

Inadequacy of Stipends.

SIR,—This subject is receiving a good deal of attention through the medium of your paper, and, therefore, I feel inclined to add my quota to the number of letters that have been written on this subject and published in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN.

The first letter, written by a lady, is an evidence of the influence that woman can wield in the Church or in the world by the use of her pen or hands, if her heart is in the work. And she confines herself to her proper sphere. It is to be hoped that her effort in broaching the subject may have the desired effect, and that it will place the missionary clergy under a debt of gratitude to her, for presumably they are the chief if not the only sufferers, for city rectors are doubtless well enough provided for. I was very glad to see in to day's paper this subject of giving touched upon, for certainly a clergyman ought to be in a position to extend his charity to the deserving poor and needy. And not only that, but he should be able to scatter Church literature broadcast among his parishioners. But how can we do anything of the kind who live on a \$500 stipend, when it is as much as we can do to keep body and soul together without going hopelessly into debt. So far, although the subject has been discussed a good deal, yet no remedy of any great practical value has been suggested. It is but very little use for a doctor to examine a wound or broken bone unless he is prepared to apply a remedy or to set the broken bones. So it will be in reference to inadequate stipends. Unless some effective remedy is applied the patient must suffer on until the disease works its own cure. Several schemes towards the accomplishment of the end in view have been admitted to the Synod of the diocese of Toronto, but none of them have been treated with any degree of favor, consequently it seems a thankless task for any man to formulate a scheme to lay before the Synod when it is sure to be voted down by the very men in whose interests it has been devised.

Perhaps the plan that has occurred to the writer in your last issue, though not very practical, might be feasible, namely, that some rich layman assume the augmentation of one missionary's salary, and I think there are a sufficient number of rich laymen in this rich diocese to supplement the salaries of all the clergy receiving only \$500 or \$530 by \$100. And by their doing so it would remove in some measure the odium of starvation salaries from the diocese. I am utterly opposed to appropriations specifically myself, believing that all moneys for the work of the Church should go through their legitimate channels, yet I am not sure that I would object to being made a beneficiary in this case. There is another plan or two which I would suggest, being, in my opinion, of a more practical character, but I refrain at this time, hoping it will fall to better hands to do so.

JURIS.

Hatch on the Organization of the Early Christian Churches.

SIR,—There can be no possible doubt that the above book is beautifully written. It speaks for a certain school of thought in clear, beautiful sentences, rising sometimes to true eloquence. As it answers—fully answers—the needs of that school, it is a successful book. It begins like most books on controversial subjects,—by promising that the examination of the subject in hand shall be unbiassed.

The author in this instance promises to largely ensure the unbiassed nature of the enquiry, by dealing with the subject in hand "by the help of modern methods," i.e., "the application of historical science and the historical temper" to the proposed field of enquiry. The scientific treatment of the subject is outlined, and as an ordinary mortal reads (if not initiated into the secrets of the modern schools), he feels within himself—"now infallible certainty will be arrived at by an absolutely scientific treatment," and as he thinks of the unalterable, undeviating laws of nature—with which he has been connecting the word "science" so largely—"the outcome of this enquiry (he thinks) will be absolute perfect truth—nothing less or more." The word "science" has a charm for the mass of readers, even the vulgar charlatan—Mrs. Edy, when she would impose upon her fellows overawes them with the word—how many thousands receive the wonderful ramblings of the woman because she calls her system Christian science? Not that I would compare Dr. Hatch's book with the nonsense of Christian science. But it were better that a method were applied, and not dilated upon the careful reader will be able to appreciate its value. "The first step in historical science" we are told is "the testing of the documents which contain the evidence."

One would naturally fancy that the claim of being about to treat a subject by means of a scientific method, would at least imply an exercise of such care as to ensure uncommon accuracy, (to many ordinary readers it would imply a process ending in absolute accuracy). We find on page 100—in attempting to prove that ordination by presbyters is valid—

the following note as the evidence:—Novatus, the African presbyter, appointed Fellicissimus a deacon, and it is to be noted that Cyprian does not question the validity of the appointment although he strongly objects to its having been made without his knowledge. (St. Cyprian Ep. 52). Tillemont's view that Cyprian used "constituit" in the unusual sense of "procured the appointment"—there is nothing in the context to support. This may be the modern scientific method, but what are the facts? St. Cyprian goes on to say (in the context) that the same Novatus, when he left Africa and got to Rome, made Novatian a bishop, he uses the same word in both cases. Novatus made Fellicissimus a deacon in the same way in which he made Novatian a bishop—and how did he do that? We know from the contemporary letter of Cornelius the outraged Bishop of Rome (Enseb. H. E. vi. 43) "he (Novatian) compelled three bishops—boorish ignorant men—to give him the episcopate by a shadowy and vain imposition of hands." Novatus made Novatian a Bishop, and Fellicissimus a deacon, in the same sense by men who, however foolish and boorish, were yet bishops. Men are not necessarily ignorant of the art of reasoning, because they have not mastered the science of logic by Whately or Thompson.

One man may practise the science of logic all unconsciously, while another going to work scientifically to establish a position may utterly fail. Poor Tillemont had not been let into the secret of historical science, but then he read the context and saw the facts as they were. The above is only one sample of Dr. Hatch's treatment of his subject—many more such may be found examined in "The Church and the Ministry" by Gore. The study of history is an art and a science.

