

Dr. Schaff says:—"You will make no mistake in a Dutch Reformed classic by addressing every man as 'Doctor.'"

There are many ministers in our Church who are as well, and some of them better entitled to the honor of D.D. than some who have received it. We have some men whose scholarship is undoubted, and by this I mean general classics, theologic, scientific culture,—lovers and readers of first class books—students of the past and present.

To avoid invidious distinctions, I do not see why all clergymen should not be called 'Doctors,' as they have the cure of souls as well as the medical men have the care of bodies. The New York Observer says:—

"All regular physicians are entitled Doctor of medicine, and all regular ministers ought to be called Doctors of Divinity."

Nov. 10th.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONTRASTED.

I. Of the Romish Creed so far as it is Orthodox.

SIR,—Among the more ignorant of those who call themselves Protestants, and, perhaps, yet more among those who do not profess to be Christians, there prevails a strange confusion of ideas as to the points on which these Churches agree and differ. This acts very injuriously on the Church of England, prejudicing many against it, and much obstructing its progress. It is surprising how ignorant many are, who call themselves Protestants, yet are open-mouthed against the principles and rites of the Church of England. I found it difficult to convince a professional man, who called himself a Presbyterian, that the Church of England had not its esthetic doctrine, its secret teachings hidden from the public eye, like the secrets of the masonic society. A lady, who called herself a Presbyterian, said that she could understand and tolerate the Roman Catholics; their aims were open, but the Church of England was an unsolvable puzzle to her. Now the belief and practice of the Anglican Church are fully set forth in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Let these fault-finders compare that with the Missal, the Mass-book of the Popish priest, and with the Breviary, which with him supplies the place of the Bible. Let them look also at the Liturgy of the Lutheran and of the French Calvinists. A plain and simple statement of the points on which the two Churches agree and differ, might clear away a great mass of ignorance and prejudice. And, perhaps, it may be more readily received from one who is not a theologian by profession; I address myself more especially to those who profess to be Christians and Protestants. Not a few of the more ignorant of these, conceive that the Church of Rome has abandoned the essential doctrines of a Christian Church, and that agreement with Rome on any point, of itself, implies error. They have simplified their belief as to the Church of Rome by condemning it into one compact dogma, the nearer to Rome, the further from Truth and from God!

Prejudice and ignorance have carried some of these people so far, that to adopt the gothic style of architecture in building a church is a suspicious symptom. Did not the gothic order originate with the Papists? It undoubtedly attained its highest perfection as Popery grew and flourished. In their eyes it is a part of the Papal system. Rome elaborately cultivated ecclesiology while perverting Christ's doctrine. The pointed arch, the clustered column, the buttress and the spire, even the *cross*, the symbol of Christianity, all indicate the corruption of the true faith. But the truth is that Rome never has abandoned the great dogmas of Christianity. What do we mean by a dogma? As soon as any error or false teaching arose in the Church, and began to spread (and this occurred very early, even in the days of St. Paul and St. John), it generated a necessity for providing a precise definition of the point of faith and doctrine involved. These definitions of points of faith are dogmas (*dogmata*). Every Church, true or false, every sect, has of necessity, its dogmatic theology.

The three Creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, each of which was adopted by general councils, the last in the sixth century, the others earlier, may represent to our minds, the most widely received dogmatic theology. They express the teaching not only of the Church of Rome, but also of the Church of England and Scotland, of the Lutheran Church, of the Presbyterian, Congregationalists, Methodists, and (with the exception of the point as to the procession of the Holy Ghost, expressed in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds by the words—*and the Son*, in Latin by *Litque*) of the Greek Church also. So that, with the exception of Unitarians, Socinians, and some minor sects, the great body of professed Christians throughout the world, hold the same doctrine as defined in these three Creeds, these express the faith of Christendom.

The real charge made against the Romanists by

those who rightly conceive their errors is, not that they have abandoned the essential dogmas of Christian truth, but that they have added to, and over laid them with a mass of false doctrine and rites, utterly incompatible with them. That they have venerated the whole of God's revelation, concealing its essentials, and practically destroying its efficacy for the enlightenment of men's souls. The result, strange to say, is that the Church of Rome is more dangerous, from the amount of truth it holds in reserve, with what to defend itself, and yet more to mislead inquiries after sacred truth than from its corruption and perversion of Christ's teaching. In short, that it still leaves to us much of Christian truth, that a Popish priest can get up into a Presbyterian pulpit, and, while adhering strictly to the doctrines of his own Church, preach an efficacious sermon, in which the most critical puritan can detect nothing heterodox. True, there are many topics which the priest will have to avoid in his discourse. But he has a large and fertile field to range over, and need not stray beyond its bounds. Such sermons are often heard at this day even in Popish churches, especially when Protestants or new converts are supposed to be present.

In controversy with the Papists we should remember that their Church still clings to so much of Christian truth, and carefully chooses only those teachings or rites, with which they overlaid the truth, utterly vitiating it. The Popish priest who gains access to a Protestant audience, should be, not only thoroughly versed in theology in its broadest sense, but be also familiar with the views of the so called heretic bodies he addresses, to avoid offending their principles or prejudices. Such a man, (and the Roman Church, with its worldly wise policy, has long since provided itself with such, well-trained in Jesuitry and casuistry). Such a man, if he can gain access to Protestant pulpits, may preach there for years sound Romish doctrine, and never betray his Church. He may defy detection, for on the topics afforded by the three Creeds I have mentioned, whole libraries of sound theology have been written without exhausting them.

