

42-55. Fourteen times is He said to have been touched efficaciously for healing. Surely all this means that in the holy humanity of our Lord lies our salvation; and we believe that IT still touches us.

56. The Apostles and other believers were encouraged to lay hands on the sick for their recovery.

57. The Apostles anointed the sick—a "tactical" act.

58. S. James exhorts the sick to seek this anointing, which some think too "tactical" to be Christian.

59. Our Lord "breathed on" His Apostles—which too, was tactical, as we can be touched in other ways than by the hand.

60. Christ's last act was to "lift up His hands" in blessing His Apostles, as He ascended into heaven. That instance of the honour of the hand its place in religion, can the Church ever ungratefully forget?

61. Christ, "the Living One," in the vision of the Apocalyptic, "laid His right hand" on the tranced Apostle, who is careful to note the manner of the touch, with the "right hand." In such a Presence how ill-timed the scorn of the "tactical," but how logical from the stand point assumed!

62. At Pentecost the "cloven tongues sat upon each of them"—consecrating "the tactical" for evermore.

63. Peter, in healing the lame man at "the gate of the Temple called Beautiful," took him "by the right hand." The constant mention of the right hand might really suggest right views of this matter.

64. Ananias laid his hands on Saul to recover his sight.

65. The handkerchiefs and aprons brought from Paul to the sick wrought "tactually" and successfully.

66-68. The Laying on of Hands, the scriptural designation of the Ecclesiastical Confirmation, was universal in the Church, being part of "the Foundation;" it is three times expressly mentioned; and it lends itself quite as easily to evangelical scorn as "tactical" ordination.

69, 70. It is surely impossible to forget, and it ought to be impossible to slight, two most sacred things, which are therefore most awfully open to this too easy form of spirituality—the scorn of the "tactical": they are the two most blessed sacraments, which from childhood we have been taught to believe are "generally necessary to salvation." I will not trust myself to expatiate on this special topic. I will only say that all these examples of touch, by the hand, by the right hand, are surely a clear recognition of our connexion, religiously, with this material world, of our place in it, of the instrumental character of the body, of the fact that "soul and body is one man;" and, above all, it is the recognition of the never-to-be-forgotten Incarnation, which brightens creation to the eye of faith, and brings out the original impress of the Creator on all His works. And with these facts before us, we need not be surprised to learn that the "tactical" has one more function to discharge in the perpetuation of the Church of God. So we shall continue our examination a little further, and see whether Dean Alford and Wycliffe Hall are infallibly directed in finding "no trace of tactical succession in the New Testament."

71. And first, though not chronologically, we find the Apostles "laid their hands on" the seven chosen as Deacons. That is not an unpromising beginning.

72. Under the direction and at the command of the Holy Ghost, the prophets and teachers at Antioch, who according to the lately discovered *Didache*, were probably the highest officials of the Church, "laid hands upon Barnabas and Saul," sending them to their mission work—whether by ordination or by way of blessing I need not stay to decide.

73. In 1 Tim. iv. 14, we find, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Here is clearly a transmission, a descent of the ministerial character by "tactical succession."

74. In 1 Tim. v. 22, we read, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," i.e., be not hasty to ordain—and by "tactical succession."

75. In 2 Tim. i. 6, S. Paul says to Timothy, "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Very few have ever doubted that this refers to Timothy's ordination as a minister of the Church; and with these instances just quoted before us, it seems nothing short of an audacious folly to affirm that there is "no trace" in the New Testament of the transmission of the ministry by what is so irreverently nick-named "tactical succession."