We must first practice the art of getting at the facts and their significance, then we may scientifically arrange and apply them. It seems very peculiar to see some people and organs extol Gladstone as the very ideal of a man of intellect and power, and yet at the same time to revile as nonsense the position he himself defends. Are all men who take another view to that of Hatch altogether lacking in scientific genius? Hatch's skillful introduction does not mean that all his conclusions are necessarily correct. The beauty, the grace, the persuasiveness of the book we delight to dwell upon. Written to prove any organization lawful, the book itself could never have been written by anyone outside the "order" of the clergy of the Church of England. It stands (with what we consider all its mistakes) one of the many monuments of the genius, and the creative power of the Church of England. It bears upon its face what the Romans call the impress of the priestly character (but of an English clergyman). Say what we may, it is in spirit (in spite of everything) priestly and clerical, it is an attempt to perpetuate the power and success in well doing of the clergy. The book could never have been written by a dissenter. Hatch could never divest himself of his priestly character.

W. B.

Questions to Sponsors.

SIR,—Having had occasion recently to baptize several children together, and to ask the usual questions in the service, I am induced to ask for some information upon these questions and the peculiar form in which they are put. "Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce," &c. If the question is put to the infant, why is the condition inserted, "in the name of this child?" If it is put to the sponsors, why is the singular adopted and not the plural, as there are supposed to be three sponsors? Is each sponsor to be addressed separately as promising "in the name of this child?" When two or more children are baptized with the same service, should the singular *thou* be still retained, or changed into the plural: but if so, to whom does the plural pronoun refer? Was it ever the custom to put the questions three times severally to the sponsors, or even twice in the simultaneous baptism of two? A clerical friend in the Old Country used to get over the difficulty, or perhaps misread the office, by asking, "Dost thou, and thou, and thou, renounce," &c., making a special reference to each sponsor. What is the interpretation or custom in Canada? One is unwilling to unnecessarily and perhaps ignorantly interfere with a word in any of the services, and yet any feeling of unreality is painful.

JAMES GAMMACH, LL.D.

March 31st, 1890.

The Union of Our Church.

SIR,—Allow me a short space to reply to the friendly criticism of "C. A. F." in your issue of 27th upon my letter on "The Union of Our Church" in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN of the 6th March. Far from being vexed, I have to thank him for this notice, as it is just what I desired when my letter was published. I only trust that others may do likewise, that this important subject may be fully discussed through our Church papers.

While I care but little what term is applied to our

General Synod, as my great desire is to see the Anglican Church united in B.N.A., as she must be if she is to hold her true position and contend against Rome on the one side and dissent on the other, I would take some exception to the term "National" as hardly applicable to the Church, constituted politically as we are in Canada, nor need this term be applied to suit the present position of Newfoundland, as there is little doubt but that that island will eventually form part of the Dominion, as some negotiations tending to this end have already been commenced. But should this union not be consummated, there need be no obstacle to a union of the Church, and some term could be found suitable, such, for instance, as "The Synod of the Anglican Church in B.N.A." But with union will come a proper title. I believe that I am correct in the statement that the Presbyterian and Methodist bodies have each their unions in the Dominion, including Newfoundland. The Lord Bishop of that diocese has already received an invitation to be present at the proposed conference on unity to be held at Winnipeg in September next.

Through the kindness of the Rev. Leo A. Hoyt, a member of the committee of the diocese of Fredericton, I have had the privilege of reading the able and comprehensive report to the Synod of that diocese, and I see nothing therein that does not put the question of the union of the Church upon a sound and catholic basis. My views entirely coincide with your correspondent's, that the diocese should be the unit for representation, but constituted as the Church is at present with Provincial Synods, and a probable increase of the same, it must become a question what the status of such will be in the future local and general government. But, whatever be their position, diocesan independence must be maintained. I have no fear on the formation of a National or Dominion Synod that Diocesan Synods could ever be interfered with, the larger and general questions of the whole B.N.A. Church being ample to occupy a General Synod without trenching upon the local interests of our Church.

If a good representation can only be secured from all our dioceses at the proposed conference at Winnipeg in September next, I have no fear but that some feasible scheme for the union of our Church will be submitted for the future consideration of the various Synods. I dare not trespass more on your space, but I would almost hope that I may have written something that may call for further criticism from C. A. F., and, if agreeable to him, I would like to have the privilege of corresponding with him on this great question.

W. J. IMLACH.

London, Ont., March 29, 1890.

More Required.

SIR,—A working party is anxious to send a parcel of clothing to Rev. J. G. Buck, at Peace River, but not having sufficient articles for a whole bale, would like to hear of any party who would be willing to let them join with them, each paying their own share of freight. If any of your readers purpose sending goods, will they kindly communicate with me, and I shall send address of the party referred to above.

LIZZIE A. DIXON,
29 Wilton Crescent.

Mediator.

SIR,—I intended not to say any more in this way upon the subject of "Mediation." Perhaps I may on another occasion, in a different form. But I cannot agree with Dr. Carry in thinking either that your answer to my criticism was "sufficient," or that the subject under consideration is in any sense "little."

On the contrary the magnitude of it is the thought that has filled my mind ever since my attention has been turned to it in your columns. And that magnitude has not become diminished by the discovery that so many, including men like Dr. Carry and yourself, are content to uphold the principle of "Mediation" as the distinctive principle of the work of the Christian Ministry. From my standpoint nothing but a very superficial or very erroneous view of the subject could ever lead me to think that the term "Mediator" (which is used in Scripture in a peculiarly technical sense) is capable of being applied legitimately to the Christian Ministry, as the terms bishop, pastor, minister, ambassador, watchman, steward, &c., may be, and are. I suppose Dr. Carry does not see wherein the fallacy of his argument lies, though I am slow to believe it of one who possesses such quickness of intelligence as he does. He assumes that the relationship existing between us and Christ as Mediator is similar to that existing between us and Christ as bishop, pastor, minister, &c.,—whereas the difference could not be greater than it is. Has he never observed that the Scriptures never apply the term "Mediator" to the Christian Minister? They do apply the other terms. This in itself ought to suffice.

Does he refuse to admit that the words "There is