

run, in every other way also. The average vacant parish looks out for a "young and pleasant" officer, "easily managed" by the local control, usually possessed of popular gifts, and preferred (for obvious reasons) unmarried. And they usually get their way. More's the pity!

THAT MATERIAL "DOES NOT WEAR."

In fact, these nice, popular young men—with-out any personal stamina or professional excellence—very soon "wear out." Then comes the trouble—the outcry against "permanent pastorates," that glory of the Church of England, above all churches in the world. The ideal of the English rector or vicar—universally respected, a gentleman and scholar par excellence, the dearest and oldest friend of generation after generation in his parish—is being rapidly effaced. Instead of that we are getting a feverish restlessness forcing in continual itinerancy as a feature of Canadian Church life. People are finding out that if they choose in haste, they are expected

"TO REPENT AT LEISURE"

—and they are not willing to repent at leisure! So they are already desiring something like the Methodist "three years' system"—which, more than anything else, is responsible for the loss of moral prestige in the public estimate of modern clergymen. They are becoming the "playthings of an hour" for the community in which they live, a very ephemeral life. "Easily married, easily divorced!" That is the modern ideal with regard to marriages, and the picture or figure is applicable to the pastorate as well. The state of flux into which ecclesiastical, as well as social life, is sinking or dissolving, is very alarming, and calls for energetic measures in both spheres. One naturally enquires, in searching for probable causes and cures for such a state of things,

WHO IS TO BLAME?—ANS., THE BISHOPS!

Is it not so? They are placed in a very trying position—a position requiring immense moral courage—and they fail miserably. There are, of course, exceptions. In the Maritime Provinces, the patronage has drifted legally out of Episcopal hands, and nothing is left to them but moral influence. This they do exercise beneficially so far as it goes—but does it go far? In many of the Western dioceses a certain "by-law on patronage"—not a "canon" even—obtained after a long and painful struggle, requires the Bishop to "consult" the parish officers before making an appointment. After consultation, and due consideration of the various pleas "pro and con," the appointment rests absolutely with the Bishop. It is an enormous responsibility—

WHAT DO THEY DO WITH IT?

Their episcopate is—by their own action—often made a dead letter: they appoint the man that the people select. The Bishop merely registers the popular caprice! Why? Because—they probably say, by way of excuse—if they didn't, if they followed their own conscientious convictions as to the best choice, the people would rebel, starve him out, etc., etc. Such proceedings would work their own cure. The present plan utterly and systematically ignores all idea of real merit in regard to promotion: and men admirably qualified by training and experience to fill the highest positions, to the immense benefit of the Church, are passed over, and left out of sight—still worse, out of use! Why, again? Because the people do not know them—and the Bishop, who does know them well, sacrifices them and the Church to ideas of temporary expediency. They please the people and "keep things quiet"—while the Church rots away into a useless hulk, for lack of management.

## REVIEWS.

LIFE IN ALGOMA, or Three Years of a Clergyman's Life and Church Work in that Diocese. By H. N. B. Sm. 8 vo., pp. 167. London and Toronto: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Algoma is confessed to be a diocese where for many reasons the work is uninviting and arduous, yet the sheep have to be tended, although they are few, in the wilderness. Here we have a very true and life-like picture of a clergyman's difficulties even when he is sympathetic and successful. We commend the story to the attention of those who go to spend their holidays in Muskoka, and forget that the Church is doing her work there and is looking for their assistance. The illustrations are evidently based on photographs, especially "making maple sugar," which speaks to the life.

