

having given to the Son all authority and power in heaven and earth, sent Him with authority to send others. He did send others with the same powers of transmission as the Father had sent Him with. John xix, 21. Consequently they sent others as need required, He promising to be with them to the end of the world.

Thus did He as God organize His Church. "I build my Church" upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. Such a building must be organized. "I organize my Church." And it was intended to "bar all human intervention in matters ecclesiastical," that is so far at least as the founding of such Ecclesia is concerned, and the faith of St. Jude doubtless is the system "once for all delivered." And whoever attempts to alter the polity then established by Christ, to suit the exigencies of the time, and teach men so, "will," I fear, "be called least in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v. 19. Nor would I care to be in his shoes. Are Christ's words, "I build my Church," without meaning? What if He does it by Apostles, guided infallibly by His Spirit, so that they all everywhere teach and practice the same thing! In this ordering, surely there is a command, a law, as also are Baptism and Holy Communion ordinances, "laws?" the latter, if not a "fast," is a feast. Christ's acts before His resurrection were those of a son under obedience. Heb. v. 7-10. Those after, were acts as God, and these "laws and institutions," orders, etc., were given after His resurrection, and woe will be to those who teach men to interfere with them or any of them. With regard to the quotation from Dr. Hort, "the true way," etc., I would ask, which was first, the Ecclesia in any locality, or the seed, i.e., the Apostle, the one sent to plant, and which did form the Ecclesia by admission thereinto through Holy Baptism, either by himself or by deputy, be that deputy Bishop, presbyter, or deacon? Again, "no trace in New Testament that any ordinance," etc. What in the name of common sense is the meaning of the many warnings against schism, if there is no organization "permanently binding," something not to be tampered with, nor to leave? The Epistle to the Philippians, to me at least, utterly refutes Dr. Hort. "Of offices higher than elders we find nothing." Professor Sanday's words, "The Church has passed through a congregational stage, it has passed through a presbyterian stage" I deny it, i.e., in the ordinary acceptance of those ideas to-day. A congregation never set over itself its chief officer, nor was any Church or portion of it, either formed, or without the control and oversight of an Apostle, or Apostolic man, that is, one invested by the Apostles, as the Apostles were invested by Christ with authority. "That which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the Churches." If the ideas of the polity of the Church of Christ, as are in these writings implied, should become general in English theology, substituting change for certainty, as change demands, the English Church will then be doomed, in my opinion. Men outside the Church are seeking for something more stable than their ever-shifting schemes. And that stability is Christ and the Church. But because it is the way of some in public positions to write and say such things as these, to please a changeable age, it is not necessary that all should swallow it, or blindly follow. The principles for our guidance are few, and true, and as needful for man now in the 19th as in the 1st century. Nothing new can take their place either, let the exigency be what it may. And such teaching, conceding the very citadel, viz., Divine authority, will never win the various divisions to unity, either. The fracture was caused by putting off of episcopal, i.e., Apostolic authority, and the uniting again can only take place by the acceptance of the same. There are many agencies to-day at work which prevent that acceptance.

FREDERICK J. H. AXFORD.

UNTRUE ON THE FACE OF IT.

Sir,—A well-known Roman Catholic layman, residing in Toronto, has, on the authority of an equally well-known Romish priest, made the statement publicly that since the publication of the Pope's letter, in which his Holiness denies the validity of

Anglican orders, 15,000 clergy and laymen of the Anglican body have seceded to Rome. What proportions the clergy bore to the laity the gentleman did not say. Both of the narrators of this story are men of unimpeachable integrity, and themselves believe what they have stated. I do not, nor will the public, without strong proof.

5 Aberdeen Chambers.

E.E.C.

WORKMAN'S REPLY TO REV. H. SYMONDS.

