

overcome for a moment by thoughts of his mother and his home. He stopped. "I turned back about half-an-acre," as he afterwards expressed it to me. "I stopped again and uncovered my head and made this prayer: 'Lord, direct me this one day.' Then I felt in my heart that I must come into Montreal." It was the turning point in his life. He came in weary and foot-sore, and was heartily welcomed by his old friends who were anxiously wondering what had become of him. He was soon followed by his mother and brother and sister, who applied to Mayor Villeneuve, of the village of Ste Jean Baptiste who at once had him arrested and lodged in gaol. This was on Tuesday, October 15, 1867. Mr. Fletcher brought me the news of his imprisonment as I was on the platform of the Bonaventure Hall at a meeting in the interests of French Evangelization. Without a moment's delay, accompanied by the late Mr. Des Islet, for some time Principal of the Pointe-aux-Trembles Schools, we set out to try to effect his release. We had not gone far when it occurred to me that our journey would be in vain, and I suggested that the best thing for us to do was to follow the example of the Apostolic Church when Peter, the so-called first Pope, was in gaol, and go home and pray for our prisoner. We did, and heard nothing of him for two days when he appeared in my house and told his own story. He was in gaol only one night. Mayor Villeneuve brought him out and examined him in the morning. "Is it true," said he, "that you are going to become a Protestant?" "No," said Zotique, "I have become one." "You ought to be ashamed of yourself," said his worship, "do you not know that Jesus Christ came into the world to set up the Holy Catholic Church?" "I am not ashamed of myself," the lad answered, "because I read in my Gospel"—taking the Testament from his pocket—"that Jesus said that if any one is ashamed of Him He will be ashamed of that one before His Father and the holy angels." The Mayor snatched the book from his hand with undisguised displeasure; and that was the last of my little gift to Lefebvre. I never heard what this zealous municipal officer did with it. Probably it met the fate of a good many Testaments and believers in Christ when Rome was dominant in Britain—was burned. He locked up his young prisoner once more and told him that he would see the judge who might send him to the penitentiary. After several hours he returned and said the judge was willing to release him if he would go with his mother. He at once agreed to do so, and was soon off with his mother and brother and sister, the whole family group rattling over the road in their primitive French cart.

As they rested at a wayside inn, Zotique continued the journey on foot and was overtaken by a stranger who took him up in his cart. They came to a piece of forest in which he took refuge and remained concealed until he saw his mother pass. Again a sore mental and spiritual struggle ensued. What was his duty in the premises? Assert his freedom and right of conscience to follow the Saviour, or go home to be watched and worried by the priest and possibly to suffer imprisonment in the end? It was night, and his decision had to be quickly made. He bethought himself where to go. He remembered having had the little house of an old colporteur, at Mascouche, named Richard, pointed out to him as the dwelling of one of the mischief-making Swiss who persisted in selling and distributing Bibles. Emerging from the woods he made for this. He knocked at the door and told his story, ending by saying: "If you are afraid to be disturbed, don't take me in, because they may come after me to-night." "Come in, my boy," said the old colporteur. "If they come after you just run out into my barn; and when they ask if you are here, I will say no, for you will be in the barn." The old man talked much, and as a Frenchman only knows how to talk. He read and prayed, and put Zotique to bed promising to have him up at three in the morning and drive in the colporteur's cart to Terrebonne, to take steamer for Montreal. This programme was successfully carried out; and the next night he went to Lachine, and the day following to Grenville on the Ottawa River, where he remained a year as a pupil in the Mission School taught by Mr. Mathieu. The following year he went to the United States, to be out of the reach of possible persecution, and to earn money to continue his education. He next attended three sessions at the Pointe-aux-Trembles Schools, and thereafter entered the McGill Normal School, taking successively its elementary, model school and academy diplomas. On leaving the Normal School he

was appointed assistant teacher in one of the public schools of Montreal, and soon became Head Master. He was then promoted to be teacher of French and other branches in the High School, and continued in the service of the Board of School Commissioners for ten years. During this time he prosecuted his literary studies, and also attended a full course of lectures in the Faculty of Law of McGill University, passed all the law examinations and carried off the gold medal when he graduated as B.C.L. in 1882. He subsequently took a full theological course in the Presbyterian College, Montreal, and received its diploma in April, 1885. In May of the same year he passed very satisfactory preliminary examinations before the Presbytery of Glengarry; and to-day this Presbytery has sustained with approval his final public trial discourses and examinations, and has licensed him to preach the Gospel. May the Lord guide his steps in future and render him eminently useful to his fellow countrymen. After his imprisonment in 1867, I alluded, to him from the pulpit of Cote Street Church, and some unknown friend sent me \$17 "for the boy who was not ashamed or afraid to confess the Saviour although he was imprisoned for it." The same winter I told some of the incidents of his career as a story to a little girl in Toronto. Her guardian repeated them to the late Rev. Dr. Thornton, of Oshawa, Ontario, who shortly after sent me \$40 for the education of the lad. These sums were devoted to the support of the Mission Schools at Pointe-aux-Trembles which, as already stated, he attended for three sessions. Like all other French and English students in our colleges, Mr. Lefebvre earned every cent required for his education; and his career, so far, illustrates not only the difficulties which beset the path of converts from Romanism, but also what divine grace and earnest perseverance can accomplish.