From Whittaker, New York, we have a small parcel of booklets: *Why Not?*—A confirmation story for boys, by Wm. Wilberforce Newton (5c.) It is short and very much to the point. *Not the Young Only*, by James H. Darlington, Ph. D., Brooklyn (5c.) This is an appeal to the heart through sympathy with an earnest worker, and with any young person it will have weight. *The Offertory*, A Last Act of Worship, by Bishop Thompson, of Illinois (5c.) It is exactly what so many Church people need, when they see the alms-bag approaching and give with unwilling mind: alms and oblations are materials of divine worship. *The Church's Doctrine of the Dead*, by Rev. S. D. McConnell, D.D. (10c.) A gem for clear and accurate statement against the popular ideas that accord with neither reason nor Scripture. *My Parish Note Book*, compiled by Rev. W. J. Miller, A.M. (10c.), is a most useful compilation of cuttings upon Church questions, and here is a short sample: "The Church of England was the first that came to America. It made the first prayer, baptized the first convert, married the first couple, buried the first dead, and administered the first Holy Communion. This was in Virginia, thirteen years before the Mayflower came to New England." *The Book of Chants*, from "The Book of Praise," edited by Rev. Dr. Shinn, and H. B. Day (10c.) Selections made from so familiar a book as "The Book of Praise" need little commendation. We have the usual morning and evening services, with plain chants to the Canticles and selections of Psalms: the service for Holy Communion, the burial service, and the choral service. This last service is very simple, and met with in many of the churches when the morning and evening prayers are to be more ornate.

## PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND ITS CLAIMS.

BY THE RIGHT REV. A. C. A. HALL, D.D.

In beginning his subject, "Papal Infallibility and its Claims," Bishop Hall stated that he should treat the question from the points of history, of reason and from the basis of the Syllabus which contained the claim to infallibility made by the Roman Church, on July 18, 1870. It was at this late council that the claim made for St. Peter, as to primacy of jurisdiction, and as to the inheritance of his powers by the See of Rome, was first made binding by the Vatican upon the consciences of Roman Catholics throughout the world.

At the time of the Arian controversy, the Church Catholic had in its own view no such infallible and supreme head; there was most surely never a time when the Church needed a divine guide, the subject in question being no less a one than the eternal Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ. Had the Roman Emperor known of so easy and suitable a way as an appeal to an acknowledged infallible head of the Church, he would not have hesitated a moment thus to settle so awful and vexed a question. Certainly at this time, at the least, there could have been no supreme authority at Rome. Think for a moment of the part taken by Pope Liberius in this violent doctrinal struggle for the safeguarding of the very essence of the holy faith. Vacillating, undecided, influenced by circumstances, he joined in condemning Athanasius, and the tenets for which he stood, supported his banishment, acquiesced in the heretical views of the Arians. Where, when Liberius so acted, where, I ask, was the infallibility of the Pope? It is said that when Liberius pronounced these judgments, adverse to the true faith, his verdict was not given *ex-cathedra*. But had there been infallibility lodged in the successors of Peter, it would be surely

reasonable to suppose that a Pope would not have been allowed to fulminate a doctrinal decision, upon a most vital question, which gave to Arianism the greatest help and encouragement it ever received.

The tale of Pope Honorius is a story that, unless it can be contradicted, is *prima facie* evidence against the historical infallibility of the papacy; Honorius was Pope during the opening years of the great monophysite controversy. There was not, at this time, the slightest claim made for the doctrinal infallibility of poor Pope Honorius; he was in fact a most exceptionally poor theologian, and distinctly and undisguisedly took the wrong side. He did not do this intentionally, he simply mistook the case; yet Honorius wrote as the infallible Bishop of Rome. The fact remains that his name was posthumously branded as that of a heretic by an ecumenical council, although it would seem that if ever God gave an infallible guide to His Church, He would have done so at a time when the discussion as to the human and divine wills in the person of His Son threatened to obscure the value and meaning of His redemptive sacrifice. Anathema after anathema was pronounced and echoed, by council after council, upon the infallible Pope Honorius and his heretical doctrines. His name has lately been suppressed in the list of heretics by the Roman Catholic Church, possibly for the sake of brevity, but it may also be that the Church recognized a slight awkwardness in having the name of one of its infallible Popes on the list of its outlawed heretics. Honorius, of course, had no idea that he was speaking *ex-cathedra*, nor had he himself dreamed that he was infallible, when he made statements that gave the strongest support to the monophysite heresy which it ever received. There are thousands of historical incidents which would illustrate the fact that the claim to papal infallibility was a late one, but attention was directed by the speaker to two more only. Pope Eugenius IV. laid down a principle which, if carried out, would have invalidated all the ordinations to the priesthood made for the twelve centuries preceding him. This papal dictum, it may be said, applied to but a small portion of the Church; but why should a Pope who so signally failed to guide a small portion of the Church be considered an infallible guide for the whole Church? In order to show that the modern papal claim is no more adapted to present needs and exigencies, than is the claim for ancient power true to fact, the speaker mentioned several errors condemned in the Syllabus, wherein the Vatican contradicts itself distinctly.

