

after passage might be culled from his writings in proof of this. But there is evidence enough in his attitude when, as an original member of the London School Board, he advocated impassionately the retention of the Bible, that book which, to quote his own words, 'forbids the veriest hind who never left his village to be ignorant of the existence of other countries and other civilizations, and of a great past stretching back to the furthest limit of the older nations of the world. By the study of what other book,' he asks, 'woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history, could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between the eternities.'" This testimony, coming from such an one as Prof. Huxley, to the worth of the Church's Scriptures, is very striking, and Churchmen who cannot approve of his philosophy will, at any rate, welcome his good word in their contention for religious instruction.

#### THE QUESTION OF PATRONAGE.

COMMUNICATED—No. 1.

The debate on the Canon of Patronage, in the Niagara Synod, calls for more than a passing notice. Apart from the question at issue, upon one aspect of which we purpose to dwell at length, the character of the debate itself was most significant and full of hope. It was not a controversy between laity and clergy. It was emphatically the laymen's debate of the synod—led on the one hand by that masterful leader of men, Judge Senkler, and on the other by Kirwan Martin, who won generous and well deserved praise from the Judge for his exceedingly able conduct of the debate. The large majority of the laymen who took part in the debate—no vote was reached—were enthusiastically with Mr. Martin in his defence of the old Canon as it stands in the Niagara constitution. As things are in Canada, these laymen, in their culture and social position, recalled the patriot band of Churchmen of whom Selborne, and Hope, and Gladstone—before the strange loves of the House of Commons turned away his heart—were the brilliant and heroic leaders. Judge Senkler's motion, which was the question at issue, took the initial authority in the appointment of a clergyman to the cure of souls, in any parish not on the mission fund, from the Bishop, and gave it to the vestry of the vacant parish. It provided that, while the Bishop might reject any particular nominee, he must license some nominee sent up to him by the vestry, unless indeed the vestry, after receiving notice of the rejection of the last nominee, should allow three months to elapse without making a further nomination. This does not limit the power of the vestry in any way, but is an uncanny provision by which it may, if it so desire, leave the appointment with the Bishop. No direct way of doing this is provided in the Judge's motion. The ultimate responsibility of providing for the cure of souls in the vacant parish resting with the Bishop and not with the vestry, and his conscience being personal and the vestry's corporate, such a power of rejection as is given the Bishop must be more a snare to him than any freedom of action in the administration of his office—its use ever threatening him with a conflict most unequal, painful and disastrous. The motion's machinery of administration is no embodiment of either the principles or the fellowship of the Church of Christ. The motion was opposed on

two grounds, as being practically unworkable and dangerous in the extreme to the peace and well-being of the vacant parishes, and as being also utterly opposed to the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church, and especially of our national Church of England. It was assumed by Judge Senkler and his supporters that the only principle involved was one of opportunism, and they contended that as the vestries by their perennially renewed gifts, variable though they might be, provided a running endowment for the parishes, they should in the present state of the Diocese be the patrons. We ourselves are well assured that a Divine principle is involved in the administration of patronage; that the power of appointment to the cure of souls, as given of God in His Church, is inherent in the Episcopate. While this is a matter of greatest importance, it has never been threshed out for us under the flail of controversy—has never been made lucid and clear, as many another question has been in our day; the facts that have to do with it have not been marshalled, combined, analyzed, and co-ordinated so as to reveal in the clear light the Divine ideal and purpose underlying patronage, as they have been in reference to other questions which have agitated the Church. On the contrary, the whole question of patronage is still far too much in the clouds of misleading confusion and ambiguity of statement and thought. We cannot then be wrong in attempting to point out its true principle as seen in the history of the Church, National and Catholic. Patronage at the first was governed not by express enactment, but by apostolic practice. This is in keeping with the genesis of the Church. In the new creation, as well as in the old, Christ was not a legislator, but a Life-Giver. We learn what are the laws of nature by the study of Natural History, and the same holds true of the Church. By the careful study of her history we learn the laws of her life as to Infant Baptism, the observance of the First Day of the Week, the Law of the Holy Eucharist, and so also of the Law of Patronage, and of many another. Coming then to the study of the Church's history, with our special intention, we find the Episcopate in her organic life like the sun in our planetary system; the historic continuation, in its permanent elements of the Apostolate to safeguard and maintain the faith, to be the bond of unity and to have the exclusive power of ordination, to be the organ by which the Church is to perpetuate and send forth her ministry of the Sacraments and the Word. We find also the accepted principle that the office of formal preaching belonged by Divine grace to Bishops only, and so to those to whom Bishops delegated the office. St. Augustine was the first African presbyter who preached *coram Episcopo*, but this *accepta ob Episcopis potestate*. The same was true of discipline, and the offerings and income of the Church were in the first instance under the disposition of the Bishop. This certainly makes a very strong presumption that we shall find patronage belongs to the Episcopate. The *onus probandi* must rest with those who deny this. Such passages in the Old Testament as Numbers xx. 25-26 strengthen this presumption—give a *traditio Divino* in its favour. As to Apostolic practice the original Greek makes it clear that no nomination, much less election, by either clergy or laity, took place in the ordinations of Matthias and the seven Deacons recorded in the first and sixth chapters of the Acts. There were certain Greek words in common and universal use to denote civil elections, nomina-