I only add that Mr. Lefebvre's now aged mother came from New Glasgow to Montreal in the fall of 1876 to hear Father Chiniquy preach; and last winter his brother and sister and cousin came in for the same purpose. Mr. Lefebvre accompanied them to Mr. Chiniquy's rooms where they conversed with the veteran missionary, and listened to his presentation of the Gospel and exposure of errors for several hours greatly to their profit. The New Testament, which a few years ago was to them an unknown and dreaded book, is now read in their homes as God's revelation of saving love and mercy to man.

A DEFENCE OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

BY REV. D. PATERSON, M.A., ST. ANDREWS, QUEBEC.

THE THIRD CHALLENGE.

Mr. Booth's third challenge is "to point to a single ordination by presbyters in communion with the Church, say in the first 1,500 years."

Without insisting on the ordination of elders by Timothy and Titus (which Mr. Booth would probably not admit as examples in point, although we believe this could be made good), we shall allow Bishop Lightfoot to furnish the answer. That distinguished writer, in the Dissertation on the Christian Ministry appended to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, says that "As late as the close of the second century, at Alexandria the bishop was nominated and apparently ordained by the twelve presbyters out of their own number." As evidence of this he quotes Eutychius as saying "That 'the evangelist Mark appointed that when the patriarchate was vacant the twelve presbyters should choose one of their number, on whose head the remaining eleven, laying their hands, should bless him and create him patriarch.' The vacant place was then to be filled up, so that the number twelve might be constant." So here we have presbyters not only ordaining a presbyter to fill up their own number, but ordaining and consecrating a bishop of the highest degree. And this custom continued, he says, till A.D. 313.

We have evidence also (to quote from the same work) that the practice of ordination by presbyters prevailed elsewhere in "A decree of the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314), which ordains that 'it be not allowed to country bishops (*χρηματοδοτοῖς*) to ordain presbyters or deacons, nor even to city-presbyters, except permission be given in each parish by the bishop in writing.' Thus, while restraining the existing license, the framers of the decree still allow very considerable latitude. And it is especially important to observe

that they lay more stress on episcopal sanction than on episcopal ordination."

As this comes from a successor of the apostles, and one so high in rank and reputation as the Bishop of Durham, Mr. Booth will probably accept it as sufficient. If not, we are ready to corroborate it by other testimony. Having thus, I think, fairly met the friendly challenge, and I hope in a friendly and brotherly spirit, perhaps your kindness, Mr. Editor, will grant space for a few words regarding those who followed the apostles in the work of the Church.

THE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES.

While the apostles had no successors in the apostleship, there were, of course, after they were gone, other men who preached the Gospel, administered the sacraments, and governed the Church; men who were appointed by the apostles, or under their direction; and by these again others, and so on, in succession downwards. All these, so far, may be said to have succeeded the apostles. They are their successors in this particular sense; and that, whether they be presbyters such as the apostles themselves ordained, or prelates who, in some branches of the Church, rule over presbyters, yet the former seem to have more of the succession than the latter, as doing more of the work which the apostles were expressly appointed to do. For, while they, (viz., the Presbyterian ministers) rule, yet they are mostly employed in preaching, whereas modern bishops, although they may preach often, are chiefly occupied in ruling, as their distinctive appellation indeed implies. And we are mistaken if it is not practically the case that the higher a man rises in the "apostolical succession," up to him who claims to be universal bishop, the less he does of that which was the great work of the apostles—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Their truest successors in our day we apprehend to be the missionaries of the Gospel. These go forth to witness for Christ throughout the world, they preach amongst the heathen His unsearchable riches, and in His name they establish churches and ordain elders to feed and to rule the flock.

THE EARLY BISHOPS.

The early bishops were much more apostolic than their modern successors in the name. It has been admitted that bishops are to be found very early in the history of the Church; that even in the second century they appear to have been very general throughout it. But what were those bishops? They were not diocesans. They did not preside over a diocese, but over a parish. A bishop was simply the pastor of a congregation. There were many hundreds of them. They were to be found in every city and in every village where there was a church; and the picture given by early writers of the bishop sitting on his throne surrounded by the presbyters, what is it but the picture of a minister with his ordained elders around him, such as may be seen at this day in the session of any Presbyterian Church? Only he does not call his seat a throne, but by the humbler designation of a chair.

Thus Mosheim says that "One inspector or bishop presided over each Christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voice of the whole people. To assist him he formed a council of presbyters, etc." Dean Milman suggests the same thing, in order to account for the great number of the bishops; and it is admitted also by Bishop Lightfoot, who says that originally a diocese was just a parish.

This view is strengthened by the fact that the early bishops were set apart especially to preach the word of God; and "In the African Churches it would seem that the duty of preaching was reserved wholly to the bishop" (Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiq.*, p. 1,685), as the regular and ordinary pastor of the church.

We see then that the Presbyterian system, according to which each congregation has a minister, who preaches the word, and governs the congregation, with the assistance of a bench of elders or presbyters over whom he presides, but without claiming any higher rank or "order" than that of presbyter, seems a very exact counterpart of the system of the early Church.

Ignatius himself, the great champion of Episcopacy, gives a very similar representation of the churches of his day. He said that every church had a bishop of its own. He spoke constantly of the bishop, the presbyters and the deacons, as we speak of the ministers, the elders, and the deacons or the managers.