Dear Churchman, I suggested as a sidelight on that Synod sermon, the general attitude of sectarianism towards the Church. As an introduction, let me write a few sentences on schism in general. In doing this I shall make use of the writings of others. One author's works I have before me. He writes regarding the temper and proceedings of the separatists of his day. I give the substance: "It was nothing else but spiritual pride which made them disdain to submit to the discipline of the Church. From thence this spiritual pride brought them to despise and turn their backs upon the Church's established worship. The sober, grave, and primitive plainness of the services began to be loathed by such brainsick, fanciful opinionists. They should please themselves in nothing but novelty and the ostentation of their own extempore, senseless effusions. These effusions were fit to proceed from none but such as have the gift of talking in their sleep, or dreaming while they are awake. They first ran out into classes, Presbyterian, from thence into independent congregations. From Independents they improved into Anabaptists, and from Anabaptists into Quakers." There the writer had to cease, but the end was not yet. To-day we may say the end is not by-and-bye, and we may well ask when shall the end of these things be. New sects are shaping themselves into bodies which they regard as Churches every day. Now, coming back from by-gone days to the recent, we can arrive at no conclusion other than this—the general attitude of the sects towards the Church is hostile, decidedly if secretly, hostile. Let me give a few amusing instances. I have these upon indisputable testimony: About half a century since a protracted meeting or a revival meeting was being held in a part of Ontario. Matters were beginning to boom. A local preacher was brought from a distance of fifteen or twenty miles. The man was a shoe-maker. He was mighty in the throat and lungs. He invited all to go forward and get religion. After a sneer at Presbyterians about election or predestination, one of their doctrines then, and at the Baptists regarding immersion, the fellow proceeded to say: "If any belong to the Church of England they will be able to throw away their armsful of prayers, as they will be able to pray without a book, and to walk without crutches." More recently still, a graduate of Trinity College, having a more intimate acquaintance with books than men, was sent to one of the missions in Ontario. Before long he met one of the dissenting ministers of the place, who blandly, and without being asked, said that he would be glad to assist the new-comer with his work. In a short time after a new family came to the village. The preacher was soon at the house. The man told him that he was a member of the Church, the preacher replied, "There are only a few of them here; you had better join us. They are very weak." Such the help the Church receives from the sects—efforts to pervert her members.

Further still, not very long ago, in a Canadian city, at a meeting of a Ministerial Association, a fresh member spoke of vestments, such as clergy ordinarily wear, as night garments. Sprightly, wasn't it? Now, a bit of testimony from a book, Bonar's "Light and Truth." I transcribe Bonar's words: "All rites and ceremonies, whether old or new, are man's ways of getting rid of Christ. They get rid of real religion by means of that which looks like religion, but which is not religion at all. What can all these things do? Can they save? Can pictures save? Can dresses?... Can music save? Can architecture save? Can cathedrals save?

Now, can they even point the way to Jesus? Do they not lead away from Him? Do they not make void the cross, and trample on the blood." That is a sectarian contribution to the Synod preacher's "rich stream of English literature." Stars above us always in order, what tangles are possible in the minds of good men! That is a fair sample of a good deal of sectarian oratory, and it is not inviting. It is unfair, unmanly, un-Christian, horrible.

WORKMAN.

REV. H. SYMONDS' REPLIES TO HIS CRITICS.

Sir, In answering the numerous letters which have appeared in The Canadian Churchman since I wrote last, it is obviously impossible for me to follow my critics into the various bypaths of the main question at issue, into which they make sundry excursions. The question under discussion may be thus stated: "Is there any evidence in the New Testament that our Lord defined the orders of the ministry?" Does not such testimony as there is lead rather to the conviction that forms of government, like forms of worship, have shaped themselves out of the free life of the Church? Therefore (to give one example) I cannot consider the frequent quotation of the Preface to the Ordinal at all to the point. Neither the authorities I have quoted, nor I myself have ever denied that from the time of the Apostles there have been Bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of God. Still less can I touch upon the personalities of Mr. Workman, who will, I think, feel rather ashamed of his letter when he has recovered from his alternate "faint and furious" spells. Neither can I quibble about words. One thinks "repudiate" is too strong a word in which to describe St. Paul's attitude towards any claim of dependence upon the twelve Apostles. St. Paul's own language is: "Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me," and he further tells us that on one occasion he withstood Peter to the face because he was to be blamed. Another critic, when the word "business" is employed of the work of Christ, cries: "What an expression!" Yet our Lord once said, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business." "Old-Time Reader" does not think that Acts vi. contains the account of the institution of the diaconate. Although the great mass of authority is against him, yet there are some—the Lutheran Mosheim, for example—who take his view of the matter. But this does not help his argument, but mine, if he will carefully consider what mine is. The same writer says: "So that wherever a Christian community existed there were found the bishop, priests and deacons." But Lightfoot has shown (and may I ask "Missionary" to note that his testimony here, as everywhere, is drawn from Scripture and ancient authors), that "we are driven to the conclusion that episcopacy did not exist at all among the Philippians," when Polycarp wrote his letter to that Church, long years after the death of St. Paul. Corinth had no Bishop at the end of the first century, whilst of Rome he says: "The attempt to decipher the early history of episcopacy here seems almost hopeless." When "Old-Time Reader" tells us that our Saviour's commands on questions of worship and government were not committed to writing, I must beg to remind him that it is the doctrine of the Church of England that what is not committed to writing in the Holy Scriptures, nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith. More than one of my critics seem to be labouring under the strange delusion that their case can be strengthened by diminishing the authority of the New Testament.

It is very surprising to me to find that such an excellent Churchman as "Hoosier" is, should think there is no practical difference between saying that "these things shaped themselves" and "these things shaped themselves out of the free life of the Church." But I am sure there are very few of your readers who will agree with him on this head, and so I may pass on to a more important point. The same writer says very truly, "Now, God the Holy Spirit is the very life of the Body of Christ,"