

is, I apprehend, too well known and very deeply felt.

I now refer to the Ecclesiastical as well as the Religious utility of singing classes. Here, I think, we shall learn a lesson of Ecclesiastical Economy. As a religious organization, we undoubtedly have within our borders many young people, (for I have special reference to the *young*) who have, more or less, a faculty for music.

Such being the case, it will follow, either that such faculty will not be utilized in a religious way, or too often that it will be utilized by some religious organization, for its benefit, if we do not endeavour to do so, for *our own*. That many young people have in this way been alienated from us, is not merely a matter of theory. It is well known that some other bodies have made the theory, as well as the practice of vocal music, a matter of careful attention. Most of the books for singing schools are published and prepared by them; so also of the music for Sunday schools. By this means they have made the singing class, to a large extent, a recruiting agency for their organization.

Hence, both from the Religious and from the Ecclesiastical standpoint we have very strong arguments for the Church singing class. I need not in detail point out its bearing upon the character, (religious and educational) of the singing in our public worship. By this means, all the talent for vocal music in each congregation may and ought to be systematic, early developed and utilized.

I have especial reference to the young people. Such will to a large extent be moulded by association, and upon the same principle that we should make the Bible class an agency both of Religious and Ecclesiastical instruction, so also should we make the singing class an agency both of Secular and Ecclesiastical instruction.

Having as I think sufficiently noticed the importance of the subject in its relation to the Church, I shall now proceed to speak of the *modus operandi*.

I am glad to know that the Toronto Diocesan Synod has so far recognized the importance of the matter herein referred to that it not only has a Committee on Church Music, but also has published a most excellent little book of Chants and Tunes for Congregational use.

I will offer some suggestions as to how the work, so well begun, may be extended. In order to the systematic prosecution of the work it is desirable that such a committee on church music should, through its secretary, encourage fitting teachers of vocal music who adopt it as a profession, and in order both to their interests and those of the Church endeavour to influence the clergy of the Church to form Church singing classes.

Such congregations as desire to secure teachers, should be put in communication with those approved by the committee. The several congregations, through their churchwardens, being financially responsible.

In order to effect the object in view of the hearty, energetic efforts of the clergy, especially will be necessary, and their efforts

must at least *precede* any action by the Lay officers of the Church.

Further, in order to any competent success, such corporate action as is here supposed by the Synod is all-important, and that such action be heartily supported by a Pastoral from the Bishop. I have considered the subject with special reference to young people of any age to attend the Bible or Confirmation class, and the influence of both conjointly upon them, for their benefit and that of the Church, is not only patent to the mind, but is also a matter of experience.

I will not further extend my remarks, but will conclude, by expressing the hope that the Synod of Toronto will push the enterprise so laudably begun, by enlarging the Chant and Tune Book, so as to make it suitable not alone for use in public worship but also in the singing school.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—If "Halifax" will send us news we shall be glad to insert it.

## Contributions.

### THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH—WHICH IS IT?

#### LETTER XVI.

To Rev. T. Witherow, Prof. Church History Londonderry.

MY DEAR SIR.—We have seen that the Christian Church always possessed a Ministry in three orders referred to in Holy Writ by the names *Apostles*, *Presbyters* sometimes called *Bishops* and *Deacons*; but in all after ages known as *Bishops*, *Priests* or *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*. My present object is to find out if possible in what respect those orders differed from each other.

That the Apostles as such possessed supreme power and authority in the Church, I believe none will deny; at least you will not, as on page 20 of your little work you very clearly and correctly explain the relative position of the Apostolic Ministry, in the words "The Apostolic office included all the others and a Bishop or Elder had the right to act as a Deacon so long as his doing so did not impede the due discharge of duties peculiarly his own. A deacon on the other hand had no right to exercise the office of a Bishop nor had a Bishop any authority to take on him the duties of an Apostle; each superior office included all below it."

The work of the ministry may be divided into the following parts. 1st. Offering up the prayers and thanksgivings of the congregation. 2nd. Preaching the word. 3rd. Exercising discipline or using the power of the keys. 4th. The power of "Laying on of hands" in confirmation and ordination.