I shall now quote John Calvin on the Laying on of Hands in Ordination, as with those who favour novelties in religion he is of more authority than fifteen or eighteen centuries of Christian testimony: "It is clear that the Apostles used no other ceremony

in putting anyone into the ministry than imposition of hands. This was the accustomed rite as often as they called any one to the ecclesiastical ministry. So they consecrated pastors and doctors, and deacons as well. And although there is no specific command for the laying on of hands, yet we see that the Apostles had this evermore in use, and that careful observation of theirs ought to be to us in lieu of a command. . . . If the Spirit of God has instituted in the Church nothing in vain, we shall understand that this ceremony, since it has proceeded from Him, is not a useless one, provided it be not turned to superstitious abuse."—*Institutes*, Bk. iv., c. 16. I suppose Dean Alford and those who follow his most meagre authority in the English Church, regard as a "superstitious abuse" the belief that we are bound by Apostolic example and the unvarying tradition of the Christian Church. If so, let them advocate the abolition of the laying on of hands, and try to persuade the Christian world (if they can) that this ritual departure from Apostolic practice is a less abuse than the belief that has sprung from it.

I am now pretty well assured that plain, honest people, who have no factious views to maintain, will readily admit and stoutly maintain that when S. Paul says to Timothy (2nd Ep. ii. 2), "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," he meant that Timothy was to ordain faithful and competent ministers by the "laying on of hands;" and that plain, honest readers of their Bible will see in the examples adduced a very clear "trace" of Apostolic mind and purpose; that the Christian ministry was to be continued by successive ordination from generation to generation by the hands of those who had themselves authority to ordain—or, in other words, by "Tactical Succession"; and, inasmuch as it is absolutely impossible to depart from this practice in our English Church, without a revolution that would leave no English Church, it does seem not only sinful, but insane, to raise quarrels and maintain them where no practical end is in view, and no real good can be attained. While we are agreed in practice, why not hold our several opinions in peace, without mutual irritation and insult? The guilt of such strife seems terrible.

JOHN CARRY.

Port Perry, August, 1890.

Dean Carmichael and his Church of England Teaching.

SIR.—You are aware, Mr. Editor, that the Very Rev. the Dean of Montreal has issued a 16-page pamphlet, entitled, "Church of England Teaching." This brochure presumably receives diocesan endorsement, for a copy has been sent from the synod office to every cleric in the diocese.

At first reading one cannot but feel thankful that this teaching has received such endorsement. It would be well for this diocese if the teaching in these pages regarding the Church of England and her position, baptism and its privileges, were as clearly enunciated everywhere. It is supposed to emanate from an Evangelical, and receives the endorsement of an Evangelical Bishop, and yet what it teaches here, on the points above given, was bitterly opposed by the same party not many years ago. The doctrine is practically High Church doctrine. It is Prayer Book doctrine, doubtless, but the contention of the so-called High Church party (if party it can be called) was, as it is still, that they were the fair exponents of the Prayer Book teaching. And one is led to say, if this is Evangelical, then many who are looked askance at because they are known as High Church, teach no other doctrine. Certainly not as regards baptism and the ministry. The latter he makes continuous as to the three orders, up to Apostolic times; and the former as admission of children, as well as adults, into the family of God, &c. I need not reproduce the Dean's language, which, I may say by the way, is chiefly culled from the Prayer Book itself, and which will satisfy, methinks, all High Churchmen. It satisfies me.

But there is an obscure, if not a weak page or two in it—pages 11 and 13. On page 11 we have confirmation treated of. This is weak, because nothing is said about the gifts of the Holy Spirit that are conferred. The rite is treated as wholly subjective. But the weakest part, weak perhaps because somewhat obscure, is that on the Holy Communion. The obscurity arises (I fancy) from the author's over-anxiety to be very safe. Let me quote: "This 'veritable' and 'spiritual' reception of the body and blood of Christ [by the way, I ask, why did not the Dean put capitals to 'Body' and 'Blood' as it is in the Prayer Book throughout?] is a 'partaking of bread,' and is 'given' by the priest and taken and eaten by the communicant, 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.'" One can surmise what the dean is striving to make clear. But do not his words, as he has arranged them, teach that all this "veritable" and "spiritual" reception, refers to bread only, and that that is all one is receiving—and that this

