

hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture that where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst . . . of all the ancients there is not one to be named that did otherwise expound or allege the place than as implying external baptism. . . . When the letter of the law hath two things plainly and expressly specified, water and the Spirit—water as a duty required on our parts, the Spirit as a gift which God bestoweth—there is danger in presuming so to interpret it as if the clause which concerneth ourselves were more than needeth." (Polity, Bk. V., p. 59). Westcott—"Water symbolises purification, and Spirit quickening. The one implies a definite external rite, the other indicates an energetic internal operation. The two are co-ordinate, correlative, complimentary. Hence all interpretations which treat the term *Water* here as simply figurative and descriptive of the cleansing power of the Spirit, are essentially defective, as they are also opposed to all ancient tradition . . . the birth of the Spirit is potentially united with the birth of water. The general inseparability of these two is indicated by the form of the expression '*born of water and Spirit*' (Greek) as distinguished from the double phrase '*born of water and of Spirit*.'" ("The Gospel of St. John," note on iii. 5.). The above quotations present widely different views; but what, after all, does this balancing of authorities and appeal to names result in? Let Westcott answer: "No conclusion is of real value to us till we have made it our own by serious work; and controversy tends no less to narrow our vision than to give to forms of language or conception that rigidity of outline which is fatal to the presentation of life." ("Epistle to Hebrews," p. vi.). If controversy is thus always baneful, is it not especially so on a subject so much controverted as baptism. Exact definition of terms is here a prime necessity, and when writers like Mozley and Waterland throw out this warning it ought to carry great weight with every earnest Churchman. May I add that every Bishop is from his position entitled to the reverent esteem of the Church; for the Bible and the Catechism alike teach us that "the powers that be are ordained of God." This leads me to my conclusion that controversy is generally productive of no good result, but if it must be engaged in, let it deal with principles and not with men. This, I am sure, will commend itself to a paper like the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, committed to no narrow partizanship. The telling words of Charles John Vaughan are significant here: "It is no small blessing, in the eyes of all but party theologians, that there should be room within the pale of a common worship for men of various opinions. It may even be regarded as one instance of God's providence over our Church of England, as at present constituted, that we have articles and formularies drawn from very various sources and incapable perhaps in some points of a perfectly logical coherence. It is thus that excellent men of conflicting doctrinal notions on many topics of secondary and on some of primary importance, have been enabled to worship together and even to minister together in a common church and at a common altar." FIDES.

No Fear of Editorial Criticism.

SIR,—We have much to be thankful for in these days of many papers. To write without fear of editorial criticism, with good hope of seeing our scribbling in print, is quite pleasant, and, perhaps, a little too tempting. Gratitude is due to somebody for the opportunity of enjoying this recreation of a country parson. In a recent number we looked through the Gospel according to St. John, to catch the primary meaning of the term "disciples" in xx. 19. Encouraged by the result, a similar search has been made through St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke. May we try to lead some of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN readers up to what seems to be the reasonable conclusion? V. "And when He was set, His disciples came unto Him." Without being too learned, we can all be sure that there is a distinction between the multitudes and the disciples, two separate companies. St. Peter, Andrew, James and John are mentioned by name as called to follow in iv. VIII. "Another of His disciples," after his first call, hesitates, is rebuked, and called again. "The disciples" in the boat were the twelve—St. Mark iv. 10, 34, 35. IX. St. Matt. called. A crowd sit down with Christ and His disciples, two bodies of the called and voluntary followers. The same distinction is plain all through the chapter. X. "His twelve disciples," chosen and given authority and power, and called apostles—St. Mark iii. 14, St. Luke vi. 13. St. Mark says: "He ordained twelve, that they should be with Him." This will throw much light on many passages. This particular body alone are spoken to in verse 40: "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me." XI. The apostles called "the twelve disciples." XII. Our Lord goes through the cornfields with His disciples, and draws attention to them as distinct from His mother, brethren and the crowd. XIII. After the multitude had gone, His