The Syllabus condemns as errors the following: Freedom of worship, freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the denial that the Church has the right to use the temporal sword to maintain its temporal power. If, in spite of these papal declarations, it be said that these views are mediæval, not suited to modern times, and that the Pope ought to, and will, reconcile himself to modern progress; if any will yet look to Rome to do its part in adjusting ancient and modern thought, or in helping on the revelation of God, continued and continuous in this age, as throughout the centuries, certainly the Encyclical Letter of 1893, on the study of Scripture, will disabuse him of any such hope. Leo XIII. here settles the matter to his own satisfaction, by taking the narrowest possible view of inspiration. He sets the seal of papal authority on the theory of verbal inspiration, and does this for the first time in the history of the Church, allowing for no error of history, chronology, or science; and proclaiming Almighty God as its sole author. Many of these difficulties were foreseen during the Vatican council.

Historically and practically, then, the Popes have not been infallible guides in matters of doctrine. Is there, then, any reason why infallibility should be so localized? Two reasons are given: "Did not Christ, it is asked, plainly confer such authority on Peter when He said to him, 'When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren?'" The Roman branch of the Church has never been conspicuous for correct or successful Bible exegesis, or it would never have attempted to build such a superstructure as the papal claim on so very slender and insufficient a foundation as this saying of Christ. If these words conferred such power on Peter, he seems to have been singularly unmindful of it. He appeals not to authority given at this time, but to a special vision, to uphold his opinion as to eating with Gentiles; he does not take the position of teacher, or the chief authority at the Council of Jerusalem; he does not plead such authority even against Paul, when he withstood him to the face. So evident is this that Roman doctors have tried to meet it, and Aloysius Vincenzi feels certain that the later Peter in the apostolic history must have been some other Peter than he to whom Christ gave the great commission. The second reason for believing in papal infallibility is the supposed necessity for such a provision. The Pope is the only representative of God's authority visible on earth; if I give him up, where shall I go? says the enquirer. Shall I put my soul under the care of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other bishop? By no means,

we an  
not pe  
idea o  
and on  
though  
though  
His pe  
Churco  
seek f  
author  
to de  
oursel  
to we  
the o  
us th  
only t  
the s  
nion v  
recogn  
need i  
the re  
as it i  
follow  
degre  
truth,  
than l  
both,  
things  
but tl  
outwa  
into a  
only i  
celebr  
spirit.  
name,  
us wil  
in the

THI

The  
of the  
new c  
"W  
to im  
impli  
In all  
anxi  
ment  
begin  
the c  
know  
gelist  
home  
the n  
their  
time  
or att  
and c  
it nee  
sonal  
who l  
Brotl  
the E  
good  
this  
the c  
stone  
good  
that  
the v  
are b  
He t  
will  
with  
want  
day's  
and  
as ye  
com  
than  
We l  
and  
ence  
prin  
hood  
full  
cies.  
prob  
both  
failu  
ther  
not l  
testi  
calle  
reco  
ble  
only  
not  
have  
Wes  
atte  
the  
right