

rate we shall say nothing; that his income therefrom was sufficient to live comfortably upon, but that being of an active turn he employed himself in carrying on business, which he did with much profit; that he was a bachelor, and he and his sister—also in independent circumstances—lived together very comfortably and were considered very good sort of people.

On making known to him the object of my mission he told me it was not long since he had contributed to the parochial collection; that people were always at him for something or another; the times were dreadfully hard, and that he really could not afford to give anything more. I, however, persisted by telling him this was a special and unusual appeal in consequence of the hard times, and that upon no class of persons did they press so hardly as on our missionary clergy in the new settlements, where the pressure was most keenly felt. This he denied, stating that he had lived in the backwoods, and it was a fine healthy place, and that people there could learn to rough it and live upon little. Yes, I said, that is true, but they and their families must have food and raiment however coarse and plain it be, and that the sacrifices they were making entitled them to the sympathy of those who were blessed with ample means and were living in comfort.

"Surely," said I, "you would treat them like the man who tried to make his horse to live upon nothing; the result was, you remember, that when he had so far succeeded as to get him to live on a spear of hay per day, the horse died. A similar instance of folly I was told as having occurred in the neighborhood in which I am now residing. It was that of a fanatic—by no means a poor man—who took it into his head we did wrong in not following nature more strictly. He maintained it was never intended we should wear shoes and stockings, not even in winter, and resolved to act on the principle. He did so and, as might have been expected, after a good deal of stoical endurance, caught a cold and died. I much fear that the insufficient and irregularly paid stipends of our missionary clergy may have compelled some of their children to take elementary lessons in these branches of experimental philosophy; but surely, after these facts, you would not allow them to be carried out to like fatal results!" But all in vain! I could get nothing from him!

If you think these observations may do the cause service by leading people who possess the ability "to consider their ways and be wise," I shall be happy to supply you with more, but I must take care and not commit the fault of persons of my age—become tiresome.

Yours, &c.,

SENEX.

#### LADY EVANGELISTS.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—We are just now having a new church sensation in Western Ontario, in the shape of two lady "Evangelists." They belong nominally to the English Church, but consort freely with the different denominations. They believe part of the Prayer Book, but carefully exclude even its collects from their meetings. One of them holds services and preaches, taking a text or subject and delivering an extemporaneous address or sermon. On one occasion, at least and presumably therefore at others, she closed her meeting herself with extemporaneous prayer when there were four ordained clergymen in the room.

The imposition of hands in Confirmation after adult baptism they deem unnecessary and irreligiously seated during the communion office where it is used because they don't believe in it. Now Mr. Editor we do not allow our Divinity Students to preach their own sermons, still less to deliver extensive addresses either in praying or preaching; but devoted christian ladies (for such the persons referred to undoubtedly are) may become public teachers and preachers whenever forsooth they feel themselves called to such a responsible office without passing any theological examination or being amenable to any authority either diocesan or parochial. Putting aside for the time being, St. Paul's strictures upon female speakers in the church, it seems to me that before women are allowed this amount of license, our lay readers should have more freedom given them in their

work, and our clergy should be released from the vows of obedience to authority and belief in the Book of Common Prayer. If the church is to be revolutionized let us go about it in earnest. But the ladies referred to defend their position by a pamphlet. It is called "woman's ministry in the Gospel," and is an extemporaneous address delivered at St. James' Hall, Plymouth (England) by Mrs. Henry Denning.

The authoress naturally begins her defence of her anomalous position as a public teacher by repeating St. Paul's direction to the Corinthian Church regarding the silence of women. She accomplishes her purpose by the newly invented interpretation that by the "church" is meant a "church meeting—which we now term a Vestry Meeting!"

If this is a correct rendering, we must either unlearn our theology or have a new version of the passage. Why, even Barnes, the Presbyterian commentator, says "St. Paul here argues against the practice on every ground; forbids it altogether, and shows that on every consideration it was regarded as improper for women even so much as to ask a question in time of public service." "No rule in the N. T. is more positive than this, and however plausible may be the reasons urged for disregarding it, and for suffering women to take part in conducting public worship, yet the authority of the Apostle is positive and his meaning cannot be mistaken."

The same Apostle's advice to Timothy "I suffer not a woman to teach or usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence," is met by the argument (?) that the clergy and laity of the Established Church are all under "petticoat government" because the queen forsooth is "head" of the church "as relative to temporal power." St. Paul's advice about not teaching and keeping silence is quietly ignored, and the not usurping authority handled in the above way.

Having thus disposed of the passages which seem to some minds to forbid the ministry of women, she takes up the texts which, in her view, seem to favor it. She begins by confounding the inspired prophetess of the Jewish Church with the female preachers of these latter days. Miriam and Deborah and Huldah and Anna are quoted as instances of woman's preaching. The daughters of Philip the Evangelist, in St. Paul's day, are referred to in the same connection, and great wonder is expressed that the Apostle could sojourn in a house where there were "four lady preachers," and yet teach what we believe he did in his Epistle to the Corinthians. Surely our lady friends do not lay claim to inspiration!

