

THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

(NEW SERIES.)

VOL. II.]

TORONTO, DECEMBER, 1883.

[No. 12.]

EDITORIAL JOTTINGS.

OUR American friends are certainly ingenious in having their own way; here is an example: In the New York courts a suit was entered by the nephew of a woman, who died intestate. During life she had placed in the hands of a friend some money, to be expended after her death in masses for her soul. As administrator, her nephew sued for the money. In England such legacies would be declared void on the general ground of superstition, religion being definitely fixed by the State; but in the United States no special form of religion is recognized by law, therefore such legacies are valid. Here, however, there was no will, and the nephew was administrator. Was it a trust? Not a charitable one, seeing a personal interest was sought—not a pious use, seeing the law knows no such piety. It was therefore, neither a trust for a gift, nor a deed. The person to be benefited was dead, or if alive, as Christianity teaches, is where she is not subject to the jurisdiction of the court, nor can she make her present wishes known. The money must, therefore, be disposed of according to the laws of the State, and, therefore, was ordered to the nephew as the next of kin and legal administrator—Q.E.F.

IN the *Catholic Presbyterian* for October, an editorial sentence reads thus "In fact Mr. Hatch, in a historical sense, is more favourable to presbytery than episcopacy, *admitting that presbytery was the primitive government of the church*, and episcopacy a subsequent development." The italics are ours and we comment thereon. Edwin Hatch, M.A., is a finished English scholar, a justly esteemed clergyman of the Church of England, and author of one series of Bampton Lectures. His opinions, therefore, demand respectful attention at least, and when those opinions seem contrary to the tradition of the church in which

he is an acknowledged leader, we may presume that they have been reached neither hastily nor without good reason. Our respected friend, Dr. Blackie, the editor of the *Catholic Presbyterian*, seems to think that Mr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures admit Presbyterianism as the form of polity of the primitive church. Dr. Blackie is welcome to all the comfort he finds in those lectures of Mr. Hatch. We might congratulate him on his excellent Congregationalism—for here is some of Mr. Hatch's primitive "Presbyterianism": "In the course of the second century the custom of meeting in representative assemblies began to prevail among the Christian communities. There were points of practice, for example, the time of keeping Easter, on which it was desirable to adopt a common line of action; there were questions as to Christian teaching—for example, those which grew out of Montanism—on which individual churches were divided, and on which they consequently desired to consult with their neighbours. At first these assemblies were more or less informal. Some prominent and influential bishop *invited* a few neighbouring communities to confer with his own. The result of such a conference was expressed sometimes in a resolution, sometimes in a letter addressed to other churches. It was a rule for such letters to be received with respect, for the sense of brotherhood was strong, and the causes of alienation were few. But so far from such letters having any binding force on other churches, not even the resolutions of the conference were binding on a dissentient minority of the members. Whether this more correctly designates the orderings of a Presbytery or a Synod which are supposed to bind all, or the recommendations of a Congregational council we leave our readers to determine. At any rate, if the editor of the *Catholic Presbyterian* accepts such as the Presbyterianism of his heart and practice—well we may as well join hands.