

mouth and one heart, we may glorify one Godhead in Three Persons, whose saving grace be with you and the flock beloved of God under you.—Of your Reverence highly regarded by us in Christ, the beloved brother in Christ, and most sincere, DIONYSIUS, OF CONSTANTINOPLE, April 30."

LONDON.—*Jubilee Lines by the Way*.—Just returned from Malvern, where the signal rocket is to be shot up at ten o'clock to-night, and visible to watchers ten counties round and flashed on from point to point till it reaches the crags of Shetland and Orkney, across the sea in the north to Land's End in the south, while fires are burning all along the chief mountain ranges in the country. These beacon fires, I am told, have not been lit since the time of the Spanish invasion in Queen Elizabeth's reign. To-day, from the porch of St. Martin's, Trafalgar Square, I saw the procession to and from Westminster, and had a close view of the features of the Queen and those in the procession. It was a grand pageant; most brilliant! The squares and streets of the route resplendent with decorations, the vast multitude as you looked down on them from St. Martin's, the procession with the pomp and majesty of royalty, the glamour of military splendor, the gold of ancient liveries richly dight with the romance of heraldry, the soft sheen of woman's beauty like a tender passion in the heart of the dream of ambition of some imperial soul—like the delicate mediæval fretwork on the marble of the great abbey, the alleluia clash and clang of the bells, the cheers of England from ten thousand throats, the long line of European princes, the subject kings and princes of India in the train of their Empress, all form a scene never to be forgotten.—E. J. F.

## Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

### THE BELL COX CASE.

SIR,—In the issue of the "DOMINION CHURCHMAN" bearing date 30th June, 1887, there appeared an article under the heading "A National Church or Congregationalism?" and over the words—*The Rock*. The article is one calculated to do a good deal of harm, I think. Said article or letter occupies space so near to the place when we look for the "Leading article" of our church paper, that I believe some explanation would do good—I mean explanation as to how such sentiments could get exposition in the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, without any correcting commentary accompanying them. I for one, Mr. Editor, will feel grateful to you, if you will take another look at the article referred to, and then let the public know whether the DOMINION CHURCHMAN endorses or repudiates the only just conclusion which may be drawn from said article. Faithfully yours,

ALEX NESBITT.

As a matter of information to our readers we have already given several quotations from English Church papers bearing upon the Bell Cox case, both sides having had their views represented. In this issue we give a final instalment of this information, by inserting a passage from the *Church Review*, and a wise letter from the Bishop of Lincoln. It is lamentable that the vestments and ritual controversy should be kept open, if these things are lawful they should be declared so without ambiguity, and if unlawful they should be so pronounced beyond all question or doubt. The Liverpool case is regarded in Canada with profound and almost universal indifference, as having no practical application to our affairs here, the State Church of Canada being Romanist, with the ultra-Protestant sects to a large extent as its political allies and supporters. Ed. D. G.

### LOOSE THEOLOGY.

SIR,—The Toronto Synod lately passed a vote of thanks to the Sunday School Committee for their labours and for the great help afforded to teachers by the Institute Leaflets. Probably they were not aware that a country parson had a letter on the stocks pitching into the "loose theology" of the Leaflets, they would not have been so previous with their commendations. As the chairman of the committee did not reply to the letter of "Country Parson,"

perhaps I may be allowed to say that being equally averse with him from wishing to teach "loose theology." I turned up Sadler's Catechist Manual (in which I have considerable confidence) to see what Sadler had to say upon these points. I looked up "The Holy Catholic Church," p. 135. Question 5 caught my eye, as to my astonishment I found the "loose theology" of "Country Parson." "Of what is the Church composed? Of men, women and children, who are baptized into Christ and continue to believe in Him." After reading this question and answer over three times to make quite sure that it was no illusion, I looked to see what edition it was and found that it was the third edition. It is possible that "Country Parson" had long ago detected this "loose theology" and had written to the author and that Prebendary Sadler had corrected his theology in later editions. However this may be, it seems to me that "Country Parson" should now caution the clergy generally how they receive Sadler's Manuals until their theology has been corrected. They have a tremendous circulation, and loose theology is so dangerous. However the main object of "Country Parson" was to show that "The Holy Catholic Church" was not founded by Christ, but "has always been on earth, no one knows exactly when founded." With my confidence in Sadler slightly shaken (I may as well confess it) I looked on till my eye caught the word "Pentecost," and I read question 35, "When was the Church founded? On the day of Pentecost." I rubbed my eyes and looked again! What! said I to myself, is Sadler one of these "modern sectarians of our day who renounce the Old Testament," and "speak of the day of Pentecost" as "the birthday of the Church?" While I was wondering how many children all over the world were imbibing this "loose theology," my eye wandered on to question 38, "By whom was the Church founded? By Christ through the Holy Spirit," the very words of the Leaflet! Undoubtedly there is "loose theology" somewhere! Is it with Sadler, or (pace Country Parson) somewhere else? However it is too much the fashion to follow names. For ought we know, Sadler may be "small and of no reputation," and "Country Parson" may have the greater weight of authority on his side. Now, there is McLean; he is a tolerably sound theologian, and his Catechism is very widely taught. True, I have only the 2nd edition of 1868, nineteen years ago, and possibly he may have straightened his theology since then, but undoubtedly he then taught (p. 55) that the "Church was founded on the day of Pentecost through the preaching of the Apostle Peter after the descent of the Holy Ghost." The section is headed "Foundation of the Church," which seems to show that McLean does not see that subtle distinction between "building" the Church and "founding" the Church which fills the vision of a "Country Parson."

