

Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the post-office, whether directed in his name or another's, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.
2. If a person orders his paper discontinued, he must pay all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment is made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper is taken from the office or not.
3. In suits for subscriptions, the suit may be instituted in the place where the paper is published, although the subscriber may reside hundreds of miles away.
4. The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers or periodicals from the post-office, or removing and leaving them uncollected, while unpaid, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

The DOMINION CHURCHMAN is Two Dollars a Year. If paid strictly, that is promptly in advance, the price will be one dollar; and in no instance will this rule be departed from. Subscribers at a distance can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper. The Paper is sent until ordered to be stopped. (See above decisions.)

The "Dominion Churchman" is the organ of the Church of England in Canada, and is an excellent medium for advertising—being a family paper, and by far the most extensively circulated Church journal in the Dominion.

Frank Weeden, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS FOR SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

June 5th — FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY
Morning.—Joshua iii. 7 to iv. 15. John xix. 25.
Evening.—Joshua v. 13 to vi. 21, or xxiv. James iii.

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1887.

The Rev. W. H. Wadleigh is the only gentleman travelling authorized to collect subscriptions for the "Dominion Churchman."

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All matter for publication in any number of DOMINION CHURCHMAN should be in the office not later than Thursday for the following week's issue.

THE CHURCH REVIEW ON OBEDIENCE TO THE STATE.—The commitment of Mr. Bell Cox to prison has brought out again the protests of those who, like him, refuse to submit to the law of the State in matters ecclesiastical. The situation is somewhat interesting to find the loftiest of High Churchmen proclaiming the same doctrine as the extreme wing of dissenters. The *Church Review* says: "We churchmen refuse to acknowledge the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council because it is not an ecclesiastical court, and ecclesiastical cases are only able to be carried thither by an oversight in the wording of an Act establishing the Committee as a Court of Appeal. We repudiate Lord Penzance's court, because he has never taken the Church's qualification as Dean of Arches, and in addition sits as judge of a court created by Act of Parliament in the teeth of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. The priests of the Church of England have solemnly promised at their ordination to "minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and Realm hath received the same." Accordingly they are not at liberty to obey any canons passed by Convocation until they have received the sanction of the "Realm," nor are they to obey Parliament without the consent of the Church. There are two parties to the bargain, and one cannot act without or in opposition to the other. A lot of nonsense is talked about obedience to Parliament as long as the Church is established; but for our part we do not know what is meant by being established. It is impossible to

point to any Act of Parliament which established the Church of England, and if by being established people mean that the Bishops sit in the House of Lords, we reply that the Sovereigns of England called the Bishops to their council long before Parliament, in the modern sense of the word, was in existence; while if they mean that the Church is protected in her emoluments by law, the same can be said of all other religious bodies, and that protection we could claim were Mr. Gladstone to return to power at the next general election and disestablish the Church."

ON OBEDIENCE TO BISHOPS.—The *Review* above quoted thus delivers itself in regard to submission to Bishops. Here again we find extremes meeting. In Canada the ultra wing of one school, by way, we suppose, of emphasizing and demonstrating practically its teaching as to the episcopal order being a superfluity not a necessity, has rebelled against the Bishop of Toronto. They are in the same boat as the ultra Ritualists! The *Church Review* says: "A much more serious charge and one which is to be considered with all gravity, is that of obedience to our Bishops. We, of all men, hold the office of a Bishop in high esteem, and are only acting in accordance with Catholic principles when we magnify the episcopal character. How shall we answer the charge of disobeying our Bishops? If by obedience the world means a slavish submission to every whim and fancy of an irresponsible Pope in each diocese, then, as the truest upholders of religious liberty and the sincerest defenders of Catholic principles, we must plead guilty, ay! and must glory in our disobedience. A Bishop must, like every other ruler, govern constitutionally; and when he bids his priests do something that he has no constitutional right to order them to do, it becomes a virtue to resist him, even as St. Paul withstood St. Peter to the face "because he was to be blamed." When Bishops make themselves henchmen of discredited courts and their discredited judgments, when they read a "not" into an Act of Parliament, which is also a decree of Convocation, they ought to be withstood. But when a Bishop acts constitutionally, even if it be with harshness and without justification, not a priest amongst us will resist him. Let us remind the world that in the early days of this miserable persecution a case did once occur of a Bishop acting within his powers, but arbitrarily. All this talk about disobedience to Bishops is "leather and prunella." We will and do obey them when they act constitutionally, however harshly and unjustly, but when they exceed their powers it becomes a sorrowful and painful duty to resist them. It is a matter of standing surprise to us that the strongest opponents of Popery do not see that we are fighting the very battle against encroachments on the part of the State to set itself above God, and of some of the Bishops to make their wills override the laws of the Church, which our forefathers fought against the encroachments of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. To properly constituted authority we are ready and anxious to submit ourselves, to unauthorized claims we shall ever offer the sturdy resistance of free-born Englishmen."

