

of privilege. The special dignity of the Pope appears throughout as a matter of purely human origin and arrangement, so says the General Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451), in its twenty-eighth Canon: "The fathers, with good reason, bestowed precedence on the Chair of Old Rome, because it was the Imperial City." This Canon was passed in despite of the protest of the Roman Legates, who alone dissented, and was officially declared to mean that only an honorary priority belonged to the Roman See.

But supposing St. Peter did receive a supremacy, and also supposing that he was Bishop of Rome, what evidence is there to prove that his privileges, whatever they were, did not die with him, or that he ever appointed the Bishops of Rome his heirs, even if he had power to appoint any heirs at all, for the three great Petrine texts do not contain anything which even hints at the transmission of the privilege? Roman Canon law states that a personal privilege dies with the person named, and cannot be extended on any plea to persons not so named; and that whenever a claim of a right of privilege is made, the document attesting it must be produced in evidence by the claimant, or else the case fails. Where, I would ask, is the document conferring these privileges on the Bishops of Rome?

Again, supposing the Petrine supremacy to have been left to St. Peter's alleged successors, by what power or process is it conveyed to them? The Papacy is an intermittent office, becoming continually vacant and then filled and conferred by a merely human election. One Pope cannot be said to hand over his gifts to his successor, because that successor is not appointed until after his death, sometimes a long time afterwards. In the case of the Episcopacy this is very different, one Bishop receives his orders from other Bishops, and so the power is handed on without break or diminution. To give an illustration: Hilbert, Bishop of Nova Scotia, was consecrated in the year 1851, by John Bird, Archbishop of Canterbury, and three other Bishops, and we can trace on the line of succession to St. Augustine, Bishop of Canterbury, and through him to Apostolic times. This is not a matter of opinion or faith even, but of historical fact, of which the records are extant. But will Father Kearns tell us how the Pope is made partaker of the Petrine powers?

We are told that "during the period of eighteen centuries Pope has succeeded Pope, without interruption, to the number of 260. No sooner was one Pope dead, or martyred, than another succeeded him. So shall it be to the end." I would ask how it was, at the death of Clement V., when there was a vacancy of the See for more than two years, in consequence of a division among the Cardinals? Where was the Supremacy during this time, and how did the Church exist without it? Perhaps by a natural law of compensation it was counterbalanced in 1409, when there were three Popes—Gregory XII., Benedict XIII., and Alexander V., elected by the Council of Pisa. For some years the world saw the spectacle of three Popes, each claiming to be the sole and true vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, and the centre of unity to the whole Church, each powerfully supported, and severed by mutual excommunication from his rivals, and all who adhered to them. If space permitted, and I cared to do so, I could give a long list of rival Popes. There are even Saints in the Calendar who were contemporaries, yet not in communion with the same Pope.

As to the supremacy and infallibility of the Popes, which Father Kearns maintains, it will be enough, out of many disproofs which are at hand, to give a few. Pope Liberius subscribed an Arian Creed, and anathematized St. Athanasius as a heretic. Pope Honorius was unanimously condemned by the Sixth General Council as a heretic, and a successor of his, Gregory II., wrote to assure the Spanish Bishops that Honorius was certainly damned. The Western Church alone deposed, on its own authority, Pope John XII., Benedict IX., Gregory VI., Gregory XII., and John XIII., the last in express terms, as simoniac, sorcerer, schismatic and heretic. And I would especially remark, that all these depositions have been acknowledged as perfectly valid, and the Popes set up in the stead of the deposed ones, as lawful tenants of the Roman Chair. Nothing in history shows more conclusively than this that the Popes were not viewed as infallible by the Church, but liable to error in the discharge of their office, and to punishment from their superior, the Collective Church, for any misconduct; contrary to the Vatican decrees, which allege that the Pope's decisions on faith and morals are "irreformable on their own merits, not by reason of approval by the Church."

For the sake of brevity, I have omitted giving chapter and verse to quotations, and contented myself with, in many cases, merely referring to them; but if any of them are questioned, I shall be ready to give not only the reference, but the text in the Greek or Latin as it may chance to be.

JOHN PADFIELD.
St. Margaret's Hall, Dec. 7, 1880.