tions and appointments, and they passed into ecclesiastical use, and St. Luke employs them whenever the facts he records requires it. In whatever he writes he is careful to use the exact and appropriate textual word or phrase. But he uses not one of these words for election, nomination or appointment in his statement of the part the laity took in the choice and ordination of either Matthias or the Deacons, and the evidence is strengthened when we come to the record of what the Apostles did. The Greek word translated *appoint* in the third verse of the sixth chapter, is one of the most common of the Greek words used for appointment to office. This use of words by St. Luke is of the greatest importance, and makes it clear that the people simply gave evidence as to character. The history is exceedingly compressed—if the people placed before the Apostles more than seven for whose character they vouched, it is conceivable St. Luke would mention only the seven ordained. Again, in Acts xiv., St. Luke uses one of the Greek words for ordination and choice, when he tells us of St. Paul and St. Barnabas ordaining the Pisidian presbyters, and no mention is made here of the people giving even their *testimonium vita*; and the same is true of 1 Tim. i. 3-18, and Titus i. 5, unless so far as the presbytery joined in the act, and here again the proper Greek words for ordination and choice are used; so are they also in Heb. v. 1, and viii. 3, and St. Matthew xxiv. 45, and Acts xxvi. 2 and 3. Here St. Paul chose and the people gave their testimony.

#### A VOCATION.

BY REV. A. CARSWELL.

When I was a student at Toronto, I was one day on my way to college commencement, and in the same seat with myself was a quiet gentleman with whom I got into conversation. After the manner of youth, I told him something of myself, and mentioned that I purposed studying divinity. I can recall his searching glance when he asked me, "Have you a vocation?" Perhaps I hardly grasped the full meaning of his question then, but it has often since come to me as a very serious one, and one which in these days, especially, needs to be asked. What is a vocation? Is it the consciousness of the possession of suitable talents, and the desire of using them? Many seem to think it is. I fancy I may have had this idea myself at one time. But is this the true conception of a vocation to God's service? Do not many men possess sufficient powers and realize a desire to use them in the ministerial calling, and yet prove altogether wanting in the true vocation? There occurs to me the case of a school-mate. I had fancied him rather thoughtless and even wild, and when he informed me of his intention to enter the Church, I was somewhat surprised, and asked what it was that determined him on that course. "Oh, well," he said, "you see I have a good voice, and a good appearance, and am clever at elocution, and I think I shall do very well." I believe he was ordained—I have lost trace of him since—but it was hard to feel quite satisfied of his vocation. A true vocation has some unmistakable marks. First there is a personal love of the Lord Jesus Christ. It ought to be needless to enlarge upon this point. Sometimes, however, men speak scoffingly of sentimentalism and cant. And doubtless there is cant in the world. But the love of Christ is not merely sentimental; it is too serious, too practical for that. It is all—inclusive of vocation; every other mark is included in this, or arises from it. There can