bread is given as bread by the priest, who, after all, does not really give it, for he only gives it (the bread) after a heavenly and spiritual manner—which, of course, is absurd, preposterous. At the least, whatever the meaning, the Dean, in trying to be careful, simply becomes dark and doubtful. Lastly, this section is weak in that it omits altogether the "memorial before God" that is made in the Holy Eucharist. He forgets to bring forward and improve on the fact that our Eucharistic service (in this differing from the denominational method) is addressed chiefly to God the Father, and only, where the act of communion requires it, to man. It is a God-ward service chiefly and in first place, and a man-ward service only in the second place.

EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCH.

Is it Peace?

SIR.—Dr. Carry's excellent letter on "Tactical Succession" and "the Historic Episcopate," in your columns, only touches on one of the many "distinctive principles" of Wycliffe College. Being lately personally interested in the working of the Divinity Students' Fund of the diocese of Ontario, I procured, a few days ago, "the Calendar of Wycliffe College" for 1890, and I must say that it was with a feeling of great sorrow that I read in its opening pages the "aims" of the College. These "aims" indicate a vindictive and un-Christian hostility to any one who does not agree with what is taught at Wycliffe College, and especially against Trinity College, 25 years the senior of Wycliffe College. The Calendar implies that evangelical truth, the Gospel of Christ, is not taught at Trinity; it glories in the fact that Wycliffe affords facilities for its students to mix freely with dissent and sectarianism at a time when the students should be trained in the distinctive principles of the Church they are to minister in; and it boasts that Wycliffe students thereby acquire "a breadth of sympathy" not attainable at Trinity College. From the tone of the Calendar it is evident that by "breadth of sympathy" is meant that our branch of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church is on no other footing than any one of the numerous sectarian bodies around her. Surely it is very important that while the mind is being trained it should be kept from doubt and other weakening influences until it is sufficiently armed and strengthened for the purpose; if this be a correct principle, the boasted connection of Wycliffe College with the poison of sectarianism is a thing to be mourned over.

One other point I would like to refer to, painful and deplorable as it is, namely, the grossly untrue misstatements made in the pages of Wycliffe College Calendar, of the views of those whose theology and views of Christian institutions differ from what is taught at Wycliffe. With such virulent antagonism and misrepresentation (though, thank God, it is one-sided only) within the Church, we may well ask of the future, Is it peace? Surely our dear Mother Church's arms are wide enough to embrace all her loyal children, however different their characteristics may be, without these children fighting and quarrelling and calling each other names and misrepresenting one another. I do not suppose that either Broad Churchmen or Ritualists, or High or Low Churchmen can claim to be the sole exponents of Catholic truth. But until some kind of finality of opinion is arrived at, why cannot each school of thought in the Church hold by such truth as by God's grace it has attained to, and yet respect the opinions of the others, so long as these opinions are not heretical and can point to history as having been universally held at some time during the first five centuries by the Catholic Church. It is the same Holy Spirit which is guiding each school of thought in the Church, and this should be remembered when one school of thought is speaking of another. Surely such a state of things as described above should not be allowed to go on under the name and apparent sanction of the Church.

I am, yours faithfully.

C. B. MAYNE.

Kingston, September 18, 1890.

Thanks.

SIR.—It is with much pleasure that I return my sincere thanks for your kind consideration in publishing my request for copies of your esteemed paper, and I am sure you will be glad to learn that several friends in Toronto, and one in Montreal, and another in the States, have already sent copies of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN for some months' issue, so that I am able to give a large portion of my flock the privilege of reading the back numbers as well as those to come. If the readers of your paper continue as they have so well begun, I hope to give some favourable accounts of the good the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN will do in my mission of 300 square miles.

It is with much gratitude that I can say of all my congregations that they are, without any opposition, following the true Anglican system of the Church of