OUR READERS, we know, will rejoice with us that our English correspondent has resumed his labours. His first letter, which appeared last week, (a pleasant surprise) came upon us so suddenly and at so late an hour, that we were not able to call the attention of our readers to it. Perhaps it is as well for us to repeat, that while we have full confidence in our correspondent, we do not necessarily endorse all his views.

ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE MARRIAGE LAW OF THE DOMINION, LEGALIZING MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED HUSBAND'S BROTHER, AND A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Summary of a Sermon delivered in St. Peter's Church, Charlottetown, P.E.I., by Rev. G. W. Hobson, on Sunday, November 14th.

[Concluded.]

Now let us turn to our Bibles, and consider the question with the light thrown upon it there. And here we will only take up the degrees of affinity. Besides the foregoing reasons, are there any from Scripture why degrees of affinity should be counted?

So doing, guards and enforces the great Scriptural truth of the Unity of Man and Wife. If not an absolutely necessary deduction from that truth it is at least a reasonable conclusion from it, naturally and wisely adopted.

But—it may be said—death having dissolved the union between a man and his wife, *a fortiori*, it is dissolved between him and her relations.

Granted for argument's sake. But is it seemly, is it decent, is it compatible with any high or pure view of those relationships that a man, having once considered a woman as his mother or his sister, may afterwards take her as his wife? While his wife lived she was his mother-in-law, or his sister-in-law. Ought she then ever to become his wife? If the relationship is admitted as a natural deduction from a Scriptural statement during the wife's life, then surely every right feeling person would have it continue.

But now, as to the directions in Leviticus. Here it will be fairer to separate the cases of the husband's brother and wife's sister. Take the former.

"If a man shall take his brother's wife it is an unclean thing, he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness." (Leviticus xx: 21.)

And, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife; it is thy brother's nakedness." (Leviticus xviii: 16.)

Very many are of opinion (the Westminster Confession emphatically asserts this) that these laws are part of God's revelation to the world generally. If so, there is no room for further argument on this point, for those who accept that revelation.

But, as I have said, I want to meet the advocates of the change on their own ground. Grant, then, for argument's sake, that these are merely Jewish laws. What then would be the case? The Jewish view of matrimony was lower than the Christian. Polygamy was tolerated. Divorce was made easy. Yet even with this lower view, they remembered that a "man and his wife are one flesh" (Gen. ii, 24); and forbade a woman to marry the brother of her own flesh. But Christian legislators are going to be satisfied with a lower view on this point than was the Jew. That certainly seems a going back or going down. One can understand restrictions being increased, but on what ground are they to be relaxed?

It is said, "but in one particular case

it was commanded" (Deuteronomy xxv, 5, 10). A special exception in no way invalidates a general rule. Our law generally is not to kill a man; but in self-defence I may kill a man. How absurd it would be to argue:—Because the law of England permits killing a man in one case, evidently it cannot think it wrong to kill a man even though there is a law against it. Now, clearly understand what this argument is. A Jew with his lower view of marriage, forbids generally such marriages. A Christian with his higher view may even go beyond the Jew and forbid them altogether. He can't surely fall below the earlier standard, and permit them altogether.

Now as to the wife's sister. In Leviticus xviii, 18, we read:—"Neither shall thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her in her lifetime." The interpretation of this verse is doubtful. In the margin of the common version we read instead of a "wife to her sister," "one wife to another." If this be correct, the verse would only forbid polygamy.

Of course those who throw overboard the direct, explicit statement about the husband's brother, cannot claim this verse to support their view about the wife's sister. They cannot claim this verse as a ground for permitting the one union if they refuse to allow verse 16 to forbid the other. But no doubt there is a considerable number of persons who consider the Levitical law as not without authority—who thereupon disapprove of the marriage with a husband's brother; but who, relying on this verse, would permit the other. To that class the following argument is addressed.

Grant, for argument's sake, your interpretation of the verse. What do we see? Among the Jews, a woman was forbidden to marry her deceased husband's brother; but a man was permitted to marry his deceased wife's sister. Bear these two points in mind.

Now come for a moment and think of a Christian marriage service. What idea runs all through it? The equality of man and wife, so far as that is possible. Have you ever thought of the meaning of the following minute and careful directions given in our marriage service?