Feeling sure that your correspondent was not merely asserting a truism, that God always has had a people on the earth, but that he must have some ground for holding that the Holy Catholic Church of the Apostles' Creed was founded "no one knows exactly when," and that Christ has always been its Head and High Priest, and that Abraham and St. John the Baptist both belonged to it, though in that case I am at a loss to understand why "he that is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he." I looked into the subject a little further, as my small library permitted. I found that Dean Goulbrow speaks of the Church as a "new society," and says that our blessed Lord founded a society as well as taught a religion and promised to be with the rulers of it even to the end of the world." Next I turned to Holmes' very excellent "Catechist Manual," with the imprimatur of S. Oscon. Then under this article (of the Holy Catholic Church) I find the following statement as to the meaning of the Church. "In the Creed it must be held to signify that Church Jesus Christ came on earth to found," and he refers to St. Matt. xvi. 18, (as the Leaflet does) about Christ building His Church, and further, "In agreement with the Saviour's declaration, His Church was founded on the day of Pentecost. Next I looked into Blunt's key to the Church Catechism, and I find him saying that the Church is "called Apostolic because it was founded by the Apostles," and that "baptized persons continue to be members of the Holy Catholic Church, if not separated from it by great wickedness (the case by the way of the Prodigal Son) or by wilful heresy or schism."

All this may be very "loose theology," "unscriptural" and "dangerous;" but at least it shows that the Leaflet does not stand alone. Little's reasons for being a Churchman is having a great run at present. Perhaps "Country Parson" has met with it. Let him turn to p. 22 and he will read: "The first thing to be proved is that Christ founded a Church, which still exists. That He did found a Church with a self-perpetuating ministry, with definite faith, and with sacraments and ordinances, has been shown from His own words and His own acts." And He quotes the text, "I will build My Church," as "a prophecy of

the foundation of the Church, of its endless duration, and of the name by which it should be called." Again he says, "A still clearer view of the origin of the Church will be obtained if we notice the steps which Christ took to found and organize it." (The italics are mine) If I might venture to quote Newman, though with fear and trembling as the easy charge of Romanism might be flung at me as at the Leaflet, I would refer to his sermon for Tuesday in Whitsun Week as supporting the Leaflet in its teaching. "Christ preached that the Kingdom of God was at hand;" (then it was not yet set up). "He founded it, made Peter and the other Apostles His viceregents in it after His departure." Lastly, I find Canon Liddon in his famous sermon on Episcopacy saying of the Apostles that "they alone were privileged to found the Church of Christ, and while founding it, to exercise a world wide jurisdiction." Liddon is not usually charged with "loose theology."

No doubt there is a true sense in which the Church from first to last is one, holy men of old believing in Christ who was to come, and the Christian Church believing in Christ who has come, and both the Jewish and the Christian Churches make up the one people of God. But to say that the Jewish Church and the Christian Church are essentially the same, seems to me a misuse of terms. The word Church is distinctive of the New Covenant. It does not once occur in the Old Testament. It is used to describe a totally new thing, viz., the Body of which Christ is the Head, and which being formed of His Humanity could not have its being until the Incarnation. The Church, which is His Body, was the creation of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost:—

"It is His New Creation  
By Water and the Word."

And was not in existence until that day. On the evening of Pentecost there were in Jerusalem, two churches—the ancient Jewish and that which was the Body of Christ formed by the Holy Ghost. A member of the Jewish Church was not *ipso facto* a member of the new Society. He had to pass from one to the other by submitting to a new rite of initiation. Not until he was "added to the Church" could a Jew become a member of it. How then could Abraham and John the Baptist be members of the Church of Christ?

Equally "unscriptural and dangerous," and novel, too, does the statement seem to me that Christ always was the Head and High Priest of the Jewish Church. Surely, this is to ignore the Incarnation as modern sectarians and sundry others also do. I have been taught that every High Priest is taken from among men and that our Lord's qualification for that office was that "He was made like unto His brethren." I have also been taught that the Headship of Christ was a result of His Incarnation and session at the right Hand of God. Eph. i. 20-22.

As to the statement of the Leaflet evidently adopted from Sadler that the Church is composed of baptized persons who continue to believe in Christ, it seems to me a careful statement of the truth. Persons are baptized on a profession of faith. As long as they profess the faith they must be counted as members of the Church. The prodigal son is not a case in point. His is the case of a professing Christian, living an immoral life. But what about Bradlaugh and others such who have been baptized and have abjured the faith. Are they to be counted as composing the Church or Body of Christ? I am, yours

July 1, 1887.

A CITY PARSON.

## SKETCH OF LESSON.

6TH. SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

JULY 17TH, 1887.

### THE GRAVES OF LUST.

Passage to be read.—Numbers xi. 4-6, 30-35.

Last Sunday we saw Israel starting from Sinai, one year and two months after their leaving Egypt. They were on their way to Kadesh in the wilderness of Paran (ch. xiii. 26), a journey of eleven days (Deut. 1, 2). The journey was difficult and after three days of it they began to murmur. They soon forgot His works (Ps. cvi. 13), instead of trusting Him Who had led them safely so far. See to-day their punishment.

1.—*The Desire Indulged*.—We saw in lesson xi. that a number of Egyptians (probably of the lowest class) had joined the Israelites on their departure from Egypt. The mixed multitude now proved the proverb (1 Cor. xv. 33). "Evil communications corrupt good manners." They induced the Children of Israel to join them in grumbling at the food which God had provided for them. Israel knew that God had promised (Exod. xxxiii. 3) to bring them into a land flowing with milk and honey. They should have known that His promise was sure (Numb. xxiii. 19, Mal. iii. 6); but instead of keeping this firmly fixed in their minds, they, too, began to look back to the variety of food with which Egypt had provided them