

torted and unfair representations of such opinions." We directly charge the latter offence against the writer of the editorial referred to, and in the more censurable ground where brethren of the same spiritual lineage should be dwelling together in charity, and mutual forbearance. We take in so far as space permits this writer's statements seriatim.

I. "Romish and Mediæval Error." It is well known that the "odium theologium" is as illogical as it is bitter, and hence the patent device spoken of by legal gentlemen—the abusing of the Plaintiff's Attorney in the absence of any other defence—is a constant refuge of those whose expectations of success depend upon the dexterous handling of the trings of unreasoning prejudice. The "*Evangelical Churchman*" has not scorned the descent to the lowest depths as we shall presently see by formal absolute proof.

II. "The Sacrament of Marriage." The term "Sacrament" has a universal application covering every solemn scriptural ordinance. Ignorance of this can alone palliate the party recklessness which makes "knowledge" an offence and ground for slander rather than an incentive to enlightenment. If I disconnect the parts of the 1st vs. Ps. 14, I read the Infidel's Creed—"There is no God":—but if I take it as a whole I have the corrective in the prelude—"The fool hath said in his heart."

Equally by taking the 25th article alone, I may have the "*Evangelical Churchman's*" Creed, but I find the true exposition of the Church's Teaching, and the folly of the *Evangelical Churchman* by turning to the 35th article which declares the unequivocal statement of the 9th Homily that "in a general acception the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified." Is Matrimony a thing? is it holy? Therefore is Mr. Hodgson or the Nova Scotia Synod to be defamed because they so style it? nowhere implying most distantly that "it is such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are." It is noteworthy how such a writer as the *Evangelical Churchman* Editor blows in every direction regardless of consistency, if he may point an arrow at his self-constituted adversary. A Sacrament is in one part of his article *so lofty a Christian Ordinance*, that to use the name intelligently for other "holy things" by express definition of the 35th article and 9th Homily, is in his mind *Romanism*. In absolute contradiction to this, to impute to the Divine Ordinances of Baptism and Holy Communion the distinctive inherent, mystical qualities which make them such as no other Rites can possibly be, and which give them, by way of pre-eminence, the appellation of "the Sacraments" to the same mind is *Romanism*. Surely it is not to be wondered at if after such lucidity upon *Romanism*, we find it hopeless to derive what the "*Evangelicalism*" of the "*Evangelical Churchman*" is.

III. The boldness of effrontery is not reached until the following flows from the pen of this darkener of Divine counsels. Bishop Sullivan's views of Montreal and those of the Montreal College Trust Deeds "are the opinions of the great body of Reformers and Protestant Theologians, and of the Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles," * * a doctrinal position in harmony with the consensus of the Protestant confessions and with the teachings of our Church standards and divines." Such splendid audacity is an insult to ordinary information as to the overwhelming mass of authorities which are in every age and equally since the glorious Reformation—in utter conflict to the crude conceptions of the "Montreal College Trust Deeds" which would do little credit in view of all these testimonies to a virtual novice in the Church of God. But the writer drags in all "Protestant confessions." Other than the Church of England he ought to know that there is but one of either independence or authority upon such a question, and hence we turn for the justification for his demagogic and pompous summoning of Pro-

testant confessions to the formal deliverance of the great Westminster confession of the Church of Scotland or Presbyterians—and there in flat opposition to this new gospel (unknown to the Church of England or any other qualified authority) we read "there is in every Sacrament a *spiritual relation or Sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified*—whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one, are attributed to the other;" and further that "the efficacy of a Sacrament depends * * upon the work of the Spirit and the Word of Institution, which contains together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers." And this is in utter refutation of the barefaced, presumptions, indicated by this reckless writer and the authors and upholders of the Montreal College Trust Deeds.

