

patriot of the time of Epiphany, it can no longer be described as inspired unless this title is consistent with a lack of natural veracity, and it would be difficult to maintain the authority of our Lord as a teacher of spiritual truth, considering he largely based His claim on the Messiahship, on a prophecy which the Book of Daniel contains. (Liddon, Preciousness of the Divine Law.) When the Doctor gives us a few samples of the allegorical method, and presses them upon our attention, he seems to me to have strangely missed his way. The allegorical method is an old one, but what produced it? It was the desire to defend and not to undermine the real inspiration of Scripture, and none are more severe upon this method than advocates of the Higher Criticism.

"Finding in Homer lines that seemed unworthy and morally reprehensible, the Stoic allegorists made no allowance for difference of time which separates the earlier from the later ages, &c.," and again speaking of Origen as a type of allegorists, we read, "Having started with the assumption that every clause of the Bible was infallible and divinely dictated, and having proved to his own satisfaction that it could not be intended in its literal sense, he proceeds to systematise his own false conclusions," viz., in the allegorical method. (See Bampton Lectures, 1885.) All this was to defend the authenticity and genuineness of the books of Scripture; it may or it may not have been a legitimate way of doing it, but the question of the legitimacy of the allegorical method has nothing to do with the question between Dr. Bedford-Jones and Doctor Roe, for that is the question of the authenticity of certain books of Scripture. Liddon (no mean authority) claims that the questions of authenticity and inspiration are so bound up together as to fall or stand together.

Of course, having read Gore's essay in *Lux Mundi* and his lectures on "The Incarnation," one would not feel disposed to question for a moment his belief in the supernatural origin of our Holy Faith: but this is not a question as to Gore's orthodoxy as to the central point of our faith, the Incarnation; it is another question altogether, viz., one of Biblical Criticism: and because a man is right on the central point of Faith, it does not follow that he is right on every other, much less is it a reason why every clergyman in Canada is to take no interest, or at least express no opinion, after Gore has spoken. My letter is long; it has been written not to defend or attack one or other side in this controversy, but simply as a protest against one bitter sentence which the Doctor has been misled into using as a controversial weapon.

The exhibition of a spirit such as that sentence contains has a tendency to draw men (otherwise disinclined) towards the position of Goldwin Smith's book on Canada. If the spirit of a dependent colony, and I may add, of a dependent church, is to crush all independence of thought and expression, all self-respect out of us Canadian clergy, then most of us have inherited from our old English fathers a dangerous something that might take fire. As a man I am conscious of being saturated with English feeling, but yet it seems to me that the true mark of the Church of Christ in Canada should not be so much Anglicanism as Catholicism.

WM. BEVAN.

Mount Forest.

P.S.—I must guard myself against being misunderstood by stating as regards the authenticity of the books of the Bible—that the Epistle to the Hebrews, very generally acknowledged by critics of the Church of England as not St. Paul's, stands on a different footing to the other books in this controversy, because the text of the Hebrews does not claim it for St. Paul.

W. B.

Is it Usual?

SIR,—On a recent Friday evening I found myself at Sudbury, in the Diocese of Algoma, and it was with a feeling of real pleasure that I went to church, knowing that his Lordship the Bishop of Algoma was to administer the rite of Confirmation. But fancy my astonishment when I found the Bishop, without a word of apology or explanation, proceed to administer that Apostolic rite without his robes or even a surplice!

Now, I am well aware that the essence of the rite is not affected either by the presence or absence of robes, and that his Lordship might even have taken off his coat and rolled up his sleeves, and still, to all intents and purposes, the rite would not have been affected. Yet how unseemly did it all appear to find a bishop, without a word of explanation, proceed to administer this, under ordinary circumstances, most impressive rite!

I must confess, Mr. Editor, that to me at least, notwithstanding his Lordship's able and eloquent sermon, the whole service seemed wanting in something, shall we call it "decency and order?"

The priest in charge was habited as a priest should be, in cassock, surplice and stole, because the Church

expects obedience from her priests. Can less be expected from her bishops?

Kindly let me know, Mr. Editor, if this is usual with bishops in Canada, or is it peculiar to the Bishop of Algoma alone?

J. M. WILLIS.

Money.