"The minister shall cause the man with his right hand to take the woman by her right hand and to say: I M. take thee, N., to be my wedded wife, &c., &c."

And now, observe—

"Then shall they love their hands; AND THE WOMAN WITH HER RIGHT HAND, TAKING THE MAN BY HIS RIGHT HAND, shall likewise say: I N. take thee M. to be my wedded husband." If the man takes the woman's hand, then their hands must be loosed, that she, in turn, may take his. Not only does the man take the woman to be his wedded wife; but the woman takes the man to be her wedded husband. There was nothing of this sort among the Jews, or with any Eastern nation. The positions were not equal. The man took the woman, but the woman did not take the man. She was not allowed so to do. Consequently, when a man "took a wife," he brought her into his family. His brothers became hers, so she was forbidden to marry any one of them. But as the woman did not "take the man," he was not supposed to go into her family; her sisters were not his, and he might marry them.

The one can be forbidden while the other is permitted only on the low view of woman's position, that she is not an equal in the contract. And so, actual & unconsciously yet really degrading their sisters, daughters, mothers and wives, in this particular, from the lofty position in which Christianity has placed them, to a level with the inmates of an Eastern harem. The proposal is a burning insult to every woman in the land. There is another matter in connection with this subject to which I must refer. It is impossible to read the debates that took place in Parliament on this question, without seeing how prominently the peculiar claims of the Roman Catholic denomination were brought forward. It may be well to state what ground that Church takes on the question.

She prohibits all the degrees, both of consanguinity and affinity, that we do. She also prohibits the marriage of cousins. She further recognizes spiritual affinities, as a bar, i. e., a godfather cannot marry his godchild. Having thus widely extended the prohibition, the Pope claims power to dispense with them. I do not know whether he is supposed to have the power to dispense with all. As a

matter of fact he dispenses with spiritual affinities, with cousins, with brothers and sisters-in-law, with uncles and nieces, nephews and aunts. Ordinarily these dispensations are not procured without a money payment. Last winter a member of that Church wrote to one of the papers that he had obtained such a dispensation at the cost of one hundred dollars.

I quote now from the official report of the debates (Hansard, session of 1880, vol. II p. 1383) where M. Girouard read letters he had received from several Bishops.

The Bishop of Sherbrooke writes, while approving of the Bill: "Would it not also be *propos* to repeal, at the same time, Article 126 [of the Quebec code], which prohibits marriage between uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews?"

And the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe writes: "I have the honor to inform you, in answer to your yesterday's letter, that I would be content to see disappear from our code not only article 125, but also Article 126 [i. e. not only the prohibition against brother and sisters-in-law, but also against uncles, nieces, aunts and nephews], which in many cases are very embarrassing to us Catholics."

So that those who are among the most anxious for the change desire that, not only shall there be a relaxation in the case of marriage connections, but also in that of blood relations.

It is but right to say that when the bill was altered, Mgr. Lefebvre, Bishop of Three Rivers, took alarm, and withdrew his sanction from it. As this prolate is confessedly one of the ablest, if not the ablest theologian on the Bench, it may be that his influence will not be unfelt by his episcopal brethren.

The question is now before you. It is a woman's question equally, if not more than a man's, for women will be the keenest sufferers by any degradation of the marriage state. It is a Layman's question far more than a clergyman's; for one clerical family there are hundreds of lay families. You can, by petition and by the use of every legitimate influence, oppose the bill for the sake of your country; and, if it should pass, you can thank God, with all your hearts, that you belong to a church which, under all circumstances, forbids such unions to all her members.

