

leads to other errors. Back of the theory of the succession lies sacerdotalism, which means that, instead of a Christian ministry whose work it is to declare the counsel of God, we would have a priesthood that would stand between the people and God. I am aware that there is a comparatively harmless use of the word priest, while there is a use of the word that is revolting to all true Christians, and ought to be. In the Church of England the words presbyter and priest are used as interchangeable terms, and etymologically they are the same word, but the word priest, as used by an evangelical member of a prelatical Church, has one sense, that is, as differing nothing of any importance from what we mean by a minister, while it is used by one ritualistically inclined in a very different sense, that is, as a priest in the Old Testament sense, a man who comes between the soul and God, and represents the laity, so called, before God. In other words, the priest in the latter sense is a man who offers sacrifice and burns incense. That is the position that the full-blown ritualist assumes, such men as we have had to deal with in this controversy. I do not hold the Church of England or any of her daughters directly responsible for this, that is to say, any further than that Church has passively permitted such sacerdotalism to be practised within her pale. Whether the prelatical Churches were justified in allowing such an abuse to go on under the shelter of their wings, it is not for me to say. I prefer to leave such questions to be settled by these Churches themselves. I am aware of the difficulties that are in the way, and I know how faithfully