Next comes another startling assertion, Mary Magdalene was a preacher! She proclaimed the Resurrection to the Apostles. The woman of Samaria, too, preached to the Samaritans when she testified of the Saviour's prophetic character, and finally Priscilla is separated from her husband and "handed down to us in Holy Writ as one who expounded the way of God more perfectly to an eloquent man and was mighty in the Scriptures." Strange, is it not, that woman cannot be spoken of as "helpers" in the Gospel without being at once transformed into public teachers and placed in the category of "preachers?"

I am not one, Mr. Editor, who would oppose woman's work in the Church; but I would have her keep within her proper sphere and labor, as hundreds of devoted women are laboring to-day with the approval and under the direction of the clergy in the parishes where their work lies. There is plenty of legitimate work to be done. In almost every parish noble spheres of usefulness might be filled by godly women. We want "helpers" in the Gospel. But let us reserve the public teaching for those who, after due examination and careful preparation, have been deemed fitted for the priesthood or the diaconate, and has admitted to holy orders in the Church. After exhausting her arguments (?) Mrs. Denning indulges in a little declamation. She treats the clergy with feeling "Mondayish," and claims that there were more Wesleys and Whitefields in the world the "weaker vessels" would not feel it so necessary to become standard-bearers. The closing words of her peroration quoted from some dear friend, admits an identity of sex quite unexpected by us stronger vessels, and I cannot better

close this letter and clinch its argument than in her own words: "Had Balaam been a more faithful prophet the ass need never have opened HER mouth." Yours, "ECCLESIA."

#### "HIGH" OR "LOW."

DEAR SIR,—A few days ago I received from a friend a copy of your Toronto contemporary of May 16th, in which some remarks of mine, arising out of the unwarrantable interference of the Church Association in our parochial affairs, are the subjects both of an editorial and a communication—a larger amount of attention than I had a right to expect.

I am charged with raising "a false issue" in having said that "low churchmen assert that Christ died only for a few, while high churchmen believe that Christ died for all." The answer to this is: "The matter here mentioned has nothing whatever to do with the issues between high and low Churchmen." I was perfectly correct in saying that it formed the doctrinal difference, and that was what I was asked to define. In the early days of my ministry it was the only issue between my worthy Calvinistic neighbour and myself, and we never argued about anything else. Though an exceedingly kind and hospitable man, he was sometimes not very courteous in conducting his argument. He told me plainly on one occasion that I could not be saved because I did not believe as he did. Once the old gentleman got me to preach for him, and although the congregation only consisted of five persons, including the two clergy, he could not trust me to preach a sermon of my own. I had to spell through one of his. The doctrine is constantly though covertly preached. In most Low Church sermons we find a marked distinction made between "the redeemed," and those we are left to infer have not been redeemed. The Lambeth Arches containing the doctrine were not drawn up by High Churchmen. The doctrine was an open and a living issue in the days of Wesley, and constituted the only difference between himself and Whitfield, and which upon every fitting occasion he opposed. The doctrine is Calvinism, pure and simple, and Low Churchmen profess to be Calvinists. It is a burning issue in the Free Church of Scotland at this moment, between those who repudiate the standards, and the part in particular which teaches this doctrine, and those who maintain them in full, as they have received them.

A part of the editorial in question is taken up in answering Dr. Robert South's witty definition of High and Low Church in which there was much truth when it was uttered, and there is just as much truth in it now. I gave it because the question having been raised by the communications of the Church Association, matters had assumed to me a comical aspect. And, indeed, the writer of the editorial justifies the definition, for he says: "We love our own Church but we cannot allow this love to blind us to her faults, or to her dangers." This is an example of setting private opinion above the Church. The editor can see "faults" in the Church which the Church herself cannot see, or else she would redress them. I can see faults in myself; in individual members of the Church, and many evils arising out of the mere accident of her being established, and, as it were in bondage to the State. One of these I will mention,—the maintenance of a Bishop in the enjoyment of the temporalities of the See from which he has been deposed by the whole Church for denying the inspiration of the Divine Record. To the Church, the body of Christ, I can see no fault. I should much like to know what the "faults" of the Church are: I can easily guess what the editor considers "her dangers."

"There is one grand distinction between us and our opponents; a distinction admitted by themselves, and one concerning which there can be no compromise. All who hold the doctrine of a human mediating priesthood are on the one side; all who hold the sole priesthood of Christ are on the other side of this line. This is the sole issue."

The offices of Christ are those of Prophet, Priest, and King. I neither know any who hold "the doctrine of a human mediating priesthood"; nor where in Scripture the sole priesthood of Christ is mentioned, or proved by inference or logical de-