IV. The editor of the "*Evangelical Churchman*" crowns his offence alike against the Church, Religion and Morality, severe as the indictment is,—when, for a miserable party end, he would pervert truth, distort facts, and enforce error, by misrepresenting the pious and judicious Hooker whose entire testimony is absolutely to the contrary. As will be seen if there be any support for the editor of the *Evangelical Churchman's* position then his adduced authority, Hooker, is impudently as a helpless, hopeless heretic, and tractarian in the glib phraseology of this writer; and the world, up to the 15th of September last, has been utterly deceived regarding the teachings, piety and claims of one whom Christians of every name have delighted to honour. What says Hooker (the italics are mine) "For we take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, nor for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as in verity they are) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the Sacraments delivers into our hands that grace available to eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify." In regard to the Holy Communion again, Hooker thus sums up the voice of antiquity regarding it: "It is evident how they teach that Christ is personally there present yea present whole, though a part of Christ be corporally absent from thence. That Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with His personal and true presence, doth by His own Divine power add to the natural substance supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changes them and makes them that to us— which otherwise they could not be,—that to us they are thereby made such instruments as mystically, yet truly, invisibly, yet really, work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ as well in that He is man as God. Our participation also in the fruit, grace, and efficacy of His body and blood wherein ensues a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life." After formulating the Lutheran and Papist expositions of the Sacrament, Hooker thus profounds (as distinct from the new-fangled notions of the Montreal Theological College as from the errors of consubstantiation or transubstantiation)!

"This hallowed food through concurrence of Divine Power, is in verity and truth to faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation—whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need—this is to them and in them my body." This latter, as it were, from the Saviour's lips, Hooker says hath in it, (a) nothing but what even Lutherans, or Papists acknowledge to be most true; (b) nothing but what all confess the words of Christ to enforce; (c) nothing but what the Church of God hath always thought necessary; (d) nothing but what alone is sufficient for every Christian to believe concerning the use and force of this Sacrament; (e) nothing

but what agrees with the writings of all antiquity, and with all *Christian Confessions*!!

What contrast does all this afford to the railings of the "*Evangelical*" editor. How entirely do they correct his false statements. How triumphantly they vindicate the testimony "everywhere—always and by all"—in favor of those who, according to his poor mental delusion and inflated pretension are "to claim mere sufferance within our Church." The British Constitution might in like manner be said to claim mere sufferance in England! We can in the review of such unchristian folly point the trader to the wisdom of Hooker, when he writes "Is it not to be wished that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament and less to dispute the manner how?" Had the author of the secret Trust deed of the Montreal College heeded this wisdom the honor of the Master would have been promoted, and the Church might have been spared many such incendiary productions as the one now criticised. We commend to all as against this preposterous spurious Protestant twaddle, this pious and humble conclusion of Hooker, whose Protestantism bears the comparison of gold to dross, as contrasted with such shallow and fanatical exponents; "let it, therefore, be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know that there I receive from Him without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performs His promise * * This bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold—this cup availeth to endless life and welfare both of soul and body. * * What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, is enough to me who take them they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness hereof suffices. His word He knows which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this: "O my God! Thou art true. O my soul thou art happy." There is not space to deal with the writers wilful perversion of the signification of the "real presence" as contrasted with Romish or Lutheran errors. The cause which stands in need of such shifts is indeed in ill condition, and when unmasked must cause indignation in the mind of every seeker after truth, and every true child of our glorious Catholic and Reformed Church.

Yours,

CHURCHMAN.

CONTEMPORARY CHURCH OPINION.

The *Southern Churchman* (Richmond Va.) referring to the small number of Candidates for Orders in the P. E. Church of the U. S., adds:

If the Church were more awake to its responsibilities, there would be more young men devoting their time and abilities to preaching the gospel of the Son of God—the only remedy for the sorrows and sins of the human race.

We think it more than likely this matter does not receive due attention from our pastors. Surely every now and then they should speak on this subject, to direct the attention of young men to the work of the ministry. Young men are wanted—men in good health, men of ability, men of zeal, men who cannot be happy in money making or getting a living, but satisfied with nothing less than to make known to their fellow men the unspeakable riches of Christ.

Men are wanted for this work; men and not girls, manly men, who have gifts and abilities and zeal and goodness and apt to teach. It is not to be supposed they will know their own qualifications; so should seek the advice of wise friends to ascertain whether they are manly, able to endure hardships; whether they have ability; whether they have zeal.—They may know for themselves whether they have the earnest desire to be servants of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who cannot rest satisfied unless they be engaged in the great and Christ-like work of doing good.