Indeed, not a few of the most valuable theological works have been written by Romanists. For instance, *The Imitation of Christ* attributed to Thomas A. Kempis. Except the Bible, no book has been translated into more languages, or oftener published, Pascal's *Pensees sur la religion* and his *Lettres Provinciales*, show a different and yet higher order of mind than that of Kempis. The works of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray, have merits which have been highly appreciated even by Protestants. Perhaps no man in the Middle Ages contributed more to the intellectual and moral culture of Christendom than Thomas Aquinas. It would be easy to lengthen this list. Not one of those I have named, seems to have entertained a doubt that the Church of Rome was not alone, exclusively the Church of Christ.

But transfer the emissary priest to a Romish Church, give him charge of a Popish congregation, bring him in contact with his brother priests and his bishop. Watch his course there, and you will see of what stuff Papal errors and corruptions consist in part, but will not easily follow him into the secrets of the confessional. If this well trained priest should gain access to an Anglican pulpit, there are two points on which he might dwell, which he would avoid when addressing Presbyterians or Methodists. He might now lay stress on the value and necessity of a liturgy, for the Anglican Church has retained a liturgy, even still using parts of the liturgies of the early Church. He might too, urge the importance of preserving the three orders in the ministry—bishops, priests and deacons. The Anglican Church holds that this is an essential feature in the organization of the Church which Christ planted by His Apostles; and that these orders are needed for handing down the powers and gifts with which he endowed His Church here on earth. In the preface to the ordination service of its ministers, the Anglican Church says:—"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests and deacons."

These two are the chief points of Romish doctrine which would be accepted in an Anglican Church, at the preaching of which Presbyterians and Methodists would revolt. In their pulpits the adroit emissary of Rome would not touch on them. *I will treat of them later.* What then are the Popish teachings and rites at which the Anglicans too will revolt? To trace them out we must follow the emissary of Rome to his own lair, to his stronghold among his brother priests and their superiors, and yet more into the midst of the confiding flock crouching around them. There he can safely strip off the disguise he has been wearing so long.

What then are the errors of Romanism? It were an almost endless task to trace them all out; nor am I familiar enough with them to undertake it. A few leading errors which have, in fact, enserated the rest, will not occupy much space

G. M.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

ADVENT SUNDAY.

Nov. 27th, 1887.

The New Leader.

Passage to be read.—Joshua i. 1-9.

The long journey of the Israelites is now over, the Land of Promise in sight—Lebanon, its most northerly point, plainly seen. Close to journey's end. Thousands of faces looking across Jordan interested, eager, but still not happy. Why?

I. *The Scene of Mourning.*—They have come so far under one leader, now dead. He has been their guide, lawgiver, teacher and protector. Now he has left them. What are they to do? Universal sorrow, (like funeral of N. W. Volunteers at Toronto). Besides, how often have they vexed and grieved him! What would they now give to undo and unsay these things! (Lesson to us; how we regret, when too late, having been unkind to those we love). Israel cannot go on without a leader. They cannot appoint one, for God has always been their real leader. He appointed Moses, and must now appoint Moses' successor.

II. *The Divine Commission.*—Already he has been pointed out (Num. xxvii. 18-28), and is well-known to every Israelite; having stood among them almost alone, when, as a spy, he made his report on the Promised Land. (Num. xiv. 6-10). Still he has a very important work to do. Is he fit for it? His name would make us think so. It was originally *Oseha* or *Hoshea* (salvation), and was changed by Moses to *Jehoshua* or *Joshua* (God's salvation), this last name being really the same as *Jesus*. Does our knowledge of him bear out his name? He had been a slave in Egypt; had seen the ten Plagues, and the Passage of the Red Sea; had been all through the wanderings—the only man in all the tribes (except Caleb) of whom this was true, and had been specially chosen by Moses to attack Amalek, acting then as Moses' minister (Exod. xvii. 9; xxiv. 18); had been on the Mount with God and Moses (Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, 18; xxxii. 17), and had been one of the spies, on which occasion his name was changed by Moses (Num. xiii. 16). In character he is eminently fitted for his work. He is brave (Num. xiv. 6-10); his faith is strong; and, above all, he is humble. Though appointed by God, he does not at once assume authority when Moses dies, but waits for God to send him (Josh. i. 2).

III. *The Divine Promise.*—Every promise should be kept. God always keeps His. He promised Abraham that Israel should be a great nation, and they were so now. He promised Moses to bring them to the Promised Land, and here they are. Now He promises Joshua what seems the most difficult thing of all (v. 8). How can he conquer all these kings with their armies? "I will be with thee," (v. 4); and God never fails (1 Sam. xv. 29). Still Joshua must do something for himself. He must act bravely; he must never doubt that God can make him do what he is told to do. (nor must we); and, above all, he is to think over God's law, love it [no dusty Bibles on shelves for us], follow it always; not just whenever it suits him. (Repeat v. 8).

Family Reading.

NOTHING TO DO!

"Nothing to do!" in this world of ours,
Where weeds grow up with the fairest flowers,
Where smiles have only a fitful play,
Where hearts are breaking every day?

"Nothing to do!" thou Christian soul,
Wrapping thee around in thy selfish stole?
Off with the garments of sloth and sin!
Christ, thou Lord, hath a kingdom to win.

"Nothing to do!" There are prayers to lay
On the altar of incense, day by day;
There are foes to meet within and without,
There is error to conquer, strong and stout.

"Nothing to do!" There are minds to teach
The simplest form of Christian speech;
There are hearts to lure with loving wife,
From the grimmest haunts of sin's defile.

"Nothing to do!" There are lambs to feed,
The precious hopes of the church's need;
Strength to be borne to the weak and faint,
Vigils to keep with the doubting saint.

"Nothing to do!" and thy Saviour said,
"Follow thou me in the path I tread."
Lord, lend thy help the journey through,
Lest, faint, we cry, "So much to do!"