SIR,—Seldom has it been my lot to take up a paper containing more interesting and important items than those in one of your late issues; and on just one of those items I would for a moment comment, it being referred to several times in the paper mentioned, and being the one represented by the title of this letter. We want money that we may carry on God's work; we want more that we may be more successful. But the converse proposition is true as well; we want more success in order to gain more money; good work well recorded opens the purse-strings of God's people; and we are thus thrown back on the question, Which are the roads to success; or what are the hindrances to the spread and spirituality of the Church? Now it will be conceded that what pays at first does not always pay in the long run, that through apparent failure at the start the foundations of future good are often laid; and then that no institution can in the long run flourish without considerable adherence to its own first principles; we can insure higher blessings only by holding to the articles of war, following the tactics the great Captain of our salvation laid down for us. And now let it be asked, how do we hear the generality of people speak of these things? Is not the glib phrase almost always, "So-and-so was most successful," or "was not so?" Is it not infinitely more rare to hear, "So-and-so did his duty bravely," or "did not do it?" Yet surely success in the long run is obtained only through the performance of duty; surely outward success gained through the breach or omission of duty is essential failure. And what is the necessary condition, humanly speaking, enabling the clergy to do their duty boldly? Not only must we have bold speakers, not only the right men rightly trained and in possession of the necessary tools to carry on their work, but they must be also in the right position? What is that position? Is it not that they should know they have the backing of the Church, and that they have this, not according as they are said to be successful or the contrary, for success is not to be the direct or chiefest aim, but according as they fulfil their higher duties; not according as they preach to order and obtain a crowd; but according as they deliver their message unadulterated and free from mutilation, acting of course correspondingly; not saying this to please Mr. J., nor avoiding the necessary teaching lest it give offence to Mrs. G., but steadily putting forth sound doctrine of a concrete, as well as of an abstract, kind? Now, in the cities one may be offended, but another drawn by the same sermon; but in country places how often is a cleric utterly dependent on pleasing just one congregation, clique, or even perhaps one individual man or woman! one over whom the Church exercises no control whatever may possibly have the greatest say in choosing, upholding, curbing or removing an incumbent just as he, the former, may seem fit; while in some parishes the discipline recognized as necessary in a club for boating or football is beyond the power of the Church authorities to exercise. Different congregations form the most opposite notions as to the ideal of what a clergyman should be; money or eloquence, birth or learning, piety or pliability may either be the thing most sought for in a given case; and this dependent position of the clergy must in the long run have a grave effect upon the members and the class of men who seek the priesthood. Ere doing so, one asks himself: Shall I be able to thus support my family, or shall I be placing myself in the position of him who has denied the faith and is worse even than the infidel himself? And the more honourable and conscientious the man, the more likely would he be to say that he could never swerve from duty in searches after success or aims to please. In the United States, I believe in almost every diocese, it has been found necessary to form a committee of laymen, as well as clerics, to aid the bishop in placing out the clergy, in order that separate congregations may not, as if infallible, have the sole choice and handling of their pastor. I do not argue either in favor of the plan nor yet against it, only I say, if we would wish the progress of the Church in country places should be commensurate with the growth she makes in cities, something must be done (this seems our most pressing need) to alter the terribly dependent position of our clergy, and give them more support in rightful action.

C. J. S.

—It is not what its proprietors say, but what Hood's Sarsaparilla does, that makes it sell, and wins the confidence of the people.

Sunday School Lesson.

1st Sunday after Easter.

April 24, 1892.

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I. THE CHURCH IS ONE.

The Bible tells us of but one Church made up of many members. (1 Cor. xii. 13-14.) True, mention is made of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, etc. (Acts viii. 1; xiii. 1; xx. 17); but these were only branches of the one "Vine," and, though scattered, preserved their unity, continuing steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship (Acts ii. 42.) Our Lord's prayer for His followers was that they might be one (St. John xvii. 20-21.) Where is that unity now? Everywhere we see Christians, instead of presenting an unbroken front to the enemy, turning their weapons against their fellow Christians, like the Midianites of old (Judges vii. 22.) How can the Church march on victoriously, witnessing for Christ in all the world (Acts i. 8), when her children spend so much time and strength in quarrels among themselves? Even in our Canadian branch of the Catholic Church, where all hold the same doctrines, and side by side in the churches repeat the same creeds and grand old prayers, there are at least two parties struggling to overcome, not the enemy, but each other. When an army is divided against itself there is not much cause for the enemy to fear, but see the danger to itself (St. Luke xi. 17.) True, there were parties even in the time of the Apostles, and yet the Church did go forward and conquer, and does yet; but St. Paul does not seem to think the party spirit anything but an unmixed evil, and reproves it sternly (1 Cor. i. 10-13; ii. 3-4.) In spite of divisions the Nicene declares the Church to be one—there is to be one flock under one Shepherd (St. John x. 16, revised version), all are baptized by one Spirit into one Body (1 Cor. xii. 13), have all one faith and one hope (Eph. iv. 3-5)—let us all try "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

II. THE CHURCH IS HOLY.

The Church is holy, being the mystical Bride of Christ. If an unbelieving wife is sanctified by a believing husband (1 Cor. vii. 14), surely Christ sanctifies His Bride, the Church, (Eph. v. 25-27.)

Again, its members are holy, being members of Christ, the Holy One (Eph. v. 30); they are also holy, being temples of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.) St. Paul writes to the "saints" at Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, etc., although he reproves them for many sins.

The Church must always consist of good and bad members until Christ comes to sift the chaff from the wheat. He has forbidden any attempt to separate the tares and wheat (St. Matthew xiii. 28, 29.) The "net" contains bad fish as well as good, and always will, until the end of the world (47-49.) The "vine" has unfruitful as well as fruitful branches. Let us take care of our own conduct lest we be "cast out and withered" (St. John xv. 2-6.)

III. CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC.

The Church is called "Catholic," i. e., "universal," because it is not confined to one place or people, but is for all the world. It is the great bond of union intended to "join all nations"; "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11.) The Jewish Church was not catholic, being confined to one people; but the Christian Church received a commission to "make disciples of all the nations" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19, R. ver.) The religion of Christ is fitted to supply the needs of all classes of people, black and white, rich and poor, ignorant and learned. All need their Saviour, and never can be satisfied until they find Him, although many do not know it; unlike the Greeks, who came, saying, "we would see Jesus" (St. John xii. 20-21.) The word "Catholic" does not mean Roman Catholic, as a great many people seem to think. Some people seem to think the word has a Sunday and a weekday meaning. On Sundays, they profess to believe in the Catholic Church, while all the rest of the week they utterly repudiate the name of Catholic. Let us remember, once for all, that the word is not a party badge, but the ancient and honorable title of the whole Church, and that the English, American, Greek, and other branches, claim their share in it.

2. The Church is Apostolic, being "built on the foundations of the Apostles" (Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). She still, as at first, continues "steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42, R. V.) She still "contends earnestly for the faith" which was once for all delivered by the Apostles into her keeping (St. Jude 3.) She still holds fast the ancient "form of sound words" which we call the Apostles' Creed. Her Bishops and other clergy are still ordained by the Apostolic laying on of hands, the chain being unbroken between our Bishops and the Apo-