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

WHY DO PEOPLE STAND?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—It is difficult to understand the ideas and motives of some persons. It is particularly difficult to understand the ideas and motives of one of your correspondents, who has consumed much time, ink and paper in attacking a beautiful act of worship, which the growing reverence of the age has introduced into many of our churches. Until the eighth century there were but two attitudes allowed to worshippers in churches—standing and kneeling. The apathy in religious matters, and the disregard of ancient pious customs, which prevailed from that period down to the Reformation, if not somewhat later, suffered the Church to go to sleep, and even to sleep, during the time of divine service. Your correspondent may just as well protest against my keeping awake during prayers, by a strong effort of will, instead of giving way to a natural inclination to drowsiness, as to protest against those of his fellow-Christians who formerly sat during the presentation of the offertory, but now rise and, with reverence and gratitude felt in the heart and shown in the bodily posture, returning to Almighty God a portion of what He, in His great goodness, has given them. This is the simple and only meaning of this beautiful and simple custom, whatever other motives may be falsely imputed to those by whom it is observed; and it seems to me that any one who attacks the custom does very wrong. Is reverence to be discouraged and, if it is, are we to take as our criterion the Churchmen who sit through prayers, leave the responses to their fellows, and generally do little in connection with the Church and its ser-

vices except by way of perpetual protest against innovation?

Your obedient servant,
J. A.

THE REPORT OF THE BOARD OF HOME MISSIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—It is pleasing to hear from the Clerical Secretary that he hopes to present a satisfactory Report early next year; but I am sorry that I cannot regard as satisfactory his explanations and answers pertaining to the Report of 1879, which appeared in your last issue.

In my former letter I ventured to impugn this Report on three grounds: the first being that the information it contained was insufficient and inadequate; the second, that it was inaccurate; and the third, that it was possibly misleading.

And after a careful perusal of Mr. Wainwright's letter, I have nothing to retract or modify.

I. My first complaint was that it was impossible to gather from the Report what the income of the Board from donations and subscriptions for 1879 really was. And the only reply to this complaint is that Mr. Wainwright was told by the late Secretary and present Treasurer that the table of receipts by the Treasurer was not requisite and need not be printed. But at least a summary of the receipts for the year might have been given, showing from what sources the income had been derived, what from voluntary contributions, and what from investments. If the Report had contained such a summary, I should not have thought of looking further.

II. In the next place, I found that the figures in Mr. Wainwright's comparison of subscriptions for 1877, 1878 and 1879, did not correspond with the sums obtained by adding the lists printed in the Reports of these years. I put Mr. Wainwright's figures and my own in parallel columns:—

Mr. W.	D. S.
1877.....\$4,137.71	1877.....\$4,251.79
1878.....\$3,542.45	1878.....\$3,677.89
1879.....\$4,880.00	1879.....\$4,411.57

To the list for 1879, Mr. Wainwright adds \$119.19 collected by him to April, 1879, so that his total for that year is \$5,299.28.

Mr. Wainwright acknowledges that some errors do occur in his Report; but he endeavors to minimize them, and deprecates criticism on the plea of the exacting nature of his duties. But is it not of the first importance that a Report of the Board of Home Missions, which is the only means the Church-people generally of the Diocese have of ascertaining what the work, condition and prospects of the Board are, should be as accurate as it is possible to make it?

It did not escape me that in the Report of 1878 some parishes (viz., Annapolis and Ship Harbor) had two lists. Mr. Wainwright suggests that if these "double lists" were deducted from my figures for 1877 and 1878, they would approximate very nearly to his. This is true enough. But why should they be so deducted? On what principle would he deduct from the Report of 1877 any list that appears in that of 1878? Why deduct from either? I did not notice these lists in my former letter, because in the case of Annapolis there was no list in the Report of 1877, and if one of those which appeared in 1878 were transferred to that year, it would not materially affect my case. I saw, too, that if Mr. W. called attention to them, as I expected him to do, we should only have another illustration of the untrustworthiness of a comparison of the lists as a guide to a knowledge of the financial condition of the Board.

In face of Mr. Wainwright's correction, I must repeat my assertion, advisedly made with all the facts before me, that the Bishop's donation of \$200.00 is not included in any list. Donations to the amount of \$228.75 are acknowledged. And then immediately below begin "the subscription lists received up to January 16th, 1880." I excluded the donations from my figures of 1879, because Mr. W. himself had limited his financial statement to a comparison of the lists, and because they had no tendency to support the inference "that the people are waking to a sense of their responsibilities."

Another element of perplexity appears in Mr. Wainwright's letter. He has corrected his addition of the subscription lists for 1879, and added to it the donations which I have excluded, and \$11.00 obtained I know not how. But he makes up for much of what he has been com-