ADDITION TO THE CATECHISM.—The defects of the Catechism are well known, defects of range not of definition. The Canterbury Convocation has taken up the task of supplementing this invaluable teaching manual and has added a Question and Answer as follows:—Q. What meanest thou by the Church? A. I mean the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head and of which I was made a member in my Baptism. Of this Body part is militant here on earth and part at rest in Paradise awaiting the Resurrection." The discussion turned upon the proposal to introduce the words "part of which is visible and part invisible." The folly of this was mercilessly exposed and it was abandoned. The words of one speaker are worth

quoting and worth noting by those who hold the "invisible" theory, of which there is no trace in the *Word of God*.

Archdeacon Norris said he was anxious that the amendment should not pass, since it tended to emphasize the words "visible and invisible Church." That phrase, when it came into vogue, was a mistake. He did not pretend to be very learned in patristic divinity; but, from what he knew of the writings of the Early Fathers, there was no such phrase as that to which he referred to be found in them. In the 16th century a new meaning began to be attached to the words—a meaning unknown to the early Church. This meaning was that the visible Church was the external Church, and that the invisible Church was composed of those known only to God. That came into vogue at the Reformation, when the Reformers had to meet the charge that they were separating from the Church Catholic. Such a charge, if it were made now, would receive a very different reply. The Reformers felt themselves to be separating from the Catholic Church, and they met the feeling by putting a new meaning on the words "visible and invisible." In later times the ancient meaning of the words was restored. In *Scripture sense*, the Kingdom of Christ was intended to be visible; and they could not find in the *New Testament* any reference to the *Invisible Church*. The visible Church was a mingled society of all acknowledged members, but it was meant to be seen, like a city on a hill, or a candle on a candle-stick."

IRREVERENCE NOT SPIRITUAL.—Canon Liddon, preaching at St. Paul's Cathedral, compared primitive with modern Christianity, saying that worship in earlier times was objective, now it was subjective. Taking as his text the words, "Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him." (St. Matt. xxviii. 9). Some endeavour to account for the demeanour adopted by the little band to whom our Lord appeared, by attributing it to a supposed Oriental proneness to that which seems to Western peoples an excess of outward demonstration. This, however, is not a true explanation. Orientals, no doubt, when approaching, or approached by, their rulers are wont to assume an attitude of servile adulation and obsequious submission. But—when away from the influences of the courts which produce this utter prostration of mind and body—they bear themselves much like other people all the world over. And Mary Magdalene and her companions did not hold Him by the feet, and worship Him because they were Orientals, but because they were human. Reverence is a movement of the soul touched by the sense of supernatural majesty. And the absence of the outward signs of reverence betokens the absence of inward reverence. To lounge in an easy chair, or loiter about with the hands in the pockets, during the progress of some elaborate function in the palace of an earthly sovereign would invariably be deemed expressive of disrespectful feelings, inwardly entertained, towards the royal personage. And how can a studiously unconcerned and negligent bearing "in the courts of the Lord's house" be otherwise accounted of? Certainly it does not betoken, and is not justified by the plea, that those who dispense with the external signs of awe are so very spiritual that they do not need to exhibit them. There is nothing specially spiritual in outward irreverence.

Go on in the strength of the Lord, and put Christ's love in the trial; put upon it burdens, and then it will appear love indeed; we have not recourse to His love, and therefore we know it not.

Cold water in the name of a disciple shall be warmed in the hearth in Zion and run to account; nay, it will turn into a more precious liquor than gold potable, and prove more cordial than all earthly treasures.