology, and was professor of that department in the University of Dublin, says in "Our Sacred Commission," (p. 82): "Good histories of the life of Christ—such as Farrar's or Geikie's, or more especially Dr. Edersheim's—tend to the same result. The result we aim at is such a mental grasp of the facts of our Lord's earthly history, such a clear picture in our own minds of what manner of person He was, and what kind of circumstances He was placed in, that we naturally, and, as it were without effort, lead our people to look at the incidents of His life with attentive interest, etc." This opinion from one who had seriously undertaken to instruct candidates for the ministry in pastoral work, is a sufficient answer to the microscopic criticism which some of your correspondents indulge in.

Cuddesdon.

SIR,—As your correspondent "Rector" under this heading has referred to a public utterance of mine, may I be allowed to make a few remarks on those portions of his letters which relate to the University of Trinity College? I am sure that the writer is not actuated by any unfriendly feelings toward Trinity, and with all that he says as to the importance of the study of theology, I am in cordial agreement. But in one respect—viz., in regard to the extent and thoroughness of our Divinity course his information seems to be incomplete. No one knows better than I do, from personal experience, the enormous value to a university man of a year or so just before ordination at a theological college. Cuddesdon, Ely, the Leeds Clergy School, and, I think, Wells, were established in order to give to Oxford and Cambridge men, who were candidates for Holy Orders, just that which it is impossible for the university to give them, i.e., special devotional and theological, and, in the case of Leeds, pastoral training, in order, in fact, to prevent them being "pitchforked," without any previous practice, into a life of which prayer and meditation and frequent communion ought to form so large a part. If Canadian conditions allowed it, an Arts course here, followed by a time of special preparation in a theological college for the ordained life, might conceivably be the best training for the ministry. But, speaking generally, Canadian conditions do not allow it. Trinity, therefore, provides the next best thing. She first provides as much as possible of those not so easily definable, but very real, advantages which are to be had in their fulness only, I suppose, at the ancient English universities. This she does by requiring all her students, with few exceptions, to reside within the walls of the college, and all without any exception to take at least one year in Arts. Then she allows those who intend to devote themselves to the ministry to enter at the opening of their second year, the Divinity class, where they begin the systematic study of theology, though they are encouraged to proceed with the whole three years' course in Arts and take the B.A. degree before entering the Divinity class. We have thus in the Divinity class graduates who remain in it two years or three at their option, and non-graduates who are obliged to remain in it at least three years. Now, sir, if "Rector" will kindly send me his name, or still better, if he will do me the honour to call on me, I will prove to him that the two or three years' course in our Divinity class is much more thorough and extensive than the courses, extending usually over one year only, in the English theological colleges for graduates. I compare our course only with those because your correspondent says "we want a Cuddesdon," not a college like Gloucester or Chichester, or the now defunct St. Bees, for non-graduates. The real value of the theological colleges in England does not lie chiefly in the theology taught and learnt, but in the strong personal influence which the teachers are able to exercise, and the invaluable training in the devotional life which they are able to give. At Trinity, the two professors and the lecturer in theology try to supply all three elements by giving a fairly complete introduction to the study of theology, and by providing special devotional instructions and exercises. Your correspondent will forgive me for saying that he pays a doubtful compliment to the first Provost when he says that under him the very purpose for which this college and university were founded was held in abeyance. That purpose, as expressed by the royal charter granted in 1852, is the education of youth in the doctrines and duties of the Christian religion as inculcated by the Church of England, and their instruction in the various branches of science and literature which are taught in the universities of Great Britain. That purpose it is the desire and intention, as your correspondent rightly conjectures, of the council and the teaching staff to fulfil to the best of their ability, while never losing sight of the most important function the college has to perform in the training of candidates for

the ministry. In the University of Trinity College the Churchmen of Ontario have a very precious inheritance, the value of which they are at length beginning to realize. During the last two years there have been more students in residence than at any previous period of the history of the university; this remark applies equally to Trinity College and St. Hilda's; the Divinity class has never been larger than during the year just ended, and it is a most encouraging fact to note that more than half its members have already obtained the B.A., in two cases the M.A. degree; and that nearly all the rest intend to complete their Arts course. I should like, in bringing this too lengthy letter to an end, to make a suggestion to your correspondent. He may, if he will, take a share in the government of the university, as indeed any one in Ontario may, by becoming a member or an associate member of the Convocation, with a vote for a member or members of the council; nay more, as he is a member of the Church of England, he is himself eligible for a seat in the council, where he might suggest not, indirectly but directly, any improvements in the constitution and government of the university which occur to him.

EDWARD A. WELCH,

Provost of Trinity College.

16th May, 1896.

Who Gave the Authority?

SIR,—It is, I think, permissible to ask who gave the committee which interviewed the Minister of Education authority to suggest, as one member did, that Bible study and examination therein should be conducted in the public schools by the teachers. Certainly no such authority was given by the synod of which I am a member, and I most strongly protest against any such scheme. Also, I should like to know why three members of the committee, the Revs. C. Ingalls and J. C. Roper, and Barlow Cumberland, Esq., received no intimation of the meeting of the committee. Is this a little private scheme of Mr. Blake's? If so, Churchmen should take prompt steps to repudiate his action. It is bad enough to have no proper opportunity for religious instruction in the schools. It would be infinitely worse to have our children instructed and examined in the Bible by teachers who are not of our own faith, and may be higher critics, agnostics or atheists, for any regulations to the contrary.

ROBT. W. RAYSON.

Be Courteous.

SIR,—I rarely scribble for newspapers; but am constrained to break my rule to correct a false impression contained in a statement in a letter of "Rector" in your issue of the 14th inst. He alludes to the Commission now sitting at Rome to inquire into the validity of Anglican orders, and in his entire ignorance of the facts, rushes to the conclusion that it is part of a joint conspiracy with the Presbyterians "that the Church may be no more in remembrance in the earth." Really, sir, "Rector" incurs grave danger if he thus waxes hot so early in the season! As a matter of fact, the Commission appointed by the Pope, on its face, bears the marks of being the outcome of a Christ like desire to arrive at the truth. In spite of the efforts of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the admirable paper prepared at the request of the Pope by the Abbe Duchesne was not put on the index. On the contrary the Pope gave him a gold medal for it, and appointed him a member of the Commission now sitting. The fight is between the French and Belgian clergy—who so far seem to have the sympathy of Leo—and the Italian mission in England, backed by the Irish. The attitude of both the latter is logical—the one defending the *raison d'être* of its own existence, and the latter acting according to the dictates of racial hatred. I break no confidence in stating that what I am about to add was communicated to me second-hand from one of the clergy of the Church of England mentioned below. Not only has the Abbe Duchesne completely riddled Cardinal Vaughan's argument; but the same has been done by a learned Jesuit, also a member of the Commission, and a friend of the Pope. Two priests of the Church of England, acknowledged to be the two ablest living authorities on this subject, have been invited to Rome, and have had frequent audiences, meeting with marked courtesy. When I add that one of them is Father Puller, S.S.J.E. (commonly called the Cowley Fathers), your readers who have read his works will see that the Pope has not feared to call for the best that can be said on our side. That such a Commission has been created, is a practical proof of the intensity of the desire of the aged Pontiff for the reunion of Christendom. Granted—for the sake of very excitable brethren like "Rector"—that the Pope means unconditional surrender as the only way of attaining this end, we on our part are equally determined there shall be "no surrender." Surely, however, every step taken to uncover the truth, or to show points of agreement, is not only a