As to the first and second parts of the work of the ministry it is universally admitted that the Apostles and the Presbyters possessed the power to do both. That the Deacons possessed this authority both Presbyterians and Independents deny. On the contrary, I maintain that Deacons as such have done and may do both.

This matter I have referred to before but will supplement what is there said by a few facts. The Deacons we must remember were *ordained* to that order by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. Ordination you define to be "the solemn designation of a person to ecclesiastical office with the laying on of hands" (p. 32) Worcester's definition is "the act of investing a man with ministerial or sacerdotal power." Webster defines it as "the act of conferring Holy Orders or sacerdotal power." While all these are correct so far as they go I must be pardoned if I prefer my own definition which is this "the act of conferring spiritual functions upon a man by the laying on of the hands of those in whom that power is vested by our Lord's appointment." This I believe to be better than the other definitions as it recognizes the fact that the ministry is "a ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 12) not of but to the

people that they are ambassadors for Christ" (2 Cor. v. 20) "Ministers of God" (2 Cor. vi. 4) and Stewards of the Mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1) and not the mere agents of the people. And as this authority to speak or act for God must come from Him alone it must be conveyed to the recipient by the laying on of hands of those to whom is committed the power of conveying or transmitting these spiritual functions. Who and what these persons are we shall see further on.

The DEACONS referred to in Acts vi. then were *ordained* to that order by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. If the functions of the Diaconate were only what you assert them to be, viz. "the charge of temporal concerns and the special duty of ministering to the poor" (p. 21) the question naturally arises, *why then were they ordained?* If the seven were simply the treasurers and distributors of the funds belonging to or contributed by the Church why was it so especially requisite that they should be "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom" (Acts vi. 8) There is a class of men called deacons "among the Presbyterians and I believe among the Independents also whose duties are essentially those you have named but these men are not and *never were* ordained, either *with* or *by* the laying on of hands. Consequently they are not, and cannot be *Scriptural Deacons*; for we have seen that they were so ordained. These men then, have no more right to the name *Deacon*, than have the Churchwardens of an English parish whose duties are exactly similar. To show still further that these so-called deacons are not and were not, at their first appointment, considered to be Ministers in the Church, I will quote from the First Book of Discipline" drawn up by "the Ancient Fathers" of Presbyterianism where we are plainly told that both *ruling elders* and *deacons* were to be *elected yearly*, viz. "Men of the best knowledge judgement and conversation should be chosen for elders and deacons. Their election shall be yearly quhair it may be convenientlie observit \* \* \* It is not necessair to appoynt one public stipend for elders and deacons seeing thei ar changed yearly and may wait upon thair awin vocation with the charge of the kirk." (Ane schort somme of 1st Buik of Discip., sect. vii) It is evident then that these "deacons" like the "ruling elders" were simply a temporary arrangement made by Mr. John Winram, Mr. John Spottiswood, John Willock, Mr. John Douglass, Mr. John Row and John Knox in 1560, to please the people, by giving them through these their lay representatives, which were changed yearly, an opportunity of handling the funds that had been devoted to church uses and thus induce them to accept the new ecclesiastical regime which these six Johns had imported from Geneva. The declaring these two offices to be "perpetuated" in the second book of discipline was clearly an afterthought.

The Scriptural Deacons then were ordained. We know also that it was their duty to minister to the necessities of the poor, but other "secular duty" or "temporal concern." I know not as belonging to the office of a Deacon; nor can you find such either. It will be remembered, also, that the seven then spoken of (Acts vi) are not once called Deacons in Scripture but, as I remarked before, I am willing to recognize them as such. However, where Deacons and their qualifications are referred to in Scripture by their appropriate title we can find not a single line of reference or hint that "serving tables" formed any part of their duty whatsoever. The portions of Scripture where their office is treated of is as follows: "Likewise must the Deacons be grave not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience, and let them first be proved, then let them use the office of a Deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Jesus Christ." (1 Tim. iii. 8, 12) Certainly there is nothing here said about "temporal concerns" or even of their "serving tables." All points directly to ministerial functions similar to those exercised by