disciples ask about the parable of the sower. St. Mark says (iv. 10): "They that were about Him with the twelve"—marking again the distinction between the twelve authorized and called, and the varying number of chance companions. XIV. His disciples distribute the bread to the multitude, and then take ship for another place. This is repeated in xv. 32. Can we imagine a few officious men forcing themselves forward to mind the apostles' business. Can we imagine Him who rebuked St. Peter for not minding his own business (St. John xxi. 21, 22) allowing busy-bodies to take the bread and distribute? Surely only those whom He had chosen would dare and be tolerated. XVI. The disciples spoken of in xiv., xv., have private converse with the Master. It seems impossible to think of any following about continually in the closest intimacy with our Lord, save those whom He invited to be with Him—St. Mark iii. 14. In xx. 17 we are told: "Jesus took the twelve aside and spoke of His death." XVII. St. James, Peter and John were on the Mount of Transfiguration, and are called "disciples." His disciples ask Him about their failure to heal the child—evidently the seven apostles left behind. XIX. "His disciples" occurs several times without anything to divert the mind from the previous meaning. XX. The last journey is begun, and He goes along with the twelve disciples, talking privately to them about the cross. XXI. Two disciples bring the ass; the disciples see the withering of the fig tree. XXIII. Our Lord speaks to the multitude and to His disciples. The old distinction. XXIV. His disciples in private met their Master on Mount of Olives. Who were they but the twelve with whom He spoke in private in chap. xx. XXV. The term is used several times. His disciples are warned of His death; murmur at the anointing of Christ; prepare the passover, and when even had come, sit down with our Lord: "He sat down with the twelve." If several others had shared His privacy all along up till the end, why should they have been suddenly shut out? Capriciousness belongeth not to God. The old distinction comes out clearly; the old principle, understood by all His followers, is carried out at the Last Supper. From verse 17 there can be no doubt that "the disciples" means the apostles. XXVII. Joseph is called a disciple, but had been so only in secret. In verse 16 the climax is reached: Then the eleven disciples went away to the place appointed them and received their commission: "Go ye and teach all nations." Throughout this Gospel there is a manifest difference made between the crowds of casual hearers, the close followers—such as His mother and other women—disciples in various places—as Joseph of Arimathea—and the well-known body of disciples called and ordained to be with the Master. The mind is constantly forced to dwell upon this distinction, until directed in unmistakable language to the apostolic band as the only recipients of the great commission. The point is not that there were never any but the twelve present, but that the attention is regularly drawn to a particular company known as the twelve, the disciples, and the eleven.

PERPLEXITY.

Justice to Rome.

SIR,—Allow me space once more to reply to Rev. F. J. B. Allnatt's letter in your issue of the 9th inst. on "Justice to Rome," also on same subject from the Rev. J. Creighton. While "being at the disadvantage now of two rev. gentlemen to one layman, as this is all I can lay claim to be, and not a brother rev. as the Rev. Mr. Allnatt kindly styles me—yet with even this odds against me I am pleased to continue this important subject, for it will all tend through your valuable paper to draw out points connected with Anglican Church history on which there is a great want of knowledge, especially with the youth of the Church in Canada, and which is so essential, if they are to be held to a true and faithful allegiance to the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, in these days of religious rivalry and man-made churches, and with much of our own teaching as tending to inculcate the idea that one Church is as good as another; and the privilege of being a member of the Catholic Church is neither understood or appreciated. To whether my rev. friends are right in their historical contentions or not, this controversy in either case will go to prove that the Church of England has all the essential qualifications and Apostolic succession to make her a true branch of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. I am, with your correspondents, fully prepared to do "justice to Rome" for any part she may have taken with other Catholic Churches in organizing and re-establishing the British Church—after the partial overthrow of it in the British Isles, at the invasion by the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles—for before this period Rome had taken no part in the conversion of Britain. While we may desire to do justice to Rome, we should not do an injustice to the early British Church by giving to Rome more credit than is due to her—as her work has only been in part with other branches of the

Catholic Church, nor does Church history warrant it, that she should be considered as the founder of the Church of England. For we might blot Rome out of our history and there would yet remain with us a full and perfect order of succession of our Bishops from Apostolic days, and with all the essentials for a true Catholic Church—equal to that of Rome herself. I have met with this idea somewhere, that well illustrates Rome's position in England: "It is as if you allowed a lodger about the same age as yourself to occupy a room in your house, and, lo! he suddenly claimed to be, not only the owner of the house, but also your own father." The Rev. F. J. B. Allnatt in his last put four propositions in answer to mine; space will not allow my quoting them in full in replying. In the first he says: "*The British Church was literally stamped out by the Saxon invasion*—after a continued struggle it was driven (not stamped out) into Wales, Cornwall and Cumberland, where the Church survived, and has continued without a break until the present day—taking its full share with the Irish and Scotch Churches in the conversion of the parts of Britain overrun by the Jutes, Saxons, etc., forming the seven little kingdoms of the Heptarchy. After a fair and impartial study of the various sources by which these different parts of the Heptarchy were converted, it will be found that Rome's part in this work was but small compared with the other Churches named. In the 3rd, he states when Augustine arrived there were no Bishops in England at all, except Luidhard; in point of fact this is not correct, for all the Bishops driven out by the Saxons were still in the British Isles, except those who fled to Gaul, and if it is fair to suppose that the coming of Augustine, when only a monk, was equivalent to establishing an Italian hierarchy, is it not fairer to conclude that Theodore's action in his selection of Bishops to fill the vacant and new sees from the monasteries founded by the old British Church, and not in any way from Rome, together with his acknowledgment of being Archbishop of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and also determined to allow no outside interference, all combined was most certainly a continuance of the ancient Christianity of Britain, and further, when—by degrees—the Scotch, Irish and British (or Welsh) agreed to recognize the primacy of Canterbury, it was only on the understanding that this did not include the right of the Pope to interfere. Space will not allow me to dwell on the fourth proposition, but there is much in it that from my standpoint might fairly be disputed. I note only one, "*That to Rome we habitually trace the succession of our Bishops*," and I note also in part of a quotation—"As to obligations of our English nation to the great Pope who took pity on the religious desolation of our fathers, and to Augustine as his agent." From this it appears it required nearly 500 years to stir the bowels of compassion of Rome towards poor, heathen Britain. What a comparison to her compassion for us in this nineteenth century, when so actively employed in trying to convert the true and free Catholic Church of England back to the thralldom of Papacy. This from an address in Baltimore, Md., by Rev. Stuart Crockett, will suit us: "It is not too much to say that the Roman system in England is intrusive and schismatical, according to the principles laid down by St. Paul and the Canons of the General Councils"—so while some so strongly advocate "*justice to Rome*," this, and such like, has ever been the kind of justice that she has meted out to the English Church. One quotation from the Rev. W. J. Creighton and I will trespass no further; he says, "Neither can I see that it appears humiliating to admit the debt we owe to her. She was then a pure, as well as Apostolic branch of the Catholic Church." Query—was she this pure Church when she commenced her Italian Missions with us, with her Popes claiming the Divine right as the supreme head of the Universal Church. I trust you will not consider that I am presuming on your liberality of space to correspondents—but know you will make allowance for me, as I have two clerics on my hands at one time. Yours etc., W. J. IMLACH.

London, Ont., May 13th, 1895.

The Prayer Book and Shortened Services.

SIR,—The pivotal difficulty in Mr. Wright's understanding the authority claimed for the Prayer Book appears to be the passage in Mr. Leith's edition of Blackstone's Commentaries, in which the learned editor quite rightly points out that inasmuch as Canada was acquired by a treaty of cession, only so much of the English Common and Statute Law would be in force as was specifically imposed by the Crown, or adopted by legislation after the grant of a representative assembly. If therefore the proposition were that the Church as an establishment, with the Statutes of Supremacy and Uniformity, formed part of the law of the land, it would have to be maintained either by virtue of some Royal proclamation or ordinance prior to the grant of the constitution, or by some provincial statute after such grant. The framers of the instructions to early Governors would